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INTRODUCTION

Teachers in the United States as well as in other countries of the world have become attuned to their new role as initiators and directors of professional development programs. The sixty-one centers funded by the U.S. Office of Education Teacher Center Program held great hope to all interested in inservice education produced by collaborative planning.

The long awaited teacher center legislation has provided the impetus for searching out unique ways of delivering relevant programs geared to the needs of classroom teachers. There is now excitement about classroom teachers acting as teacher center consultants. Teachers are eager to participate in programs they have helped develop and to share with others who have been successful in coping with class problems similar to their own.

This guidebook is offered as a resource to teachers in their efforts to take a leadership role in the teacher center movement. After numerous conversations with teachers, the focus of the publication was aimed at federation members who wanted to begin planning teacher center projects. It can also be used as a reference for teacher center policy board members who are revising proposals to be resubmitted to their State Educational Agencies. The most valuable references used in preparing this publication have been the sixty teacher center proposals funded by the Office of Education in 1978.

We congratulate policy board members of all funded centers and applaud them for the creative use of visuals, organization methods and successful project planning. These proposals are now available and provide greater insight into the Teacher Center Rules and Regulations. Sections from funded proposals have been photoreduced for easy identification. This publication is not designed as a comprehensive study, but rather as an introduction to project development. The teacher center is a growing concept, so new materials will appear in print each month. The removable pages make it possible to add to the book and to delete sections that become obsolete.
Sincere appreciation is extended:
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to David B. Sherman, Bureau of Special State and Federal Programs, New York City Board of Education and Miriam Smith, New York City Teacher Center Consortium, who shared their Project Manual for the Information Center for Proposal Development and outlined the factors necessary for successful proposals;
to Charles Lovett, U.S. Office of Education, Teacher Centers Program, who assisted in the final editing of the handbook;
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to Sandy Gautier, who made the final copy of this Handbook a reality as a result of many weeks of planning and editing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Used to Evaluate Teacher Center Proposals</th>
<th>Pages in Handbook Which Address Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The extent of the teacher center policy board's authority and responsibility for supervision of the project (10 points).</td>
<td>pp. 30-33; 46; 51; 153-54; 156-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The potential of the proposed teacher center for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students (20 points).</td>
<td>pp. 29-30; 37; 54-73; 153-54; 156-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The soundness of the proposed plan of operation, including consideration of the extent to which—1. The objectives of the proposed projects are sharply defined, clearly stated, and capable of being attained by the proposed procedures (10 points); and 2. The adequacy of provisions for reporting of the effectiveness of the project and dissemination of its results, and for determining the extent to which the objectives are accomplished (10 points).</td>
<td>pp. 36; 70-74; 77; 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The appropriateness of size, scope, and duration of the project so as to secure productive results (5 points).</td>
<td>pp. 96-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The adequacy of qualifications and experience of personnel designated to carry out the proposed project (5 points).</td>
<td>pp. 36; 105-127; 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The adequacy of the facilities and resources (5 points).</td>
<td>pp. 100-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The reasonableness of estimated cost in relation to anticipated results, including the proportion of the budget represented by costs for released time or substitutes (5 points).</td>
<td>pp. 36; 128-145; 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The potential of the teacher center to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall program of inservice training for teachers (15 points).</td>
<td>pp. 84-86; 156-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The representativeness of the teacher center policy board under sec. 1924(h) (10 points).</td>
<td>pp. 23-28; 44; 45; 153-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The extent to which federal funds will support new or expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources (5 points).</td>
<td>pp. 78-83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AFT ROLES IN
THE EVOLUTION OF U.S.O.E. TEACHER CENTERS

AFT leadership has set the pace for involvement in teacher center planning on collaboration during this decade. In 1971 AFT President Al Shanker cited the teacher center as a "major educational advance" and later "as a needed educational reform." His theme of forging new alliances has generated new enthusiasm for collaborative ventures necessary for the formation of local teacher center policy boards.

Eugenia Kemble, AFT Assistant to the President, outlined the rationale for effective teacher inservice education and highlighted the new interest that was developing in teacher centers. Since that time, the AFT leadership has supported the governance structure that insures that "teacher centers" are really for teachers.

The AFT Executive Council members have also exerted leadership by making recommendations for a Teacher Center Advisory Group in 1976. This group of ten members visited existing centers and interviewed center staff. They provide information to teachers involved in the development of their local and regional teacher center projects.

In February, 1978, the National Institute of Education provided a further impetus to AFT leadership efforts. Recognizing the overall capabilities for leadership and dissemination, NIE awarded a two-year grant for the establishment of the AFT Teacher Center Resource Exchange. Through this project, creative teachers have an opportunity to become more knowledgeable about the teacher centered inservice programs and skills in governance techniques. Activities include teacher center seminars and conferences, and a clearinghouse of information on teacher center resources which is shared upon request. This publication is made available through the AFT Clearinghouse.
RESOLUTION ON TEACHER CENTERS

WHEREAS, teachers have long recognized that teacher preparation and inservice education need to be more closely related to classroom realities; and

WHEREAS, teaching is a profession that can be perfected only through constant sharing, beginning, ideally, with an internship program for new teachers; and

WHEREAS, the framework for the sharing of new curricular approaches and of teaching strategies must be determined by teachers themselves if inservice programs are to be truly useful; and

WHEREAS, new federal legislation authorizing the creation of teacher centers provides for centers to be run by policy boards composed of a majority of teachers; and

WHEREAS, the voice of teachers on such boards is best reflected through democratically elected teacher organizations; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that in all activities related to the planning, establishment, and operation of federally-funded teacher centers, local school boards and institutions of higher education must deal with the elected bargaining agent or organization representing teachers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that teacher representatives to the policy boards that run centers be named by the elected collective bargaining agent or organization representing teachers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that teachers serving on policy boards and participating in organized in-service activities sponsored by teacher centers be provided with released time so that they may take full advantage of the services offered by the centers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that every effort be made to work cooperatively with institutions of higher education in developing centers and in administering their programs; and be it further

RESOLVED, that center programs be made available to all educational personnel who wish to make use of them including paraprofessionals, guidance counselors, curriculum specialists, and teachers of every level and specialty; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the American Federation of Teachers urges Congress to fully fund the teacher center legislation at its highest authorized level.
FUNDING FOR TEACHER TRAINING

WHEREAS, the Congress has provided funds for teacher centers; and

WHEREAS, the combination of decreasing birth rates and budget cuts has resulted in staff reductions in school districts throughout the nation; and

WHEREAS, bilingual and special education are among the few areas where there are expanding job opportunities; and

WHEREAS, experienced and highly trained teachers have been laid off, while inexperienced recent college graduates have been hired; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the American Federation of Teachers and its affiliated locals strongly support the inclusion of teacher training components in the areas of bilingual and special education in teacher center proposals; and be it further

RESOLVED, that we urge the American Federation of Teachers to support legislation which would establish opportunities for the retraining of in-service teachers.
The essential nature of teaching has not really changed very much in the last century. The conditions are different, thanks to unions. There is also a wider variety of teaching technologies to choose from—new math or old math, for example. But teachers still live an isolated working life. Their professional time is spent almost entirely with students. They learn what works primarily through trial and error. And, only they have any real sense of their most important successes—successes with individual students that can rarely be measured.

That first terrorizing day of total responsibility for a class, alone, is one that is well known to every teacher. To succeed as teaching is to come through a rigorous trial in which the chief witness also happens to be the judge—the school principal. Having passed the initial test the teacher only faces more of the same. Freedom to work privately is highly valued because it minimizes the threat of observance and provides the greatest leeway for personal fulfillment. There is nothing in teacher education that fosters these developments. There is nothing in the structure of schools and their administration that will encourage these conditions to change.

None of the reforms that periodically get dreamed up by education schools or government officials have taken this aspect of the teacher's life into account. Most have come in the form of pressures on the teacher to produce more, such as performance contracting or performance-based teacher certification. Or, they have represented basic shifts in the substance teachers have to work with, like career education, environmental education, aesthetic education, and many other curricular fads. Because all of these have failed to examine the essence of teaching—or even to fairly take it into account—they have either remained both innocuous and ineffective or have been quickly abandoned as irrelevant failures.

Teachers know these things. Some of the better education studies have documented them. Robert Dreeben's The Nature of Teaching and Dan Lortie's Schoolteacher thoroughly discuss the lack of collegiality among teachers.

*Eugenia Kemble is Senior Special Assistant to the President of the American Federation of Teachers.
the ways teacher preparation establishes this pattern; and the picture of the individual classroom as an isolated "cell." A major study by the Rand Corporation, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, found that innovations really took hold in school districts where teachers were most involved in their development and implementation. It is really surprising, then, that reforms have managed to ignore these issues up until now. Perhaps it is because none of them have really emerged from teacher demands for change. Nor have they accepted the basic logic of teachers' defensive posture against reform—the vulnerability that comes with isolation.

One difference with teacher centers as a reform idea is that teachers have asked for them. Another is that one of their essential characteristics is teacher sharing, which goes to the heart of the teacher isolation problem. Last, and most important, is that teacher centers are by definition an innovation that is controlled by teachers themselves. As long as 1971, American Federation of Teachers President Albert Shanker wrote in his New York Times column that teacher centers modeled after their British counterparts could greatly enrich the professional lives of teachers by enabling them to share skills and experiences with one another. Other American educators, enamored of the open education approach to learning in the early grades, also picked up on the idea. But in their minds the centers could serve as a vehicle for proselytizing open education philosophy.

A flurry of activity focusing on teacher centers ensued but teacher organizations were effectively relegated to the periphery of the movement by those in control of money sources. Proposals submitted by the union to major foundations like Ford and Carnegie were turned down. A report to the Office of Education from the Teachers National Field Task Force, which included many teacher organization representatives, recommended that federally sponsored teacher centers be teacher-controlled. But when the Office of Education finally decided to support some centers the entities that were created were dominated by State and local administrative bureaucracies. So, even though the American Federation of Teachers was instrumental in popularizing the idea in this country, without outside money it was not in a position to play a leading role.

With the help of the same foundations and the same Federal bureaucrats that had ignored the union, teacher centers began springing up around the country. Before long the National Institute of Education was supporting something its staff called "networking." NIE enabled
centers to keep in touch with each other through a central clearinghouse operation called the Teachers' Centers Exchange located at the Far West Regional Laboratory in San Francisco. The problem was that these earliest centers lacked any representative teacher control. They did not really reflect what the profession at large wanted. As a result, many of the centers that have emerged out of this early stage of teacher center development suffer from common problems. Among them are:

- A heavy emphasis on the needs of elementary school teachers, in particular activities concentrated on making things by working with materials. Secondary teachers have rarely shown much interest in these centers and their programs generally offer little at that level.

- Creation of the center by individuals who have a particular educational philosophy and therefore tend to constrict center programs to meet their biases. The result is service to a limited number of teachers who tend to have a similar point of view.

- Instability growing from insecure funding.

- Lack of effective needs assessment mechanisms that might enable centers to draw up programs that service broadly varying groups of teachers.

- Failure to implement effective evaluations that might show some concrete evidence of the importance of their work. As a result many school districts in which these centers operate remain unconvinced of their value.

- Insufficient staff due to funding shortages.

- Governance mechanisms that are more exclusive than inclusive. Very few operating centers have working relationships with the union representing teachers in their area and few have bothered trying to establish them.
In the fall of 1976, the work that the AFT and others had done to press for a Federal teacher center bill finally brought success. As part of the Education Amendments of 1976, Congress authorized a new teacher center law that could provide up to $67.5 million in Federal funds for centers run by policy boards composed of a majority of teachers. A last-minute effort by teacher colleges who believed that the bill represented a political threat to their turf failed, and a new and potentially large source of Federal funds for teacher centers was created.

Passage of the bill represented a clear departure in the development of American teacher centers. While the role of organizations awaited clarification, the main governance question had been resolved. Teachers would control the new centers. The hodgepodge of establishments calling themselves teacher centers—many of which simply amounted to extensions of State departments of education or universities—were faced with a strong new definition of what a center was. Teacher centers that received funds under the new bill would be placed where teachers had the majority voice. Most centers would be funded through local education agencies though up to 10 percent of appropriated funds could go to institutions of higher education. But all centers would be run by policy boards and all policy boards would have a majority of teacher members.

Unfortunately, the new bill was not warmly greeted in all quarters that might be expected to have an interest in it. Not only were the colleges wary, but many of the new centers that had received life from foundations and the Office of Education were worried that they would have to turn their centers over to teachers in order to get funds. In something of a last gasp on the subject, the Ford Foundation sponsored a conference that collected a large number of activists from these centers at the University of Chicago in June 1977. The atmosphere among participants was largely despondent. Most seemed to view the new bill as a threat rather than as the basis for major reform of inservice education for teachers. Rather than figuring out how to adapt to the requisites of the new bill, most had come to the conclusion that they were not going to be part of the action and had written the whole enterprise off their slate of interests.

The American Federation of Teachers began developing its response to the bill shortly after it was passed. The Executive Council of the AFT named a 10-member Teacher Center Advisory Group composed of teacher leaders from around the country experienced with the issue. The group's purpose was to develop policy recommendations on teacher
centers; to monitor the Federal regulations drafted to accompany the bill; and to act generally as a source of expertise for locals interested in establishing centers. Unfortunately a low appropriation, tentatively set by the joint committee at $8.25 million, for the first year of the bill's implementation, accompanied by general chaos in an Office of Education reorganized by a new administration, has slowed the momentum for establishing new centers somewhat. But the first year will still be key since basic directions and purposes will be determined by the earliest centers funded.

Directions and purposes might well be based on British center history. While the term teacher center can be applied to almost anything, as the experience in this country demonstrates, the major purposes set forth by the British centers fall into two broad categories: curriculum development, and a more general professional growth and inservice education emphasis that could take many forms. The curriculum development function was really the basis for the establishment of many of the earliest British teacher centers. The idea was to teach British teachers, through centers, about newly developed Nuffield Math materials. Curriculum-oriented centers were also set up in conjunction with Britain's new comprehensive schools. According to Robert Thornbury, who heads the Sherbrooke Teachers' Centre in London, centers were also established for the more general professional purposes of attracting teachers to difficult urban teaching and supporting them once they got there. Revitalizing teacher education was still another, all-encompassing purpose.

So far talk and action on teacher centers in this country have not focused much on curriculum development. At this stage in our experience with the idea lack of movement in this area is probably advisable since the focus of attention might easily become diverted into imposing particular curriculums on teachers, rather than allowing the initiatives to come from them.

Yet, there are immediate needs teachers have here that demand the specialized attention teacher centers could provide. Basic skills in the areas of reading and math are obvious firsts. In the fall of 1977 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act goes into effect. And, as necessary as it is for our schools to educate handicapped children, provisions of the law requiring placement of children in "the least restrictive environment"--which for the most part will mean regular classrooms--and requiring the development of individualized education plans for each child will tax teachers and school systems greatly. Teacher centers could provide an invaluable source of support
and shared information for teachers as this new law is implemented.

Another issue of concern is the minimum competency movement which seems to be sweeping the country. State by State, along with an emphasis on tests and accountability plans. Teacher centers could devote program and consultation time to the subject of tests—how they can be used; how they are limited; and what constitutes a misuse of tests either for individual children, for school systems, or for States.

Problem areas like these are ones on which all educational personnel, whether guidance counselors, paraprofessionals, or subject area specialists will want to participate. Centers should be open to all of them so that insights can be shared across functional lines. In fact, centers might be viewed as agencies of consolidation when it comes to educational training for federally funded specialties—handicapped, bilingual, and vocational education as well as education for the disadvantaged (Title I, ESEA).

These are the immediate problems and everyday practicalities that teachers need help with. But they should not draw attention away from the second area of importance—teacher centers as an agent of reforming inservice teacher education. To begin with, teachers themselves want it changed. And, such reform may be even more possible now, given current characteristics of the teaching force. For one thing, the declining enrollment in our Nation’s schools has meant a decline in teacher jobs as well. This together with high unemployment among the general population has meant less teacher turnover; a slightly older teacher work force than previously; and greater likelihood that teachers will remain in the job for longer periods of time since fewer other jobs are available to them. A stable and experienced teaching population is likely to be even more demanding of quality inservice education than one undergoing continuous shifts and changes. Certainly teachers who have plans to stay on the job for longer periods of time will be more concerned with their own professional renewal than transient teachers—provided they are not threatened by vindictive evaluations, or accountability schemes. Such teachers not only want teacher centers as a better source of inservice education, they are also more likely to be receptive to the new ideas that teacher centers produce.

Geraldine Joncich Clifford develops the argument relating reform possibilities to teacher stability in her book, the Shape of American Education:
those disposed toward educational innovation cannot exercise influence unless they are retained in teaching.

it is unfair and unrealistic to expect perpetual beginners to initiate and sustain the burden of professional development. It would be better if the most creative and innovative teachers were retained and given the seniority and recognition that would allow their efforts to gain exposure and influence outside their own classrooms, to effect teaching generally.

brief careers militate against the consumption of research on teaching, and against systematic efforts to improve education. They also limit the pool of potential leaders.

Luckily teacher centers are beginning to take hold at a time when the teaching population is stable and when the demand for quality inservice teacher education is surpassing that for preservice teacher preparation. Federal programs like Teacher Corps have reflected this by shifting their emphasis toward inservice training. But these pluses are somewhat neutralized by the fears of the teacher colleges. Some education schools have ventured into new concentrations on inservice programs, but the process of changing emphasis has been slow and less than inspired. Since teacher centers are an outgrowth of the demand for inservice reform, and because teacher control is an inherent part of their definition, the response of schools of education to the new idea has been unenthusiastic—the common reaction being one of suspicion that teacher organizations and their stress on inservice education will combine to put colleges out of business. This is an attitude that needs to be changed if teacher centers are to succeed.

It is true that while colleges of education have been foot-dragging even as they lethargically bemoan the declining enrollment picture, teachers have moved in to take a leadership role. But the colleges' fears are really unwarranted. To begin with, if teachers' isolation is to be one focus of attention, the preservice role of education schools in encouraging this will require examination as well. Ideally, teacher centers will be a catalyst for reforming inservice staff development in relation to preservice preparation. One really cannot be changed without the other. To do this effectively education schools must be a part of the enterprise. Dan Lortie pinpoints the problem in his book Schoolteacher:
Their (teachers') professional training, in short, has not linked recurrent dilemmas to available knowledge or to condensations of reality (e.g., cases, simulations) where such issues are deliberated. The repudiation of past experience .conjoins with intellectual isolation (a historical feature of teacher training) to produce curricula which extoll the highest virtues but fail to cope with routine tactical and strategic problems. It is small wonder, then, that teachers are not inclined to see themselves as sharing in a common "memory" of technical sub-culture. Since they have not received such instruction, they are forced to fall back on individual recollections, which in turn are not displaced by new perspectives. Such a pattern encourages a conception of teaching that is individualistic rather than a collegial enterprise.

One logical way to connect reform in preservice education with changes in inservice development would be to require that all beginning teachers undergo an internship patterned after the medical internship for doctors. Prospective teachers would obtain preliminary certification and then spend their first years of teaching with a partial workload. The rest of their time would be spent in consultations with experienced teachers and in maintaining course work and advisory ties with their preparatory college. An internship for teachers requires that colleges provide key transitional support. It is a role that could be played out best on the neutral territory of a teacher center.

Institutions of higher education are central to the functioning of teacher centers whether or not internship is involved. Their staffs can give workshops in the center and act as advisors to teachers who request such services. Arrangements can even be worked out where university credits are awarded for work done in centers. To put it simply, universities can build their own work into the new centers in ways that will expand upon rather than displace their current services. They can and should be part of a reform that sweeps from preservice through inservice development.

The world of research is another that should recognize the potential of teacher centers. Teacher centers will provide a new arena for the work of researchers as well as a vehicle for disseminating their results. The attitude
of disdain most teachers feel toward researchers, accompanied by outright hostility toward much of their work, might be modified somewhat if teachers and researchers used teacher centers as a meeting ground—a place to explore research needs as well as discuss research results. Worthwhile findings could be introduced directly to teachers as one way of translating usable research data into real practice.

While informing teacher education and disseminating research are important byproducts of the growth of teacher centers which may be unwelcome to teacher educators or go unnoticed by researchers, they are not the most important aspect of the concept. Teacher centers are first and foremost for teachers who are on the job right now. As places where teachers can share ideas, develop new approaches, meet with specialists and coach each other, teacher centers will provide the first opportunity teachers have had to grow and develop in ways that they choose. Since they will have the controlling voice, centers will be viewed as nonthreatening and supportive. The beginning teacher who is floundering can go there to seek advice and know it will not become a part of his or her professional record. Groups of teachers who want to try something new can thrash it out at the center, asking for help from whomever they choose. If a teacher is curious about a new reading approach he or she may be able to find out about it at the center. The prospect of mainstreaming a number of handicapped children into a regular classroom may seem impossible until one can go see where another teacher has done it. The center can help teachers with needs and talents like these find each other.

What could emerge from this process is a common understanding among teachers of what the knowledge and skill base for their profession really is—that thread of shared experience that can unify teachers and instill pride in teaching. Teachers have never had either the freedom or the opportunity to do this before. It will give them the kind of professional control that now exists for other professions, and the self-respect that goes with it. If teacher centers succeed, teaching may no longer be as isolated and as anxiety-ridden a career as it now is. There will be a place to go where problems can be solved—where those developing new ideas have in mind the teachers who make them work.
This section of the publication is purposely limited to avoid duplication of materials from other sources. Excellent studies and descriptions of teacher centers are available from the Teacher Corps and Teacher Center Exchange, an NIE funded project. It is an information, referral, and assistance agency for and about Teacher Centers. We encourage policy board members and all teachers to survey the literature to explore the local possibilities for developing a teacher center through ongoing discussion and communication with other interested teacher center leaders.

An annotated bibliography has been included for your convenience and further research. It includes numerous articles and reports that have been published from March, 1976 through July, 1978. For sources published prior to this, refer to the excellent bibliography published by Mary F. Crum, Teacher Centers, available from the Eric Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.
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BEGINNINGS

LEARN THE RULES

Have you and other members of the federation discussed the possibility of a local teacher center funded by the U.S. Office of Education? If your local is the bargaining agent or the majority teacher organization in the district, you can assume a leadership role. Read the Rules and Regulations of the Teacher Center Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197.1 Scope and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.2 Definitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.3 Elements of a teacher center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.4 Teacher center policy board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.5 Categories of financial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.6 Distribution of funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.7 Project duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.8 Allowable and unallowable costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.9 Application requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.10 Review of applications by State educational agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.11 Evaluation criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.12 Right of appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.13 Compensation to State educational agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


STUDY EACH SECTION. You will note the repetition, and you must become attuned to the important statements that may be overlooked during the first or second reading.

FOCUS ON THE EVALUATION CRITERIA. Check the outline. Criteria are listed as 197.11 in the outline.

EVALUATION CRITERIA WILL BE REFERRED TO IN THIS PUBLICATION BY.
Q: What is the purpose of the Teacher Center Program regulations published in the Federal Register, January 11, 1978?

A: The rules and regulations outline details for planning a teacher center project at the local level with the support of federal funds.

Regulations governing the development of a local teacher center project mandate collaboration among educational personnel. The local educational agency (LEA) plans cooperatively with the teacher organization and the institutions of higher education (IHE(s)) for a teacher center that will provide an inservice education program designed to meet the needs of teachers in the area to be served.

Each teacher center is planned and operated under the supervision of a Teacher Center Policy Board that is composed of a majority of teachers. Options are provided for the selection of teacher members of the Policy Board. Nonpublic school teachers must be represented if they choose to participate.

Q: How do the two grants differ?

A: The planning grant proposal describes activities that will take place during a twelve-month period that will enable teachers to organize and develop an effective Teacher Center Program.

The operational grant proposal outlines a Teacher Center Program that will be operational during the first year of funding. An institution of higher education (IHE) may only request assistance to operate a teacher center planned and established with other funds.

Q: How many grants were awarded during the first year of the USOE Teacher Center Program?

A: In August 1978, the following projects were funded:

- 53 operational projects
- 6 awarded to IHE
- 48 awarded to LEA
- 8 planning projects
- 61 TOTAL

Q: How long is the project funding period?

A: The Commissioner approves projects for a specified project period which generally will not exceed 36 months, subject to the availability of funds.

Q: What service does the state educational agency (SEA) give to the local educational agency (LEA) in the teacher center program?

A: The state educational agency (SEA), when notified, should provide assistance to districts during the planning stage. When
the proposals are completed, they are submitted to the SEA for approval. The schedule for submission is published in the Federal Register each year.

Q: Does each State have evaluation criteria that differ from the Federal criteria?

A: Some states have established special criteria to ensure that federally-funded Teacher Centers fit into the State plan for inservice education. Information regarding these can be obtained from the SEA teacher center representative, whose names can be found on page 180.

Give special attention to the deadline date; no exemptions can be made.

Q: Does the State have any other responsibility for proposals?

A: The State Educational Agencies may conduct a review process. All applications are evaluated according to State criteria (where they have been established), as well as Federal criteria. In addition, the SEA is responsible to transmit the proposals to USOE by the date published in the Federal Register.

Q: If a proposal is rejected by the SEA, is there an appeals process?

A: If the proposal is not approved by the SEA, the proposal is not sent to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. If the LEA or IHE is dissatisfied with the recommendation of the SEA, they may petition the U.S. Commissioner (note schedule for deadline on Appeals in Federal Regulations) to request further consideration of the application by the SEA. Notify USOE of intent to appeal by telephone. This process must be completed before the federal review.

Q: How are proposals reviewed for funding by the U.S. Office of Education?

A: During the first year of the Teacher Center Program, each proposal was reviewed by a five-person panel. Composition of the panel reflected proportional Policy Board membership:

- 3 teachers
- 1 LEA representative
- 1 IHE representative

Each member of the panel reviewed the proposal using the EVALUATION CRITERIA and assigning points for each criterion. Panel members discussed the adherence to the criteria and could revise their scores. Raw scores were standardized and a computer ranking of proposals was compiled.

Q: What happens to proposals that are not funded?

A: Proposals that do not receive funding are returned to the LEA or IHE that submitted them. Comment sheets completed during the review process are available to the LEA or IHE upon request from the Teacher Center Program Office (USOE).

Q: Is it possible to resubmit a proposal that is not funded?

A: A Policy Board may decide to resubmit a teacher center proposal. An analysis of the comment sheets prepared by the review panel can be used as a guide for areas of weakness and points for revision.
A further study of each section with a focus on the evaluation criteria will prove effective. The SEA can be contacted for assistance in the revision.

For copies of proposal comment sheets, applicants can contact:

Planning The Proposal

After you read the Rules and Regulations, and discuss them with other interested teachers, if you wish to accept a leadership role in developing a proposal to submit to the U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, prepare yourself for a challenging series of events.

The following steps have been outlined to assist in your planning efforts. While they are not mandated by USOE, they were used by a number of funded projects. They were compiled from an analysis of Policy Board minutes submitted by funded teacher centers.

“TO INSURE SUCCESS, INVOLVE ALL CONSTITUENCIES FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE PROJECT.”
**TIMETABLE FOR PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Proposal/Required Activity</th>
<th>Sub-Activities</th>
<th># of Days Required</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Process</td>
<td>- Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meetings with participating LEAs/HEAs/SEA/USOE/etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Participation</td>
<td>- Meetings with NPS agency reps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>- Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review of similar programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>- Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>- Scope of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Design</td>
<td>- Consultation with Evaluator(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Review by Budget Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Information</td>
<td>- Cover Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Required Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>- Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>- Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- &quot;Polishing&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>- Signatures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Duplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The timetable presented above was designed to assist proposal writers in the planning and developing of Federal/State proposals.

BUILDING A SUPPORT SYSTEM

An AFT local concerned about inservice education can:

I. ESTABLISH A TEACHER CENTER PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Group of interested AFT members meet to discuss possibility of a Teacher Center in district or a consortium. A decision must be made regarding the service area to be served.

  - The size of the policy board should be discussed (range between 15-20 suggested)
  - Timeline (to meet deadline for application)
  - Possible sites

II. ENCOURAGE COLLABORATION

- Contact district superintendent. If the project is to include more than one district (consortium), all superintendents should be included in planning and the district representatives identified for the Teacher Center Policy Board. Discuss the impact of working with the collective bargaining agent (CBA) to insure the success of the project. Emphasize the potential of the CBA for dissemination of information and project support through meetings, publication and school contacts.

  - Topics for discussion
    - Contact with SEA for state criteria and technical assistance
    - The policy board membership (LEA, IHE) (number of members)
    - Timeline for policy board formation
    - Responsibilities for contacting IHE, school board and nonpublic school administrators documentation
      - letters to IHE and responses
      - letters to nonpublic school administrators and responses
Exhibit 1

Dean
Graduate School
XXX University

Dear Dean:

The Public Schools are planning to submit a proposal for a Teacher Center project to the U.S. Office of Education. Enclosed is material describing the Teacher Center Concept for your information. Institutions of higher education with a department or school of education are eligible to designate representatives to the Teacher Center Policy Board which will plan and direct the project. After you have reviewed the enclosed material with your staff, please let me know if University wishes to be represented on the Board. If so, please send the name of your representative to University as soon as possible.

Our deadline for submission of the application is January 31st, so we need to activate the Board quickly. I appreciate your consideration of this matter, and hope that you will be able to participate.

Sincerely yours,

Superintendent of Schools

Encl.
When the LA is reluctant to begin the project, there may be a lack of knowledge of teacher centers. For assistance and resources, contact appropriate resource persons listed on p. 176.

With the approval of the superintendent, the policy board can be established. Composition of the policy board is described in the Teacher Centers Program; Rules and Regulations: (197.4).

## TEACHER CENTER POLICY BOARD: COMPOSITION

The majority of the members of the policy board shall be representative of all teachers in the area to be served by the center, including teachers for handicapped and exceptional children, and teachers of vocational education.

197.4(2). LEA - representatives of the school board of the area (two or more persons)

197.4(3). IHE - institution of higher education (one or more)

197.4(4). Note this section for consortium or multi-district project

* including non-public schools if they wish to participate

## TEACHER REPRESENTATIVENESS

Each district applying for a grant must assure that the board is representative of teachers by:

1. Making the categories of teachers (e.g. vocational education teachers, special education teachers, and other teachers at both elementary and secondary levels) fairly reflect the categories of teachers in the area to be served, including equitable representation of non-public school teachers (if there are non-public schools in the area to be served which choose to participate in the teacher center).
The federation committee should identify teacher-leaders for the Policy Board. Use one of the following options for choosing teacher members of the Policy Board. AFT recommends the use of option A or B.

**TEACHER CENTER**

**Rules and Regulations**

197.4 (b) **SELECTION PROCESS: OPTIONS FOR CHOOSING TEACHER MEMBERS OF POLICY BOARD**

(A) Agreement between the local educational agency and the teachers' collective bargaining agent as to the specific teacher representatives or as to the procedures for selecting the teacher representatives;

(B) Appointment of the teacher representatives by the teachers' collective bargaining agent;

(C) Appointment of the teacher representatives by the teachers' organization with the largest number of members;

(D) Voting in which all teachers in the area to be served by the center have an opportunity to participate, either through a general or school-by-school election;

(E) Another method which permits teachers generally, either directly or through their teachers' organization, to nominate or select the teacher representatives on the board, or

(F) A combination of two or more of the options in clauses (A) through (E) of this subdivision.

Refer to 197.4 (3) for procedures for a state-local teacher center serving an entire state.
The following nine agendas are SUGGESTIONS for planning sessions. Common elements from planning sessions have been included.

**POLICY BOARD MEETING**

It is appropriate for a Federation member to act as chairperson at this meeting.

**Agenda:**

- Review Federal Regulations related to the role of the policy board
- Elect a chairperson and secretary
- Discuss policy board by-laws
- Discuss needs assessment and recommendations for process (experts could be invited to a special session to facilitate process.

**Outcome:** Formation of policy board.

**Exhibit 2**

---

**AGENDA**

Public Schools
Teacher Center Policy Board Meeting

Date
Superintendent's Conference Room
9:00 a.m.

Greetings and Introduction
Overview of Federal Regulations
Proposal Development
Timeline
Abstract
Criteria for Evaluation
Proposed by-laws
Election of chairperson, secretary

Next Meeting: NEEDS ASSESSMENT: INSTRUMENT and PROCESS
POLICY BOARD MEETING

Exhibit 3

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Meeting of Teacher Center Policy Board

Date

Members in Attendance

Signature

Representing (Affiliation) *

* TEACHERS SHOULD IDENTIFY SUBJECT AREA OR GRADE AS WELL AS SCHOOL

ROLE OF THE POLICY BOARD SECRETARY DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT:

- Distribute agendas before meeting (if possible)
- Update all Policy Board members on project activities; send minutes of previous meeting
- Provide copies of sub-committee reports for all members
- Keep copies of all correspondence and Policy Board minutes
- Prepare and keep attendance forms for each meeting to be used for documentation
POLICY BOARD MEETING

**Agenda:**

Identification of Needs Assessment Instrument and Process
(This could be the agenda for a number of meetings.)

Discussion of existing data

Formation of committee to prepare concept paper when planning efforts have begun very early

Discuss by-laws; vote on those proposed.

**Outcome:**

Final plans for:

- Duplicating Needs Assessment instrument or publishing it in a local newspaper
- Distributing it to teachers
- Compiling results
- Compiling existing data (include data on student needs)
- Concept paper (to be used for dissemination of information on teacher center)

Distribute Teacher Center concept paper for review.
(Discuss the proposed project and the positive benefits of collaboration among IHE, LEA and teacher organization.)

- Publish in federation paper
- Make available to local paper and media
- Copies to be distributed to all administrators, school board members, university deans and faculty in school of education and federation lead

*At all possible, meetings should be planned to inform elementary and secondary teachers and solicit recommendations.*

*Optional activity. Preparation of an initial paper will help publicize the project and generate new ideas.*
Policy Board Meeting

**Agenda:**
- Feedback on Needs Assessment Process (It is presumed more time will be needed for the return of all forms.)
- Formation of sub-committee to compile results of needs assessment and existing data, prepare report for next meeting
- Discuss and ratify by-laws for policy board

**Outcome:** Policy Board By-Laws

*Subcommittees are optional. TCPB may choose to work as a committee of the whole on the project.

Exhibit 4:

**Sample By-Laws of the Policy Board — A**

1. Unless otherwise stated, Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all meetings.

2. By-Laws to implement this policy board shall be enacted by a 2/3 majority vote of the Board provided that the 2/3 includes a majority of teachers.

3. Any dispute arising in connection with the meaning, construction or interpretation of the policies of this board shall be decided upon by a majority of this policy board.

4. A quorum shall consist of a majority of those present provided that a majority of those present are teacher representatives.

5. Establishment of any sub-committees shall be by a 2/3 majority vote of the policy board provided that the 2/3 includes a majority of teachers.

6. Minutes of all meetings shall be recorded, and with suggested changes, if any, approved by a 2/3 majority vote of the policy board provided that the 2/3 includes a majority of teachers.

7. Provisions for election of Chairperson, Secretary or other roles shall be decided upon by the policy board, and they shall be elected by a 2/3 majority vote of the board.

8. No member of this policy board may designate a substitute to represent him/her officially at meetings.
The name of this organization shall be "The Bowling Green/Wood County Teacher Center Policy Board" hereinafter referred to as "BTC".

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

The BTC shall be composed of two representatives elected or selected from each of the following schools: Bowling Green City Schools, Bowling Green State University, Wood County Office of Education, Teachers must consist of at least 51% of the total membership.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Selection of members

The BTC shall be composed of at least 51% of the total membership.

a. Teacher Representatives

Teacher is defined as a full-time employee of the participating school system. Each organization shall select its representative according to its own organizational structure. Each representative shall serve a three-year term. It will be the responsibility of the BTC to assure that the policy board continually represents all categories of teachers, administrators, higher education, and designated representatives of Boards of Education. The balance of representatives as initially established by the BTC shall be maintained.

Section 2. Replacement members

Each organization listed above, following notification by secretary of BTC is responsible for replacing their representative member on the board when the individual is no longer representing their organization. The new replacement will then complete the unexpired term of membership on the BTC for the individual who is no longer representing them.

Section 3. Other memberships

Other representatives of related groups may be added to the BTC at the discretion of the board as a whole as long as the Federal guidelines related to selection and total board composition are adhered to.

Section 4. Alternate

An official alternate with voting privileges shall be selected by each organization at the same time that the official representative is selected. The alternate shall serve in the absence of the regular member. The BTC Chairperson shall be notified, in writing, of the name of the alternate and how changes are to be made.

Section 5. Absence

a. After three consecutive unexcused absences a member must be replaced by the organization he or she represents. An absence is excused if the member sends an alternate and/or notifies the BTC Chairperson.

b. Four unexcused absences, with no alternate, results in loss of membership, and the representative must be replaced by the school system or organization he or she represents.

c. Notice of loss of membership through absence, shall be sent to the appropriate organization by the BTC Chairperson.

Section 6. Voting Rights

All members, except direct employees of BTC shall be voting members. Official alternates may vote if the regular member is absent.
ARTICLE IV - OFFICERS

Section 3: Term of Officers

A. All officers must be members in good standing of the BRTC at the time of election.

B. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be elected for a two (2) year term, beginning in January, with no more than one (1) successive re-election permitted for any one year before they are eligible for election (with the exception of the first chairperson).

C. Officers may complete their term of office so long as they remain duly recognized members of the organization they originally represented on the BRTC.

Section 4: Reassignment of Board Members

Nominations shall be presented in writing to the Chairperson.

Section 5: Vacancy of Office

A vacancy in an officer position shall be filled for the duration of the term in question with an election by the BRTC as a whole, at the next regular or special meeting.

Section 6: Removal of Officers

Officers may be removed from office in the following manner. A written complaint by a regular member shall be presented to the Chairperson or the Vice-Chairperson. The Chairperson shall conduct a hearing within four weeks of receipt of complaint at which the officer has an opportunity to present his or her views. The officer receiving the complaint shall make a recommendation to the BRTC Board as a whole at the next meeting, and a subsequent vote by two-thirds of the members present at a meeting at which a quorum has been established shall decide the issue.

ARTICLE V - MEETINGS

Section 1: Conduct of Business

A meeting of the BRTC, official business can only be transacted when a quorum is present. A simple majority is sufficient for passage of issues.

Section 2: Quorum

A quorum shall consist of two-thirds (2/3) of the total regular membership.

Section 3: Regular Meetings

The BRTC as a whole shall meet monthly, unless otherwise determined by the Board. The annual year shall begin January 1st. Notice shall be sent to all members and designated alternates by the secretary at least seven (7) days prior to each regular meeting.

Section 4: Special Meetings

Special meetings shall be called at the discretion of the Chairperson, or at the request of five (5) or more members.

Section 5: Reimbursements

All Board members or their official alternates shall be reimbursed for basic necessary expenses incurred in order for them to attend all BRTC Board and committee meetings. These expenses include: mileage or transportation, meals, postage, and telephone, and substitutes.
ARTICLE VI - AMENDMENTS TO BY-LAWS

Amendments shall be presented in writing to the Chairperson and must be mailed to all regular members at least ten (10) days prior to the next meeting. Acceptance of an amendment may occur after one meeting of discussion of the issues and two-thirds vote of the total board membership at the second meeting.

ARTICLE VIII - COMMITTEES

Section 1. Membership

All committees must include:

The Chairperson and at least three Board members. At least two teacher representatives must serve on each committee. Outside specialists or consultants may be invited to join committees at the need arises, but without voting privileges.

Section 2. Committee Meetings

In order to conduct business, committees shall meet as necessary and shall perform tasks via specified time line as assigned by the Board of whole. Permanent committees may be designated through amendment to the by-laws. Any committee not designated by amendment as permanent shall dissolve once its original task has been completed.

Section 3. Permanent Committees

- Staff Training/Retraining Planning Committee
- Curriculum Improvement/Basic Competencies Committee
- Community Resources and Utilization Committee
- School Policy and Practices Committee
- Research, Practices, Self-Development Center Committee
POLICY BOARD MEETING

Agenda:

- Draft of Needs Assessment Data
- THINK TANK: Objectives to flow from needs assessment
- Subcommittee for activities and evaluation
  (Appoint subcommittee to formulate and refine objective)
- Identify activities and evaluation process to implement objectives
- Identify type of project to be submitted to USOE: (Planning or operational grant).
  Make it obvious.

Outcome: Objectives for the teacher center that are based on identified needs of teachers

- Recommendation on the type of grant to be submitted

USE HARD DATA...
PROVE YOUR CASE.
EXHIBIT 6: CONFLICT RESOLUTION

TEACHER CENTER POLICY BOARD

It is anticipated that the most successful programs will be those recommended by unanimous concurrence from the Policy Board.

When one or more board members do question proposed board actions, the board should promote full discussion of those questions (including use of other resource persons when appropriate) since each board member brings unique areas of experience which might be unfamiliar to other board members.

Actions normally shall take a simple majority vote, provided discussion has been held on questioned issues.

In recognition that other responsibilities may cause meeting absence, a Policy Board member may designate an alternate to carry his/her vote, or the appropriate organization may name a needed alternate. (The organization which originally selected the board member will select replacements.)

When the full policy board is not in attendance at a meeting and when an issue requiring action is in dispute, any voting member or alternate may raise the question of representativeness.

When the question of representativeness has been recognized, the chair shall have those present and voting determine whether to:

- poll the absent members who do not have alternates;
- accept proxy votes from absent members;
- proportionate the votes for teaching/nonteaching members to guarantees over 51% for teaching teachers; or
- defer action for a reconvened, more representative group meeting.

Once the question of representativeness has been recognized, each vote should be subject to a 'test of unreadiness' intended to:

Prevent or defer Policy Board action when the combination of absent votes and present available votes, who indicate unreadiness to vote, exceeds 50% of the total board vote count.
POLICY BOARD MEETING

You may wish to invite the Federal Grants Officer or Director of Federal/State Programs Administrator from the LEA to this meeting.

**Agenda:**

- Discussion of refined objectives
- Further identification of ACTIVITIES and evaluation techniques
- Direct the subcommittee to draft a narrative of the project
- Discuss the following and appoint subcommittee to draft:
  - Descriptive summary of TCPB: (all information on TCPB formation)

**Outline:**

- Preliminary Activities that led to formation of TCPB
- TCPB minutes of meetings
- Correspondence from:
  - Federation
  - IHE, LEA, nonpublic schools
  - Business leaders
  - Community organizations

- Dissemination plan (strategies for information about the project) after implementation

- Personnel (qualifications and job descriptions)

- Budget (itemized account of expected expenditures)

- Documentation (collection of correspondence, minutes of TCPB meetings, etc.)

- Connection with local inservice

**Outcome:**

Revised project plan

Creation of proposal subcommittees
POLICY BOARD MEETING

Agenda: Review of Drafts of Proposal Committees

- budget
- needs assessment summary
- narrative (include proposed site)
- dissemination
- documentation

Recommendation should be taken back to sub-committees.
(Each policy board member can get recommendations from constituency. Teacher members can distribute copies & union representatives in each building, request suggestions.)

Outcome: First draft of proposal.
**Revision of First Draft**

- comments, additions, deletions
- recommendations should be taken back to committees (check with constituency)
- further additions/deletions
- develop abstract (brief description of project)

**Outcome:** Edited copy of proposal
Agenda: Final Copy of Proposal

Chairperson accepts the responsibility for final editing and printing (Copies should be sent to policy board members before next meeting.)

Outcome: Approved Proposal

MAKE SURE THE SUPERINTENDENT WILL SIGN IT. IF IT NEEDS SCHOOL BOARD APPROVAL, LEAVE TIME TO GET IT.
POLICY BOARD MEETING

Agenda:
- Approval of final copy of proposal; all members sign approval page
- Copies are complete with application form and assurances (copies to be sent to SEA by deadline)

Outcome: Proposal to be signed by Superintendent or his/her representative

Planning Exhibit 7

PROJECT APPROVAL INFORMATION

Suggested approval sheet

We, the Policy Board of the Teacher Center, having participated in the development and read the proposal requesting a grant to establish a teacher center, give our approval of this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing (Teachers note level Elementary or Secondary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*subject area and school

This is a mandated record. It verifies the fact that each teacher on the policy board played a key role in the development of the proposal, and has approved the final proposal.
The TCPB is the governance body of the teacher center project. Each Teacher Center Policy Board Member must approve the proposal before it is submitted to SEA.

### EXHIBIT 8 - TEACHER CENTER POLICY BOARD APPROVAL FORM

The following official motions were raised, discussed at length and acted upon by the Policy Board:

- Motion to approve role and by-laws of the Policy Board (as incorporated in the proposal) - UNANIMOUSLY ACCEPTED
- Motion to elect as Chairperson of the Policy Board - UNANIMOUSLY ACCEPTED
- Motion to have proposal editors revise the narrative portion of the Needs Assessment relating to Figure 926 - UNANIMOUSLY ACCEPTED
- Motion to have the Policy Board participate in the selection of the project evaluator - UNANIMOUSLY ACCEPTED
- Motion to have this Policy Board act as the Policy Board for the ________ Program - UNANIMOUSLY ACCEPTED
- Motion to approve the proposal budget, as submitted - UNANIMOUSLY ACCEPTED
- Motion to approve Teacher Centers application, as submitted - See approval signatures in proposal of Policy Board members

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairperson at approximately 8:00 p.m.
Evaluation Criteria

During the USOE review process (May, 1978), indicators were used by proposal reviewers to assist in clarification of each evaluation criterion. Review sheets provided space for reviewers' comments. Points were taken away or assigned to the proposal, depending on its conformance with the criteria. Comment sheets are available to the agency that submitted the proposal from the Office of Education after the review process.

Since then, other considerations have been recommended for use in the interpretation of evaluation criteria. For convenience we have included new indicators developed by state education agency members of the:

National Teacher Center Resource Center
Rhode Island Department of Education

Teacher Center Proposals submitted to the U.S. Office of Education for funding are evaluated by the State Department of Education (SEA) and then by the Commissioner on the basis of the following criteria. Each criterion will be weighted as indicated, with the total for all criteria being 100 points. An application must receive a minimum of 50 points to be considered for funding.

During the development of the project, the Teacher Center Policy Board should pay careful attention to the evaluation criteria and organize the proposal so that there is evidence of conformance to these criteria.

In evaluating an application, the Commissioner considers:

(a) The extent of the teacher center policy board's authority and responsibility for supervision of the project (10 points).
(b) The potential of the proposed teacher center for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students (20 points).
(c) The soundness of the proposed plan of operation, including consideration of the extent to which:
   (1) The objectives of the proposed projects are sharply defined, clearly stated, and capable of being attained by the proposed procedures (10 points); and
   (2) The adequacy of provisions for reporting the effectiveness of the proposed project and dissemination of its results, and for determining the extent to which the objectives are accomplished (10 points).
(d) The appropriateness, scope, and duration of the project so as to secure productive results (5 points).
(e) The adequacy of qualifications and experience of personnel designated to carry out the proposed project (5 points).
(f) The adequacy of the facilities and resources (5 points).
(g) The reasonableness of estimated cost in relation to anticipated results, including the proportion of indirect costs represented by costs for released time or substitutes (5 points).
(h) The potential of the teacher center to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall program of inservice training for teachers (15 points).
(i) The representativeness of the teacher center policy board under 1107.6(b) (10 points).
(j) The extent to which Federal funds will support new or expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources (5 points).
(Implements Sec. 323, 20 U.S.C. 1116c.)
TO EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA,

- EACH CRITERION PRECEDES THE COMPONENT OF THE PROJECT IT DESCRIBES
- ITEMS NOTED UNDER CRITERION WERE USED BY PROPOSAL READERS during the evaluation process to score the proposals. (1978)
TEACHER CENTER POLICY BOARD REPRESENTATIVENESS

EVALUATION CRITERION
197.11(i)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND....

Is the TCPB adequately representative under Sec. 197.4(b) of the Regulations? (10 points)

Were the classroom teacher members of the board nominated or selected by the teachers generally (either directly or through their teachers' organization) or were they selected by some other person or persons?*

Were the representatives of the school board(s), institution(s) of higher education and non-public schools designated by their constituents or were they selected by some other person or persons?

Does the teacher majority of the policy board fairly reflect the make-up of all teachers in the area to be served?

Comment:

* These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
Other Suggested Indicators*:

Provide for a "chain of communication" that allows information to flow quickly to and from policy board members and their constituents or organizations.

Comment:

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978
TEACHER CENTER POLICY BOARD AUTHORITY

EVALUATION CRITERION

197.11(a)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND...

Does the proposal describe the extent of the TCPB's authority and responsibility for supervision of the project? (10 points)

Policy Board:

Evidence bearing on this point would be a clear statement regarding the extent to which the teacher center policy board (TCPB):

- will have authority to set policy for the center;
- will have authority to select and employ its own operating staff;
- will have authority to select and employ consultants and experts;
- will have control of the teacher center budget and the expenditure of its fund; and
- will have authority to plan and design all subcontracts that are made to secure technical or other kinds of assistance.

Comment:

* These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
Other Suggested Indicators*

Bylaws should be established and clearly delineate the role, responsibility, and authority of the policy board, such as:

- identifying eligible project participants;
- employment of operating staff, consultants, and/or experts;
- budgeting/expenditure of funds;
- subcontracting for technical or other assistance.

Full participation in development and approval of proposals before submission and plans before implementation.

Provision for documentation of the policy board's work through mechanism such as recorded minutes of each meeting.

Statement from superintendent and TCPB (signed) should include documentation of legal and non-legal constraints that bear on the boards of authority.

Comment:

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978
TEACHER CENTER POLICY BOARD COLLABORATION

Each teacher center project that is successfully implemented is an example of collaboration of the highest degree. The policy board of the teacher center must wrestle with alternatives and set policy, as well as establish a management plan that will meet the needs of local teachers. These considerations should be part of the policy board formation process. All policies must be in compliance with Federal Regulations and included in the teacher center proposal. Employment provisions which govern the terms and conditions of project employees must be in compliance with state and local law as well as contractual agreements.

AUTHORITY OF THE TEACHER CENTER POLICY BOARD

The Federal Regulation mandates the teacher majority on the policy board which will hopefully ensure the fact that policy board decisions will reflect the concerns and needs of the local classroom teachers. Although there is no regulation regarding policy board meetings, a number of funded centers have scheduled monthly meetings with emergency meetings when needed.

The local educational agency (LEA) or the institution of higher education (IHE) submitting the proposal acts as fiscal agent and has legal responsibility for the teacher center project.

The teacher center policy board is responsible for the supervision of the teacher center. These supervisory functions include activities not prohibited by state or local law.

The policy board may have the authority:

- to serve as governing and policy-making body;
- to plan/conduct/review the needs assessment;
- to develop/finalize/approve the project proposal;
- to approve and recommend budget program modifications;
- to make decisions on the final budget;
- to participate in the selection of project staff;
- to identify eligible participants in the project;
- to disseminate project information;
- to determine effectiveness of teacher center programs and terminate ineffective activities.
Every teacher on the policy board should be aware of his/her role as representative of the teachers in the area. Decisions regarding staff, budget and/or program changes will affect the teachers served by the teacher center. Recommendations for staff will critically determine the management and successful implementation of the project. Careful adherence to the qualifications and an interview process will provide insight into the team members. These persons will deliver service that will benefit teachers and generate interest and support for the project. Collaboration among all project staff and policy board members is another important ingredient for success.

Funded Projects

Budget modifications will offer a challenge to policy board members since the original budget was prepared with great care. Necessary adjustments because of changes in the funding level or rising costs should not alter the project plan. It may be possible that the participating colleges and universities or the district could provide an in-kind contribution. If this is impossible, explore ways of modifying without making changes that cut services to teachers.

Leadership Training (TCPB)

As the majority membership, teachers can initiate leadership programs for policy board members. Locals can sponsor training sessions on parliamentary procedure, budget and finance, as well as other aspects of management. As the operation of the center expands, funding from other sources could be pursued. Teacher members should update the policy board on procurement of these funds. The teacher center provides an umbrella for inservice programs in the district (or districts) served. Established centers demonstrate success in serving area teachers and have the necessary organization to disseminate information regarding new projects.
A more elaborate, urban center identifies the authority of the teacher center policy board in this organization chart.

EXHIBIT

TEACHER CENTERS POLICY BOARD

FIELD COORDINATOR

PROJECT DIRECTOR

CLEANING HOUSE RESOURCES COORDINATOR

SP. TYPIST

PROGRAM DEVELOPERS & OTHER IHE STAFF

IHE COUNCIL

LOCAL TCH ADVISORY GROUP

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPECIALIST

J.H.S INTERMEDIATE SPECIALIST

HIGH SCHOOL SPECIALIST

TEACHER WORKSHOP

LEADERS (HOURLY)

SCHOOL SECRETARY

TS - TEACHING SPECIALIST
This chart demonstrates the functions of the teacher center policy board in the development and implementation of the project.
PLANNING THE
PROJECT PATTERN

NEEDS ASSESSMENT
EVALUATION PLAN
OBJECTIVES
ACTIVITIES
STAFF
SURVEY
BUDGET
## PART THREE: PLANNING THE PROJECT PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion: Teacher Student Needs</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire A</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Process</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Needs Assessment</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment Sources</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion: Objectives</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Objectives</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion: Activities</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Center Activities</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC Clearinghouse Directory</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion: District Inservice Program</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion: Evaluation and Dissemination</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Plan</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination Plan</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination Sources</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion: Project, Size, Scope, Duration</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Plan</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Time Line</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion: Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TEACHER-STUDENT NEEDS**

**ÉVALUATION CRITERION**

197.11(b)

**REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the proposed teacher center have the potential for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students? (20 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Judgement should be made on the extent to which

There is a clear, convincing statement of the teachers' needs for inservice education and/or curriculum development in relation to the students' needs; and

There is an identified mechanism or process for determining teacher needs;

It seems reasonable to believe that meeting the teachers' needs (No. 2 above) will contribute to meeting the students' needs (no. 2 above)

**Comment:**

---

* These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets need for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
EVALUATION CRITERION 197.11(b) (continued)

Other Suggested Indicators*

Clearly identified sources and collection procedures for student and teacher needs. Differentiate between perceived and assessed needs.

Describe relationship between identified student and teacher needs.

Describe how teacher center activities will potentially impact upon student needs (e.g. eventual evaluation may include examination of new or previously used data bases.)

Teacher Center programs should clearly define activities in the following areas:

- Development and production of curricula;
- Facilitate teacher access to educational research;
- Provide training to better meet special student needs and familiarize teachers with current educational research in order to improve teaching skills.

Comment:

*Considerations recommended by Teacher-Center State Coordinators National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans October, 1978
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Teachers will participate in an inservice program if it is designed to meet their needs. The first phase of the project must include an assessment of problem areas as perceived by teachers.

The needs assessment will be the pivotal point of the teacher center proposal. Expressed concerns of teachers and identified needs of students will provide the basis for the objectives and the program of the local teacher center. Each year there is a growing evidence that student needs are changing and teachers must quickly adapt their instructional programs to meet these needs.

For example, data on excessive student absenteeism and truancy could be used to support teachers' needs for some type of inservice that will focus on the use of incentives or relevant instructional strategies geared to the level and experience of those students.

Policy board members and others may be prone to surmise needs but the most realistic inservice activities are based on needs identified by teachers. The objectives of the project should flow from the needs assessment.

Hard data provided by the district Special Projects Office or the Curriculum Superintendent will demonstrate general areas of need.

INCLUDE EXAMPLES OF THE FOLLOWING USING CHARTS, GRAPHS, AND OTHER CURRENT DATA:

GEORAPHICAL AREA
any significant trends that are problematic
example: population shift

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA
income levels, studies of ethnic backgrounds, demographic information

STUDENT POPULATION STUDIES
enrollment of students in special programs, attendance studies, absenteeism and truancy, ethnic background, Title I studies of student population, dropout rates, achievement levels

TEACHER POPULATION STUDIES
age distribution of teachers, years of teaching experience, years of experience in district(s), level of academic training
NEEDS ASSESSMENT (CONT.)

The new teacher center must focus on the development of a program for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students. (197.11; a)

In order to assess student needs, the following data can be compiled and used as one indication of need:

- standardized achievement test scores
- criterion referenced test scores
- state assessment test scores
- district-wide study of subject area mastery of objectives

Caution must be exercised in using this information. Student information compiled for Title I programs, CETA and the implementation of PL 94-142 is also relevant when assessing learner needs.

IF YOU DON'T DISCUSS STUDENT NEEDS
YOU MAY LOSE 10 POINTS!
DEVELOPING THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

All of the information gathered for this project can clearly indicate areas of local educational need. Publications, results of recent public opinion polls and district-wide studies provide the broad diagnosis of educational needs. Parents, teachers and administrators together must search out the meaning of the statistics. It is imperative to go beyond the hard data to develop the most relevant program for the local teachers' center.

EXHIBIT 11

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Problems Facing the Public Schools: Public Opinion</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Facing the Public Schools: Public Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to quantify the specific current needs of teachers, as perceived by teachers themselves, it is suggested that a survey instrument be developed to give each teacher an opportunity to identify their own inservice needs.

Plans for the widest distribution could include publishing the survey in the federation paper or using the federation mailing list.

Data from the final instrument can easily be compiled and interpreted.

**EXHIBIT 12** SURVEY A

**SURVEY OF TEACHER IN-SERVICE EDUCATION NEEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Individualization of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teaching of reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teaching of mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Effective utilization of test data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Communicating teacher expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Stimulating student motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Teaching strategies and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Behavior modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Utilization of audio materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Effective sharing of promising practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Interpersonal &amp; intergroup relations: student/student, student/teacher, student/parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Middle School concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Junior High School effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Systematic, developmental teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Humanizing instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Student involvement in instructional decision making, increasing student self direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Career education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Talented and gifted students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Combating sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Competency-based education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Hayes education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Always adapt any instrument to local needs.*
EXHIBIT 13: SUMMARY OF SURVEY A RESPONSES: TEACHERS K-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>MEAN RATING</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PERSONS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Individualization of instruction</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teaching of reading</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teaching of mathematics</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Classroom management</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Effective utilization of test data</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Communicating teacher expectations &amp; improving student’s self image</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Stimulating student motivation</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Teaching strategies and skills</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Behavior modification</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Utilization of media materials</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Effective sharing of promising practices</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Interpersonal &amp; intergroup relations</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Students/students, etc.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Middle School concerns</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Senior High School effectiveness</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Systematic, developmental teaching</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Humanizing instruction in instructional decision making, increasing student self-direction</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Student involvement in instructional decision making, increasing student self-direction</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Career education</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Talented and gifted students</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Combating sexism</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Competency-based education</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Metric education</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After an analysis of the needs assessment survey or questionnaire has been completed, clearly define your local needs. This section of the proposal should precede the program plan.

This is an area where the skill of the special projects administrator from the district can facilitate the activity. In large districts digitized sheets are used and information is tabulated quickly by computers.

INSERVICE PRIORITIES: RESULTS OF SURVEY A RESPONSES...

EXHIBIT 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>PROBLEM AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KINDERGARTEN-12</td>
<td>INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHING OF READING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE AREAS OF GREATEST CONCERN FOR K-12 teachers in survey A. Other concerns for program development can be prioritized by using the rank listing.

ORGANIZATION CAN PROVIDE FOR SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO CATEGORIES OF TEACHERS

- EARLY CHILDHOOD
- ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
- MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS
- HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS
CITY TEACHER CENTER

Name ____________________________

Address ____________________________

WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT?

Elementary School: ____________________

Junior High School: ____________________

High School: ____________________

Grade(s): ____________________

School: ____________________

District: ____________________

Describe any special assignment you have, if any ____________________

WHAT IS YOUR CERTIFICATION AND LICENSING STATUS?

Are you fully certified and licensed for your present assignment?

____ yes ______ no 23

If you are not fully certified and licensed for your present teaching assignment, approximately how many three-credit courses do you need to obtain the appropriate certification? Check as many as apply.

____ one or two courses in the content area

____ three or four courses in the content area

____ five or more courses in the content area

____ one or two courses in educational foundations or methods

____ three or more courses in educational foundations or methods

____ I do not need course work but must take and pass the appropriate licensing examination

ASSUME THAT A TEACHER CENTER WILL BE LOCATED IN OR NEAR YOUR SCHOOL. THE CENTER WILL PROVIDE INDIVIDUALIZED IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR TEACHERS THROUGH WORKSHOPS, COURSES, AND YEAR-LONG INTENSIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES. THE ACTIVITIES WILL BE CONDUCTED AND MONITORED BY NON-SUPERVISORY TEACHING SPECIALISTS IN COOPERATION WITH UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL. COLLEGE PROFESSORS WILL TEACH SOME COURSES. YOU COULD EARN UNIVERSITY CREDIT OR IN-SERVICE CREDIT THROUGH YOUR PARTICIPATION IN TEACHER CENTER ACTIVITIES. THE ACTIVITIES WOULD BE DESIGNED SO THAT YOU COULD ACQUIRE SKILLS AND DEVELOP MATERIALS THAT WOULD BE IMMEDIATELY USEABLE IN YOUR CLASSROOM.

Would you like to become involved in a year-long intensive professional development sequence in the center?

____ yes ______ no 30

Would you attend occasional university credit-bearing courses in the area of your present teaching assignment at the center?

____ yes ______ no 31

Would you take the same courses for in-service credit or for no credit?

____ yes ______ no 32

Would you attend occasional workshops in the area of your present teaching assignment?

____ yes ______ no 33

Would you attend workshops or courses outside the area of your present certification and teaching assignment?

____ yes ______ no 34

If yes, what area would you be most interested in?

____ yes ______ no 35

If yes, what area would you be most interested in?

____ yes ______ no 36
WHAT DO YOU THINK WOULD HELP YOU THE MOST TO IMPROVE YOUR TEACHING? Check any that apply.

- greater depth of knowledge in subject matter for the content area
- improved ability to structure content for teaching
- increased knowledge about how children learn
- greater understanding of the theories of teaching and learning
- better knowledge about the kinds of curriculum materials (books, kits, etc.) that are available
- greater skill in adapting published materials for classroom use
- improved ability to develop my own classroom materials
- assistance in long-range and day-to-day planning
- more effective classroom management skills so that pupils could spend their time more productively
- better methods of assessing and monitoring pupil progress
- other.

HOW DO YOU THINK YOU CAN BEST LEARN ABOUT THE THINGS YOU CHECKED ABOVE? Please check no more than five of the following.

- after school single session or short term workshops
- after school university credit bearing courses
- professional reading
- consultations with regular supervisors about teaching problems
- consultations with non-supervisory teaching specialists about teaching problems
- informal conversations with other teachers
- seeing demonstrations in classrooms by teachers who are trying new techniques that have been proven effective
- trying out new techniques and talking with other teachers about them
- examining different teaching strategies and their applicability to various subject areas
- other. Please specify

ARE THERE ANY FACTORS THAT YOU THINK ARE IMPORTANT IN PLANNING A TEACHER CENTER THAT THE COMMITTEE SHOULD KEEP IN MIND?
A successful technique for the distribution of a questionnaire or a survey is to publish it in the federation paper. Additional copies can also be made available through building representatives.

EXHIBIT 12 provided project planners with specific information about teachers and their inservice needs.

EXHIBIT 16
ANALYSIS OF DISTRICT RESULTS

SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY POPULATION
(#1 to 29) OF SURVEY

TEACHER NEEDS IN TERMS OF PROPOSED TEACHER CENTER SERVICES,
(#30-36) OF SURVEY

TEACHER NEEDS IN SPECIFIC AREAS
(#37-47)

TEACHER NEEDS CONCERNING APPROACHES TO INSERVICE EDUCATION
(#48-58)

GOAL IN NEEDS ASSESSMENT IS OBVIOUSLY THE NEEDS OF TEACHERS
### EXHIBIT 17  
**TEACHER NEEDS IN SPECIFIC AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF CONCERN</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TEACHERS RESPONDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater depth of knowledge in subject matter for the content area</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ability to structure content for teaching</td>
<td>2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge about how children learn</td>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater understanding of the theories of teaching and learning</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better knowledge about the kinds of curriculum materials (books, kits, etc.) that are available</td>
<td>2396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater skill in adapting published materials for classroom use</td>
<td>2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ability to develop my own classroom materials</td>
<td>2426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in long range and day-to-day planning</td>
<td>2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective classroom management skills so that pupils could spend their time more productively</td>
<td>2360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better methods of assessing and monitoring pupil progress</td>
<td>1624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A list of priorities compiled from survey. This analysis provided the policy board with the direction as to the kinds of direction as to the kinds of inservices activities teachers needed, their duration and their focus.
QUESTIONNAIRE A (CONT.)

PROJECT EXPERIENCE '78

In large urban districts, it may be necessary to establish satellite centers in more than one school. If a survey is distributed it may be more productive to meet with the teachers at those schools and distribute the surveys at that time.

EXHIBIT 18: ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE A

TEACHER NEEDS IN SPECIFIC AREAS AT PROPOSED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF CONCERN</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater depth of knowledge in subject matter for the Student area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ability to structure content for teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge about how children learn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater understanding of the theories of teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better knowledge about the kinds of curriculum materials (books, kits, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater skill in adapting published materials for classroom use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ability to develop my own classroom materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in long range and day-to-day planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective classroom management skills so that pupils could</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend their time more productively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better methods of assessing and monitoring pupil progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Responses</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Responses
FACE-TO-FACE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Personal contact surveys are time consuming, but they generate interest in the new project and the inservice concept. Policy board members can choose a reasonable number of teachers to interview. They spend approximately 20-30 minutes with each teacher.

EXHIBIT 19: SOME SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What would you list as the three most important problems in your school that would benefit from inservice training? In your district?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How would you like to see teacher center services provided, e.g., courses, workshops, released time for visitations, short or long programs, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If some programs were limited to helping you in areas that represent the learning needs of your students, what would these areas be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can you think of any &quot;extra&quot; services or facilities that a teacher center might provide that would otherwise not be available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can you name three things that you would like to see a teacher center provide directly to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have any suggestions for the development of a teacher center that haven't been included in your remarks thus far?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher's perceived needs can be prioritized from survey results.
ONGOING NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

Needs assessment procedures must be built into the project program. The Phi Delta Kappa Needs Assessment Kit,
Commission on Educational Planning
Box 789, 8th and Union
Bloomington, INDIANA 47404

outlines workshop activities that provide for individual decisions as well as group interaction.

Interviews, workshops and informal surveys can be scheduled throughout the duration of the project. Adaptation to shifts and changes will continue to draw teachers into greater participation in center activities.

Information about the types of surveys can be researched from the numerous books and articles that are available on needs assessment planning and organization.

Comprehensive studies of the needs assessment process have been published.

Policy board members may wish to use the following as reference sources:

Educational Technology 17 (11). November, 1977. The entire issue is focused on needs assessment.


Copies may be obtained from:

The Center for Urban Education
The University of Nebraska at Omaha
3805 North Sixteenth Street
Omaha, Nebraska, 68110
DIRECTORY OF SOURCES

Alameda County Needs Assessment Model
Alameda County Schools
685 A Street
Hayward, California 94541

Aspects of Educational Assessment
Center for Statewide Educational Assessment
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Assessing Career Needs of Learners
State Department of Education
942 Lancaster Drive NE
Salem, Oregon 97310

An Assessment of Educational Needs for Students
In Oklahoma
State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Atlanta Assessment Project
Instructional Services Center
2930 Forrest Hill Drive SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

The Beverly Hills Community Looks at its Schools
Beverly Hills Unified School District
255 South Lasky Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90212

California Assessment Program
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall, 4th Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

CAM
Evaluation Center
Hopkins Independent School District 274
Hopkins, Minnesota 55343

Citizens' Opinion Survey
Denver Public Schools
900 Grant Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Conducting Local Needs Assessment: A Guide
ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Community Questionnaire
Charleston Public Schools
3 Chisolm Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29401

Connecticut Educational Needs Assessment
State Board of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

The CSE Elementary School Evaluation Kit
Allyn and Bacon Inc., Longwood Division
470 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

Design for Developing a Program of School Improvement
State Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Developing a Workable Needs Assessment Process
Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools
Los Angeles, California

District of Columbia's Citywide Needs Assessment
Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Presidential Building
415 12th Street NW
Washington, DC 20004

Districtwide Needs Assessment Report
San Diego Community College District
3375 Camino Del Rio South
San Diego, California 92108

Education for the 70's
Tacoma Public Schools
Tacoma Avenue at Eighth
P.O. Box 1357
Tacoma, Washington 98401

Educational Goals for West Virginia
Department of Education
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Educational Needs Assessment
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Educational Needs Assessment
Merrill Area Public Schools
Merrill, Wisconsin 54452

Educational Needs Assessment
Northeastern Educational Intermediate Unit
Scranton, Pennsylvania

Educational Needs Assessment
Westinghouse Learning Corporation
P.O. Box 30
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Educational Needs Assessments
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Educational Needs Assessment: A Statewide Design for Texas
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Establishing Educational Priorities through the Illinois Problems Index
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Educational Values Assessment Questionnaire
Behavioral Publications
2852 Broadway
Morningside Heights
New York, New York 10025

Fourth Annual Survey of Attitudes toward the Public Schools of Brevard County, Florida
Brevard County Public Schools
3205 S. Washington Avenue
Titusville, Florida 32780

Fresno County Needs Assessment Process
Fresno County Department of Education
Fresno, California

General Educational Needs Assessment in Mississippi
Office of Planning and Evaluation
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

General Needs Assessment
Bucks County Public Schools
Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Gila River Comprehensive Needs Assessment
Information Analysis Associates
Box 1421
Mesa, Arizona 85201

Hawaii Educational Assessment
State of Hawaii Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Indiana Education Needs Assessment Project
Division of Innovative and Exemplary Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Indicators and Statewide Assessment
Division of Planning, Development, and Evaluation
Colorado State Department of Education
1362 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Louisiana Assessment of Educational Progress
The Division of Instructional Services
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Maine Assessment of Educational Progress
Division of Planning, Evaluation, and Research
State Department of Educational and Cultural Services
Augusta, Maine 04330

A Manual of Information and Guidelines for Teachers and Administrators
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Materials for Use with Local Districts Interested in Developing a Systematic Planning Process
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Milwaukee Public Schools Needs Assessment
Division of Educational Research and Program Assessment
Milwaukee Public Schools
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The Minden Public School Objectives Poll
Minden Public Schools
District R-3
520 West Third Street
P.O. Box 301
Minden, Nebraska 68959

Minnesota Educational Assessment Program
Minnesota Department of Education
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Monticello Needs Assessment Committee Questionnaire
Monticello Public Schools
Joint District No. 3
312 South Main Street
Monticello, Wisconsin 53570

National Assessment of Educational Progress
Education Commission of the States
300 Lincoln Tower
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
Nebraska Needs Assessment Survey
Nebraska Department of Education
Box 94997
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Needs Assessment
Virginia Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Needs Assessment
Accreditation and Educational Improvement Section
State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Needs Assessment in Education
State Department of Education Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Needs Assessment Kit
The Diagnostic and Prescriptive Center for Educational Environments
1210 13th Street
Parkersburg, West Virginia 26101

Needs Assessment Model
Educational Improvement Center Department of Education Central Station
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

A Needs Assessment Model for Establishing Personnel Training Priorities
University of Connecticut
Connecticut Special Education Resource Center U-4
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Needs Assessment Models: A Critical Analysis
Alameda County School Department
685 A Street
Hayward, California 94541

Needs Assessment Procedures Manual
Education Systems Associates
3445 Executive Center Drive, Suite 205
Austin, Texas 78731

A Needs Assessment Process Guide
New Mexico Department of Education Education Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Nevada Needs Assessment
Division of Planning and Evaluation
Nevada State Department of Education Carson City, Nevada 89701

Newton Public Schools Needs Assessment
Newton Public Schools
57 Trinity Street
Newton, New Jersey 07860

Next Step
Worldwide Education and Research Institute
2315 Stringham Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109

New Hampshire Educational Needs Assessment Department of Education
410 State House Annex Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Ohio's Statewide Assessment State of Ohio Department of Education Columbus, Ohio 43215

The Pennsylvania Questionnaire
State Department of Education Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Program Planning Guide
Kansas State Department of Education Kansas State Education Building
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612

A Proposal to Assess the Needs of Students in Ten School Districts Project #2204
State Fair Community College
Sendai, Missouri 65361

Pupil-Perceived Needs Assessment Package Research for Better Schools
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Report of the Visiting Committee
Salmon High School Evaluation
Salmon, Idaho 83467

School Climate Profile
Cheyenne Mountain Schools
1118 West Cheyenne Road
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80906

School Profile: Bonanza Game Priority Evaluator:
A Needs Assessment System
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Skyline Wide Education Plan
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204
State Needs Assessment Project
State of Idaho
Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Office Building
Boise, Idaho 83720

Student Opinion Inventory
National Study of School Evaluation
2201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Survey Results: Educational Needs in the Pacific Northeast
Northeast Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

Utah Educational Needs Assessment
Planning and Evaluation Unit
Utah State Board of Education
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Washington Statewide Educational Assessment
Department of Public Instruction
Olympia, Washington 98504

Workshop Packet for Educational Goals and Objectives
Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.
Eighth and Union Streets
Box 789
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND.

Does the proposal contain sound objectives which are sharply defined, clearly stated, and capable of being attained by the proposed procedures? (10 points)

Judgement should be made on the extent to which

- Objectives relate to the stated needs;
- Proposed activities relate to the objectives; and
- You think they will attain their goals.

Comment:

These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
Other Suggested Indicators:

Clearly describe the scope and sequence of activities from "Day 1" of the project.

Objectives should be:

- consistent in format;
- concise and complete—population, expected outcome, measure(s), time;
- attainable in terms of face validity;
- supported by sub-objectives on other information, if needed to further explain intent of objectives;
- clear relationship shown between goals, objectives, needs and activities.

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978
IDENTIFY OBJECTIVES

PROGRAM PLAN

Performance Objectives

When the results of the needs assessment have been completed and compiled, the program plan can be determined. Objectives that address the needs outlined by local teachers must be stated in measurable terms.

Measurable Objective

1.1 During the project period of September, __________ to June, __________, no less than 80% of teachers participating in the teacher center afternoon workshops will demonstrate an increase in their ability to identify their own professional development needs in order to better serve their students.

In many cases, objectives are written as goals with no possibility of reasonable implementation. The following "objective" would not be acceptable.

Objective

1. Teachers will improve their ability to serve their students.

Objectives focus on areas of concern identified by teachers in the needs assessment. The evaluation criteria speak to "the potential of the proposed teacher center for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served in terms of the learning needs of their students." This could be accomplished through the personal growth of teachers, their professional development and acquisition of new skills. [197.11 (b)]

Objectives may be difficult to define. However, one way of making them precise is to project the school district two years into the future. Identify the changes that would be visible then. These may be the objectives of your project.
If time permits, policy board members can explore alternatives through the use of workshop materials. Specific instructions on the writing of performance objectives are provided in the Workshop Packet for Educational Goals and Objectives subtitled, A Program for Community and Professional Involvement. The packet may be obtained from the Commission on Educational Planning, Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

"I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of stating your goals, objectives, and plan of action clearly and in an orderly fashion. All parts of the proposal must work into a single plan. For instance, if a statement of needs is called for, it should be written so that a statement of objectives will flow naturally from it. It should be evident to the reader that the accomplishment of those objectives will satisfy the needs. The statement of objectives then becomes the basis for writing a section on results or benefits expected and a section on approach (the 'how I will do it' section).

"Objectives of a proposal tell reviewers what the applicant intends to do with the money requested. If these objectives are couched in vague terms, then the reader gets only a vague idea about what the proposer hopes to accomplish. That, in turn, makes it difficult to determine if the approach the applicant describes is adequate in terms of his objectives.

"Objectives should be written precisely, and when possible, at the 'task' level. In other words, if the applicant intends to train community personnel in consumer education, the objectives should spell out specifically what aspects of consumer education will be zeroed in on rather than leaving them at the general 'consumer education' level."

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND...

Does the proposal explain the extent to which federal funds will support new or expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources? (5 points)

Is there a statement of the kinds of activities that will be initiated with federal funds? *

Does the proposal include a description of similar activities already being funded from other sources?

Comment:

* These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, 1978)
EVALUATION CRITERION 197.11(j) (continued)

Other Suggested Indicators*:

Describe present programs, funding level and source of funding.

Description of types of activities being initiated with federal funds (e.g. expanding existing program or implementation of new program.)

Comment:

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators
National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans
October, 1978
CENTER ACTIVITIES

Federal Teacher Centers regulation points out that each teacher center may afford opportunities for teachers to:

1. Develop and produce curricula (including the modification or adaptation of existing curricula) designed to meet the educational needs of the students served by the teachers;
2. Use educational research findings or new or improved methods, practices, and techniques in the development of the curricula;
3. Provide training designed to:
   (i) Enable the teachers to better meet the special educational needs of the students they serve (including training to enable teachers to implement effectively specific curricula); and
   (ii) Familiarize the teachers with developments in curriculum and educational research, including the use of research to improve teaching skills.

FEDERAL REGISTER...197.3(b)

INCORPORATE NEW PROJECT ACTIVITIES IN YOUR PROPOSAL

The plan of action will include the description of the activities of the project. Program activities outline the step by step procedure for implementation of the objectives. This section should outline exactly how the objectives will be accomplished.

1.1 Workshops will be provided for teachers on Thursday afternoon between the hours of 3:00-5:00 p.m. Sample workshop topics, based upon the survey of teacher needs, may include...classroom management, use of multi-ethnic reading materials, etc.

The activities will describe the delivery of inservice to the teachers. Numerous modes of inservice education can be utilized in the plan. Care should be taken in choosing the most appropriate for the activity. The following were used in the first year proposals: interactive workshops, seminars, individual advisory classroom support (peer to peer), independent study, visits to other classrooms, university courses, and discussion groups.
INCENTIVE CONTRACTS

Teachers with curriculum proposals contact the policy board mini grants committee. The policy board carefully reviews each proposal which includes a budget, the project's purposes and goals, and methods for sharing the project throughout the district. Priority is given to projects that can be transferred to other classrooms and other schools, and to ideas which later can be developed into district-funded, rather than policy-board funded, programs.

OTHER IDEAS THAT PROVIDED TEACHERS WITH NEW INCENTIVES...

- THE CREATION, AND DISTRIBUTION OF NEW INSTRUCTIONAL IDEAS DESIGNED BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS
- UNIQUE TIME SHARING FOR INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE IN THE CLASSROOM
- PLANS FOR FOCUSING ON TEACHER STRENGTHS

...teachers will instruct other teachers in requested workshops; for example:

Reading and Star Wars Fang
Taught by: Mr.
Teacher at __________ Elementary School

Metric Measurement for Middle School Learners
Taught by: Mrs.
Teacher at __________ Middle School
### ACTIVITIES (CONT.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ✓ | ARTISTS - in residence  
at the Teacher Center and available  
to teachers in the schools |
| ✓ | MAIN CENTER - "drop-in centers" |
| ✓ | PURPOSE ROOM -  
An area where children of the teachers who  
attend can be cared for while teachers are  
working at the center |

Consider links to present resource banks for the local project. Explore ways in which teachers can be put in contact with the information banks.

**ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE**

- on Career Education: 614/486-3655
- on Counseling and Personnel Services: 313/764-9492
- on Early Childhood Education: 217/333-1386
- on Educational Management: 503/686-5043
- on Handicapped and Gifted Children: 703/620-3660
- on Higher Education: 202/296-2597
- on Information Resources: 315/323-3640
- on Junior Colleges: 213/825-3931
- on Languages and Linguistics: 703/528-4312
- on Reading and Communication Skills: 217/328-3870
- on Rural Education and Small Schools: 505/646-2623
- on Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education: 614/422-6717
- on Social Studies/Social Science Education: 303/492-8434
- on Teacher Education: 202/293-7280
- on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation: 609/921-8000
- on Urban Education: 212/678-3437

Special consideration should be given to the use of the ERIC System. Rental of a computer terminal will provide teachers with an unlimited source of publications and research data.

Write to each clearinghouse:

Request copies of publications and services, and that your name be placed on their mailing list.

For details on computer services and current rental charges contact any ERIC Clearinghouse or AFT Teacher Center Resource Exchange.
Clearinghouses

Each of the 16 ERIC clearinghouses collects materials on a particular subject in education.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Career Education (CB)
Ohio State University
Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210
Telephone: (614) 486-3655

ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services (CG)
University of Michigan
School of Education Building, Room 2106
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
Telephone: (313) 764-9492

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills (CG)
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Rd., Urbana, IL 61801
Telephone: (217) 333-1386

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management (EA)
Library (South Wing), University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
Telephone: (503) 688-5043

ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children (EC)
CEC-Information Center
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091
Telephone: (703) 620-3660

ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics (FL)
Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 N. Kent St., Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: (703) 528-6312

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (HE)
George Washington University
1500 15th St. NW, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 396-2597

ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources (IR)
Syracuse University, School of Education
Syracuse, NY 13210
Telephone: (315) 443-3640

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges (JC)
University of California at Los Angeles
96 Powell Library, Los Angeles, CA 90024
Telephone: (213) 825-3931

ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education (EC)
University of Illinois, College of Education
108 W. Green Street, Champaign, IL 61801
Telephone: (217) 333-1386

ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools (RS)
New Mexico State University
Bldg 3AP, Las Cruces, NM 88003
Telephone: (505) 646-2623

ERIC Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education (SE)
Ohio State University
1200 Chambers Road, Third Floor
Columbus, OH 43212
Telephone: (614) 422-6717

ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/ Social Sciences Education (SS)
Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302
Telephone: (303) 492-8434

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education (TE)
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
15 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 293-7280

ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation (TM)
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road, Princeton, NJ 08540
Telephone: (609) 921-9000 (Ext. 2152)

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education (UD)
Teachers College, Box 40
Columbia University, 525 W. 120th St.
New York, NY 10027
Telephone: (212) 678-3782
EVALUATION CRITERION

197.11 (h)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND...

Does the teacher center have the potential to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall program of inservice training for teachers? (15 points)

Is there evidence that the teacher center activity will influence in any way the inservice programs already in existence? *

Is there a statement explaining how the teacher center program will be coordinated with existing inservice program?

Comment:

* These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
EVALUATION CRITERION 197.11(h) (continued)

Other Suggested Indicators*:

Analysis of present inservice programs to establish present status.

Provide information about problems that can be identified in present program of inservice training.

Plan participation of those responsible for other inservice programs on the policy board (e.g., IHE Representativeness, R2R Coordinator.)

Develop objectives, and activities that supplement other inservice programs (e.g., IST activity may follow-up on an early activity from another program.)

Analyze needs and respond to those that are not being addressed in other programs. (Do not complete for the same audience, cooperate to provide a better service; e.g., provide IST to supplement development of a new curriculum.)

Coordinate the operation and procedures of the center with other IST programs (e.g., Identification of resources, delivery of services.)

Comment:

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978.
DISTRICT INSERVICE

Provide a descriptive summary of the present inservice program and related activities. If there are a number of different programs, clearly identify the goals of each and point out the relationship of the teacher center activities to the activities already being implemented. Describe the way in which this program will interface with and enrich the existing programs and not "supplant" them. Up to 15 points can be awarded for this important section of the proposal; therefore, it is essential that a well-documented review of existing programs and projected benefits be included. If current inservice activities do not provide for teacher input, the emphasis in this section should be placed on the fact that as a result of the Teacher Center program, inservice programs for teachers will now be based upon teacher needs as perceived by teachers themselves. If the present program is designed to meet local needs and is a part of a local or state plan, make this clear in your narrative.

If there is no existing inservice program, state this in precise terms. Look carefully at what is being done. There may be inservice activities that are not centrally supported. Again, don't overemphasize a strong, relevant program...or no program at all. Reviewers evaluating your proposal search the narrative carefully for evidence of district support for the project activities. Services to teacher center participants, materials, activities supported by curriculum departments in the district and other related plans enhance the project. In-kind contributions support the teacher center and indicate built-in success factors.
EVALUATION CRITERION

197.11 (c.2)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND...

Does the Proposal provide a plan of operation for:
- reporting on the effectiveness of the project;
- dissemination of its results; and,
- determining the extent to which the objectives are accomplished? (10 points)

Will be able to know from their reports after the project's termination whether or not and to what extent they will disseminate to whom and how and when?

Comments:

These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets, used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
Other Suggested Indicators:

Clearly describe the scope and sequence of activities from "Day 1" of the project.

Objectives should be:

- consistent in format;
- concise and complete—population, expected outcome, measures(s), time;
- attainable in terms of face validity;
- supported by sub-objectives on other information, if needed to further explain intent of objectives;
- clear relationship shown between goals, objectives, needs and activities.

Comment:

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators, National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978.
EVALUATION PLAN

The evaluation plan describes the strategies, schedule and materials that will be used to determine the degree to which the project's objectives were achieved. In each case, it is essential to include a data-gathering plan and the method(s) by which analyses will be made. An evaluation objective should be written for each program objective. The time period and the instruments to be used should be identified. Technical Assistance can always be obtained from the LEA for this section of the proposal. The teacher center representative in the SEA will also be a valuable resource in developing an evaluation design.

It is recommended that an evaluation specialist be written into the program, at least part time, to insure credibility in the evaluation process.
EVALUATION PLAN

PROJECT OUTCOMES

A careful study of the literature will reveal expected outcomes for the new teachers' centers. Allen Schmieder, Chief of the U.S. Office of Education Teacher Centers Program and Charles Lovett, Administrative Assistant, made recommendations to new teacher center developers:

1. effectiveness as perceived by teachers
2. effectiveness as perceived by administrators
3. degree to which teachers' individual needs are met
4. degree to which the high priority training needs of school systems are met
5. relationship of training programs to substance of curriculum in classroom of participants
6. impact on student achievement
7. impact on teaching skills
8. proximity to schools and communities of participants
9. proportion of training during "regular" school hours
10. degree of teacher input into program development and implementation
11. extent of teacher-developed curricula used in training programs
12. extent to which programs are more comprehensive and systematic than traditional inservice programs
13. amount of teacher interaction and sharing of classroom successes
14. increase in utilization of new learning concepts, approaches, and research findings
15. degree to which teachers are better prepared in high priority staff development needs areas; e.g., mainstreaming, basic skills, reading, energy education
16. impact in terms of the above on other forms of inservice education

DISSEMINATION

Since your project will be a success, others will be interested in every aspect of your project. They will be eager to read the proposal, to be placed on your mailing list and if at all possible to visit the center to gather first-hand information.

The dissemination plan can include a sequential unfolding of program information with designated benchmarks for initiating new information exchanges. Consideration should be given to information sharing at the local, state, and national levels. Since the SEA has been allocated funds for dissemination purposes, the SEA Teacher Center Representative can be contacted for recommendations regarding the state plan and the way in which the local project fits into the state plan.
G. Individual school building representatives

1. Will act as liaisons between the Teachers' Center and the individual schools.

2. Will attend a orientation session after the start of school in September, relative to the purposes and procedural operation of the Teachers' Center and the responsibilities of the individual school building representatives.

3. Will update teachers, at staff meetings called by principals, regarding Teachers' Center activities including media, new materials, evaluation of materials, and specific programs.

4. Will promote the Teachers' Center concept stressing teacher participation, involvement, utilization, and input.

5. Will provide input to the Teachers' Center staff regarding all aspects of the program.

6. Will distribute, collect, and return completed evaluation tools to the Teachers' Center.

H. Administration

1. Upon funding, central office administrators and public and non-public school principals will attend an orientation meeting regarding the purposes and procedures of the Teachers' Center.

2. Administrators and principals will receive assigned Teachers' Center communications and will be utilized as resource persons when appropriate.
Other funded centers designed plans that include many of the following plans.

--- LOCAL DISSEMINATION ---

- publish a monthly teacher center newsletter to be circulated among teachers of the district(s)
- publish a schedule of teacher center events in the district-wide calendar, Federation paper, local newspaper (Bulletin of workshops, courses, etc.)
- prepare news releases, plan consortium press conferences for the teacher center (list newspapers by name)
- presentations on teachers centers to school board at public meetings
- instructional materials and professional library catalog to be developed and disseminated to schools in all districts
- plan Inservice Education community forums, round-table discussions, and field trips
- weekly communication to all schools via the public school closed circuit television
- produce a slide-tape presentation describing the teacher center to be used:
  - to introduce the teacher center to new teachers
  - to orient visitors to the teacher center
  - to disseminate information at local meetings and conferences
  - to inform pre-service teacher educators at the participating IHE's
  - to use in appropriate graduate courses at participating IHE's
- publish a directory of teacher-made materials and other inservice resources (according to subject area and skill)
- publish a Teacher Center Handbook
Projects are strengthened when there is an identifiable link to other programs.

STATE AND NATIONAL DISSEMINATION

- share newsletters with other funded centers
- video tapes, demonstration films prepared with assistance of the School of Communication will be developed
- slide-tape presentations on educational topics will become part of a national clearinghouse for teacher center materials
- press releases and articles to:
  - SEA monthly newsletter (list by name)
  - AFT American Teacher
  - AFT Teacher-Center Resource Exchange Clearinghouse: T.C. Conferences
  - AFT American Educator
- participate in state/regional symposium of teacher center personnel.

Activities cited above are relevant for a single district or a consortium. For consortiums, further exchange is encouraged:

- policy board will host staff members from other centers to exchange ideas on center operation
- teacher-made materials will be exchanged with other center sites in the project
- required reports to the U.S. Office of Education will be published
- descriptive brochures will be made available upon request from other school districts

There is no end to the ever-widening sphere of influence that a local teacher center can have in the educational world. Although we are aware of the international implications, we reserve this section to a subsequent study.
INFORMATION SOURCES FOR DISSEMINATION:

1978 Dissemination Networks
(Information Resources for Education) $4.50
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER
855 BROADWAY, BOULDER, CO 80302

Data Bases and Clearinghouses
Information Resources for Education

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
EVALUATION CRITERION

197.11(d)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND....

Is the project of appropriate size, scope, and duration in order to insure productive results? (5 points)

Does it seem reasonable that what is proposed can be achieved within the proposed time lines? *

Comment:

* These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals. (1978)
EVALUATION CRITERION 197.11(d) (continued)

Other Suggested Indicators*:

Clear description of population should include:

area served (e.g., school district, multiple districts, etc.);
eligible participants (e.g., regular public school, classroom teachers, non-public school teachers, etc.)

Face validity should be established for project objectives and activities with regard to timelines.

Documentation of the commitment of all constituencies to the project.

Develop plan of action including size, scope, and duration of project.

Clearly define a plan for evaluation to insure that objectives are being met.

Clearly describe the format and type of contents of reports.

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators, National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tentative Objectives for the Second and Third Years - 1979/81</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Teacher Center staff shall establish procedures for the identification of instructional materials and methods to meet the immediate needs of teachers (commercially developed materials or material packets developed by teachers using the Center).</td>
<td><strong>Assessment of the degree to which the objective was met will be evidenced by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Additional resources to meet the immediate perceived needs of teachers will be identified.</td>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Teacher Center staff shall catalog instructional materials and methods for inservice programs and for meeting individual needs of teachers and their students.</td>
<td><strong>1. Project Records</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Teacher Center staff shall develop a written catalog of instructional materials and methods and shall disseminate the catalog to all teachers to be serviced by the Teacher Center.</td>
<td><strong>2. Teacher Center Activity Log</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Teacher Center staff shall identify master teachers who will demonstrate the instructional materials and methods in the catalog upon request of at least ten teachers in the subject area or grade level.</td>
<td><strong>3. Printed Copies of the Instructional Materials and Methods Catalog</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Upon request of a teacher, the Teacher Center staff shall research and suggest materials from the Center catalog to focus on the specialized needs of a student within a teacher's classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE TIME LINE IS VITAL FOR THE OVERALL PROJECT PLAN

EXHIBIT 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT TIME LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening of center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation of specific design of programs of policy board, teachers and IHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassessment of goals and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassessment of goals and programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION CRITERION

197.11 (f)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND

Are the facilities and resources described in the proposal adequate for the project? (5 points)

Do they describe clearly the "sites", i.e., the place or places where the center's activities will occur? *

Do they describe clearly how they will identify and secure the resources which are necessary to meet the identified needs?

Do they make sense in relationship to the proposed objectives?

Comment:

These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
EVALUATION CRITERION 197.11(f) (continued)

Other Suggested Indicators*

- Location for delivery of services should be clearly specified.
- Facilities should match activities.
- Procedures for obtaining resources are specified (e.g., identify potential resource and cost information.)

Comment:

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978
A teacher center site should be identified by the policy board and the district before the proposal is submitted. The center should be easily accessible to all teachers served, have ample parking and adequate space. Ideally, areas in the building could be designated for different functions. It will not always be possible to have a large enough building but wherever possible ideas like the following should be incorporated: professional library, media room, work rooms, graphic production room, dark room storage as well as staff and meeting areas.

One urban project developed the PURPOSE AREA. This is a room where children may be left to read, play or watch television while teachers are engaged in activities at the Center.

Proposed sites for the new teacher centers were most often school buildings. In some cases the proposed teacher center had several rooms. A number of rural teacher centers identified centers "on wheels." It is interesting to note that in several cases, the teacher center could not have a "place." One "reader" of the proposal commented on such a teacher center:

EXHIBIT 23  CENTER SITE

A description of all resources needed by the project should be included in the proposal. It is particularly important to identify those resources which will be provided to the project--at no cost to the project. Wherever possible, budget items should not be included for those resources which are usually available, such as some equipment, furniture, space, some instructional supplies, etc.
STAFFING THE TEACHERS' CENTER
AND PAYING THE BILLS
## PART FOUR: STAFFING THE CENTER: PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Staff</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion: Personnel</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Qualifications</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Inservice Specialist</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Coordinator</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearinghouse Coordinator</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Specialist</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Developer</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Specialist</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Aide</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Staff</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Performance Controls</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PAYING THE PROJECT BILLS: BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criterion</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Forms</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Budget A</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itemized Budget A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget A Explanations</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itemized Budget B</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itemized Budget C</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff positions emerge and role responsibilities can be clarified while the program evolves. The "who" of the management plan identifies the duties and responsibilities of the staff. A detailed management plan will include the qualifications necessary for each position as well as a job description for each.

Positions will vary depending on the size of the project and the number of the teachers to be served. The manager of the project could be a director or coordinator responsible for the effective implementation of the project.

Union contracts must be taken into account; resumes for teacher center personnel are not necessary. Equal employment practices require job announcements and consideration of all qualified applicants.
PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

EVALUATION CRITERION

197.11(e)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND....

Are the qualifications and experience of personnel designated to carry out the project adequate? (5 points)

If staff members are not identified is the job description and method of selection adequate?

Comment:

These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
Other Suggested Indicators*:

Note ways in which teacher center staff will insure direct linkage with classroom teachers and those providing inservice training or other assistance.

Provide organizational chart.

Provide specific duties/responsibilities and qualifications for each position. Personnel should show direct experiences related to duties in scope as well as contact.

Provide corporate or agency resumes for any contractors that will provide services to the project.

*Considerations recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978
THE FOLLOWING ARE SAMPLES OF PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND JOB DESCRIPTIONS TAKEN FROM FUNDED TEACHER CENTER PROPOSALS. THEY ONLY PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE PROJECTS.

**Director Qualifications**

- Possesses a valid teaching certificate.
- Is a tenured, classroom teacher.
- Is capable of assuming administrative responsibility (an administrative certificate is not required).
- Possesses a broad-based curriculum background.
- Has demonstrated involvement in educational problems and processes.
- Has knowledge of evaluative techniques including statistics and collection of data.
- Is skilled in inter-personal communications.
- Has practical experience with the represented multicultural community.
- Has a demonstrated background in child-centered programs.

**Job Description - Teacher Center Director**

- Implements programs of the Center as directed by the Policy Board.
- Is responsible for staff selection.
- Coordinates program with Center staff.
- Manages the human and materials resources.
- Is responsible for the supervision of the budget.
- Is responsible for the total evaluation of staff performance, program implementation, and fiscal efficiency.
- Is responsible for adhering to the federal guidelines governing teacher centers.
- Reports periodically to all responsible agencies.
- Provides for public relations with schools and community.
- Provides a monthly newsletter of center activities.
- Provides for communication with the Local Education Agency.
- Attends all scheduled meetings of the Policy Board unless otherwise specified.
Title of Position: Project Director

Qualifications/Experience

- Teacher Certification and current employment as a classroom teacher in the service area of the project.
- Minimum of ___ years experience as a classroom teacher.
- Demonstrated organizational abilities and skills necessary for implementing and sustaining a project of this scope.
- Active participation in AFT and other professional organizations.
- Demonstrated knowledge about the concept and implementation of Teacher Centers.
- Ability to communicate well - orally and in writing.

Duties and Responsibilities: The Teacher Center Director will report and be directly responsible to the Teacher Center Policy Board, and will work cooperatively with participating agencies constituting the membership of the Teacher Center Policy Board.

Other Responsibilities and duties include:

- Initiate and follow through on all planned Center activities and workshops.
- Devise methods of eliciting and analyzing evaluative feedback on Center-sponsored activities, and institute modifications in the project plan as deemed necessary through this evaluation process.
- Maintain a system of communication with service agencies in the Cincinnati area and public and non-public school administrators, to improve communication with teachers about services available on them.
- Oversee Teacher Center staff and coordinate teacher volunteers for special staffing needs.
- Devise and conduct a needs and strengths assessment among teachers, for the purpose of program development and finding teacher consultants.
- Work cooperatively with the Teacher Building Committee chairperson in each school to arrange meetings with teachers to introduce them to Teacher Center concepts and opportunities.
- Disseminate information regarding Teacher Center operation through local press, T.V. and radio releases and interviews.
- Prepare all financial and program report forms and maintain all budget records for the Teacher Center.
- Consult with and visit other Teacher Centers to develop ideas for improvement and further expansion.
Title of Position: Assistant Director

Qualifications

- Masters degree plus 30 hours
- Successful teaching experience

- Experience in planning, organizing, and implementing inservice programs
- Experience in formulating innovative educational experiences
- Commitment to Urban Education
- Experience with test construction and evaluation measures
- Experience in working with individuals and groups with diverse backgrounds
- Understanding of and experience with experimental curricular projects and innovative methodologies

Duties and Responsibilities

- Serve under the direction of and report to the Center Director
- Assist in the implementation of the program design
- Assist in establishing Center policies relevant to the design
- Monitor attainment of program objectives
- Determine budgetary allotments according to established Center policies
- Assume leadership of Center Advisory Committee and serve as liaison with other advisory committees
- Facilitate tactical support for and coordination of Reading Resources Laboratory and Mathematics Education Resources Center
- Receive and process required reports from Center staff members
- Coordinate services of all components to avoid duplication of efforts and facilitate operations
- Communicate the Center's purposes as needed and/or required
- Accept accountability for Center operation
- Accept accountability for establishing a unique policy of Center effort, in order that it may be distinguished from existing inservice programs
Title of Position: Assistant Director

Qualifications

- Teacher Certification and current employment as a classroom teacher in the service area of the project.
- Minimum of 3 years experience as a classroom teacher.
- Active participation in teacher-oriented professional organization.
- Demonstrated competency in written communication skills and some experience in writing for and/or publishing a newsletter or other formal communication device.
- Demonstrated competency in organizing and carrying through projects.

Job Description: The Teacher Center Assistant Director will be fully funded by the project. He/she will report to and assist the director in all phases of the Teacher Center operation, but will be primarily responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of communication with teachers in the project area and for organizing teacher involvement in the planning and implementing of project activities.

Responsibilities and Duties:

- Publish a bi-weekly newsletter regarding Teacher Center policies, activities and services and take charge of disseminating it to all project area teachers and local colleges of education.
- Establish a system of information dissemination for teachers in conjunction with Cincinnati area colleges and universities.
- Establish and coordinate a network system of teacher-initiated and planned workshops and activities.
- Organize and coordinate other teacher communication approaches, e.g. bulletin boards, radio/T.V. programs, etc.
- Compile a file of local resources for field trips and speakers.
A teacher center program must relate to the needs of the classroom teacher. Teachers must have "the assistance of such consultants and experts as may be necessary to develop and produce curricula, utilize research findings, and provide training to improve the skills of teachers to enable the teachers to meet better the educational needs of their students." (Appendix B-5) Experts are given a variety of different titles.

Qualifications of Teaching Staff

- Holder of valid teaching certificate with overlapping skills in the following areas: elementary, secondary, special education, vocational and/or counseling.
- Tenured classroom teacher.
- Broad-based curriculum background.
- Demonstrated involvement in educational problems and processes. Able to assume some administrative responsibilities in Center operation.
- Knowledge of evaluative techniques including designing thereof.
- Highly skilled in interpersonal communications.
- Demonstrated experience with the represented multi-cultural community.
- Demonstrated background in child-centered programs.
- Warm, receptive, supportive, listener, and communicator.

Job Description

- Will design and conduct workshops.
- Will supervise and/or design materials.
- Will provide on-site assistance.
- Will requisition and scrounge materials.
- Will be skilled in interpersonal communications.
- Will schedule work and workshops.
- Is a source bank of ideas and techniques.
Title of Position: Teaching Specialist

Qualifications/Experience

- Board of Education licensed teacher with at least 5 years of recent teaching experience, whose teaching styles have proven successful.
- Classroom experience within several school organizations.
- Exemplary knowledge about content, materials and methods in all curriculum areas.
- Strong background in learning theory, child development curriculum and learning strategies and educational research.
- Knowledgeable about teacher centers, inservice education and teacher training.
- Willingness to undergo additional training.
- Demonstrated ability to collaborate with staff/adults/administration.
- Recommendation of policy board.

Job Description

- Guide participating teachers through inservice professional development activities using such techniques as classroom demonstrations, peer discussions, simulations, materials, development activities both during and after school.
- Cooperating with program developers on design of instruments for monitoring and assessing the progress of the program.
- Act as a facilitator by organizing a schedule of services which best serve the learning needs of teachers using the site.
- Cooperate with the project staff in identifying, disseminating and sharing exemplary practices and materials generated by the individual site.
Title of Position: Demonstration Teachers

Qualifications

- Must have served as local school curriculum committee chairperson or similar leadership roles.

Job Description

- Assume responsibility as instructors, demonstrators, lecturers and curriculum specialist.
Title of Position: Elementary/Junior High/High School Level Specialist

Qualifications/Experience

- Teaching license appropriate to level.
- Demonstrable skill in relating to adult learners in an educational setting.
- Minimum of 5 years teaching experience in a variety of school organizations.
- Strong background in teacher training, curriculum development, learning strategies and educational research.
- Willingness to undergo additional training in program development and research.
- Recommendation of the Policy Board.

Job Description

- Coordination with program developers in implementation of project at various sites.
- Participate in design of needs assessment and evaluation instruments for workshops and clearinghouse components as they address each level.
- Develop and implement procedures for orienting teachers to use resources and services available at the site.
- Arrange and conduct workshops in cooperation with field coordinators for staff and/or participating teachers.
- Assist teachers in implementing new methods, strategies, and materials, in cooperation with clearinghouse coordinator and field coordinators.
Title: Special Project Schools Inservice Specialist

Qualifications
- Masters degree plus 30 hours
- Evidence of successful public school or college of education teaching experience
- Evidence of successful experience in designing and directing inservice training activities
- Familiarity with current research and trends in inservice education and staff and curriculum development

Duties and Responsibilities
- Direct, plan, develop and administer programs of professional growth and development with administrators, faculty members and paraprofessionals
- The Specialist assumes leadership with staff in:
  --conducting needs assessments and task analysis
  --planning projects to respond to identified needs
  --monitoring and evaluating professional growth and development events
  --coordinating professional growth efforts of local school
  --designing programs, writing proposals, allocating materials and resources to support professional growth
  --serving as liaison between school site, Center and other appropriate institutions/offices
  --serving as liaison between site and Interdisciplinary Teacher Education Program
  --determining needs for funds, supplies and resources at Special Project Sites
  --gathering data for research purposes
  --acting as change agent
  --motivating staff to search for new solutions to educational problems
  --keeping abreast of new ideas and sharing with staff
  --facilitating building of self-renewal in staff

- The Inservice Specialist attends conferences, seminars and workshops as they relate to professional growth and development
- Writes and publishes articles for educational journals, with Center administrative approval, as they relate to Center development, pupil progress, and the professional growth of administrators, teachers and paraprofessionals.
Title: Center Inservice Specialist

Qualifications

- Earned Masters Degree plus 30 hours
- Evidence of successful teaching experience
- Evidence of successful experiences in planning, organizing and implementing inservice programs based upon goals and objectives
- Evidence of successful experiences in working with individuals and groups with diverse backgrounds
- Evidence of successful experience as a consultant to colleagues
- Evidence of experience in developing innovative and effective alternative program designs
- Evidence of commitment to continuous inservice training
- Evidence of ability to coordinate resources with program needs

Duties and Responsibilities

- Manage the delivery system enabling educators to request their own inservice experiences
- Identify consultants and maintain a resource bank for field services
- Collaborate with requesters to design and implement inservice experiences based upon needs and statements of goals and objectives
- Coordinate and supervise inservice programs as requested for field-based sites
- Monitor and evaluate field consultant services
- Serve as consultant in areas of expertise
- Specify and obtain human and material resources that are relevant to the inservice needs of requesters
- Cooperate with all Center components to provide effective inservice programs — particularly, matching consultants/material resources to inservice needs
- Assist requesters with diagnosing and identifying their inservice needs
- Facilitate collaboration with professional colleagues in the University, the State Department of Education, other universities/colleges, Teacher Centers and AFT
- Demonstrate the commitment to improve student learning through professional growth and development
- Manage budgetary needs according to Center policies
Title of Position: Field Coordinator

Qualifications/Experience

- Teaching license; minimum of 5 years teaching experience in a variety of school organizations.
- Demonstrated ability or previous experience in coordination/administration of programs.
- Demonstrated familiarity with schools.
- Demonstrated knowledge of curricular materials, teacher centers, inservice education and teacher training.
- Experience in relating to adult learners.
- Willingness to undergo additional training.
- Recommendation of the policy board.

Job Description

- Assist in planning and implementing ongoing in-service staff development activities during and after school.
- Set up and maintain teacher center resource rooms at the various sites with the assistance of other appropriate staff.
- Foster an atmosphere of cooperation and communication among school personnel at the local participating sites.
- Facilitate the preparation and accessibility of materials developed by and for teachers served by this project in cooperation with clearinghouse personnel.
- Work with teachers on an individual basis and consult with groups of teachers regarding their inservice requirements for meeting the specific learning needs of children.
- To assume responsibility for administrative and fiscal matters related to the project.
- Maintain appropriate records of activities at the various sites.
- Assist in the performance of the Director's duties.
Plans for the housing and distribution of resources for in-service programs and instructional planning often include a skilled librarian or subject area specialist. The size of the district and the number of available resources will determine the scope of the position.

Title of Position: Clearinghouse Coordinator

Qualifications/Experience

- Board of Education licensed teacher, librarian or person with similar background in library/media skills.
- Knowledgeable about information retrieval systems, referencing, cataloging.
- Familiar with a wide range of curricular materials in all areas, teacher centers and professional literature dealing with inservice training, teaching strategies and research.
- Demonstrated knowledge about existing city, cultural and educational resources.
- Recommendation of policy board.

Job Description

- Identify, select and catalog materials, information and resources appropriate to the project.
- Disseminate information, resources and materials appropriate to the various site activities.
- Assist the director in control and ordering of materials for the entire project.
- Keep abreast of recent research, new materials and curriculum development throughout the United States.
- Incorporate products of this project into the clearinghouse and disseminate them to other sites.
- Develop a telephone information service for teachers and project staff.
Title of Position: Mathematics Specialist

Qualifications

- Minimum 30 hours beyond the masters degree
- Strong background in mathematics education
- Experience in inservice education of teachers of mathematics
- Teaching excellence
- Knowledge of and ability to use staff development techniques

Duties and Responsibilities

- Manage the mathematics education center at the
- Assume leadership of the mathematics education advisory committee which consists of teachers, supervisors, and university faculty
- Plan and administer inservice workshops and consultant services, on a group or individual basis, related to the teaching and learning of mathematics
- Conduct inservice training programs for public school personnel in the area of mathematics
- Document results of inservice programs and write reports about those programs
- Prepare the budget and orders for materials, equipment, and supplies for the mathematics education center
Title of Position: Reading Specialist

Qualifications

- Minimum Masters degree plus 30 hours
- Expertise in the area of reading and the related language arts
- Prior experience in inservice, preservice teacher training
- Prior teaching experience
- Prior teaching experience in an urban community
- Knowledgeable in research techniques

Duties and Responsibilities

- Manage the reading resources center
- Plan and administer inservice training of public school personnel in the area of reading and the related language arts
- Plan and conduct inservice workshops; provide consultant services for individual teachers in relation to a student or students for the expressed purpose of improving instruction
- Identify outside resources
- Serve in a leadership role in relation to the ad hoc reading advisory committee and in relation to collaboration with universities
- Provide services to the center staff when needs are presented in the area of reading and the related language arts.
- Conduct research and disseminate the findings of the research
- Assume budget responsibilities for the reading center
- Publish in relation to learning modules, and research findings
- Report directly to the assistant director
- Write reports requested by the director and submit to the assistant director
Since evaluation and research are important components of the teacher center, the policy boards may choose to design a position for an evaluator, or program developer.

**Title of Position:** Program Developer

**Qualifications/Experience**

- Advanced degree in educational measurement and evaluation and statistics.
- Experience in research on teaching.
- Ability to design data collecting instruments relevant to teaching and teacher center activities and to apply information to inservice activities.
- Knowledge of computer programming.
- Experience in teaching research.
- Experience in relating research results to teachers.
- Knowledgeable about ______ schools.
- Recommendation of the policy board.

**Job Description**

- Assist in design and training of specialists for the individualized professional development program at all levels.
- Assist in design of on-site training strategies for program.
- Conduct sessions with participating teachers on the use of pupil and teacher data in the identification of professional development needs.
- Train paraprofessionals to collect data, and research assistants to interpret data.
- Design system of data collection, processing, analysis and reporting for program development and evaluation purposes.
- Develop models of effective teaching and models of effective in-service training in cooperation with other project staff.
- Design data collection instruments for program for teacher specialists in cooperation with project staff.
- Participate in the design and implementation of needs assessment techniques including the construction of instruments.
- Participate in design and preparation of evaluation reports.
Title of Position: Researcher

Qualifications

- Bachelors and Masters with special skills related to the conduct of research.

Job Description

- Assume primary responsibility for design, collection and analysis of evaluation of the teachers' center program. To work in cooperation with independent evaluators and the division of research and evaluation to make research findings available to all center staff and participants, and to public school personnel.
Title of Position: Evaluation Specialist

Qualifications

- Masters Degree in research and evaluation
- Evidence of successful experience in designing evaluation plans, instruments, and procedures for public school and/or college level educational projects
- Evidence of successful experience in developing needs assessment instruments
- Evidence of successful experience with observation, interview, and feedback techniques

Duties and Responsibilities

- Design evaluation plans for assessing the effectiveness of and each of its components: field consultant services, reading and mathematics centers, and special project schools
- Design needs assessment instruments for determining inservice training needs of public school staffs
- Analyze data generated from the above, prepare progress and final reports based on the evaluation plan, and make recommendations for future directions
- Write and publish articles for educational journals, with center administrative approval, as they relate to center development and evaluation
- Monitor, by on-site visits, school projects and programs sponsored by the center
- Assume leadership of the evaluation advisory committee
- Facilitate collaboration with professional colleagues in the universities/colleges, professional organization
All personnel involved in the project activities should be skilled in interpersonal relations as well as in their special area.

8.3 Educational Aide Qualifications

- Holder of aide certificate.
- Knowledge of audio-visual materials and all types of production machinery.
- Maintain the professional library.
- Be proficient in typing.
- Have creative skills in developing a product.

8.3.1 Job Description of Educational Aide

- Assists clients at work in the materials production area; locates materials, supervises and instructs in operation of laminating machine, projectors, recorders, VTR equipment.
- Maintains materials and supply inventories.
- Reorders when necessary.
- Acts in secretarial capacity during extended day.
- Catalogs all materials, books, and equipment.
- Organizes and maintains a system of check-out and return on materials, books and loan equipment.
- Assists as needed for seminars, workshop activities, and demonstrations.
- Maintains the coffee pot for all visitors.
The project dissemination plan, as well as the day-to-day organization, depends on an efficient clerical staff. Careful attention must be given to qualifications of staff members.

**Secretarial Qualifications**

- High school education and one year of business college or vocational education or comparable experience and training.
- One to three years of applicable work experience, preferably within the public schools system.
- Satisfactory completion of required tests.
- Knowledge of general principles of accounting, bookkeeping.
- Ability to compose routine communications.
- Ability to work courteously and tactfully with people.
- Superior skill in operation of necessary office machines, typing at 65 wpm, dictation at 80 wpm when applicable to the needs of the staff.

**Job Description of Secretary**

- This employee performs a variety of complicated, routine secretarial, clerical, and/or accounting functions.
- The employee must apply appropriate procedures to the various duties.
- The employee is responsible for accurate performance.
- Responsibility may extend to contact with persons within and outside the school system to discuss routine business matters.
- Skill in the operation of the typewriter, dictaphone, adding machine, calculator and/or other office machinery is required when applicable to the needs of the using school or department.
- Perform other related tasks as directed by the supervisor.
EXHIBIT 24 B. PROJECT PERFORMANCE CONTROLS

The following are key project performance control mechanisms customarily used by the Teacher Center for the management of this project.

1. An internal Work Design will be prepared for each Core Staff member, Part-Time Consultant and Policy Board member during the first month of the project. This Work Design will review the project's objectives, its work, tasks, timing, and completion schedule. The Work Design will be periodically updated.

2. Weekly staff meetings for Core Staff members and bi-monthly meetings with Core Staff and Part-Time Consultants will be held to discuss problems, solutions, task assignments, and reassignments.

3. Monthly reports will be prepared documenting:
   - Gross expenditures
   - Estimated percent of tasks completed
   - Projected time and budget requirements for task completion

This report will be designed to assure that adequate resources are available to complete the efforts originally proposed.
The budget of the teacher center project can be determined when all the components of the proposal are in place. Forms for the budget must be completed and an itemized budget included in the final proposal. Items should be identified in each category on the form.

The allowable costs for the teacher center program are:

- personnel costs (management of the center)
- consultant services
- service contracts
- released time or payment of substitutes (to replace center participants)
- expenses of teacher center policy board
- other direct and indirect operation costs

UNALLOWABLE COSTS:

- remodeling of facilities
- construction of facilities

Technical assistance from the district special projects office and the state teacher center representative will ensure the preparation of an acceptable budget.

MATCH BUDGET ITEMS TO ACTIVITIES IN THE PROPOSAL NARRATIVE.
EVALUATION CRITERION

197.11 (g)

REVIEWERS WILL READ YOUR PROPOSALS WITH THESE QUESTIONS IN MIND...

Is the cost of the proposal budget reasonable in relation to anticipated results, including the proportion of the budget represented by costs for released time or substitutes? (5 points)

1) Does the amount budgeted for resources and activities seem sufficient or too little or excessive to carry out their plan of operation?
2) If money is budgeted for released time or substitutes, is the amount reasonable in relation to the amount budgeted for other activities (e.g., for providing the inservice training)?

Comment:

*These questions were taken from USOE comment sheets used for evaluation of teacher center proposals, (1978)
Other Suggested Indicators*:

- Describe procedures for developing budget estimates (e.g., procuring local salary schedules, cost of IST.)

- Provide projected unit cost information (e.g., cost to train each teacher, cost to provide information searches.)

- Identify cost information for comparable activities (e.g., IHE, cost to train, R&D cost to generate search.)

- Provide total cost information (e.g., cost to train all teachers in proposed population.)

- Provide cost information regarding substitute teachers, including unit cost, total cost, and comparability data.

- Provide information regarding the proportion of cost allocated to release time or substitutes vs. total program cost.

- Provide rationale for using or not using released time or substitutes.

Comment:

*Consideration recommended by Teacher Center State Coordinators
National Teacher Center Resource Center, New Orleans, October, 1978
Complete this form with following information:

**Personnel**

6a. Total salaries for staff members. Staff receive amount listed on LEA or IHE salary schedule.

**Fringe Benefits**

6b. Budget office in personnel (LEA) can give % rates for C.O.L.A., retirement, Social Security, etc. (If included in indirect cost, don't list here.)

**Travel**

6c. List expenses for Project Staff. Include Director's trip to Washington, D.C. meetings, visits to other centers, and visits to SEA.

**Equipment**

6d. If equipment is essential for project objectives, anything over $300 is to be listed. Justify your purchase in the proposal narrative.

**Supplies**

6e. Materials that will be used for the duration of the project—described on itemized budget.

---

* Photo reduced from application form in Appendix C-10.
EXHIBIT 25: PART III - BUDGET INFORMATION (continued)

Contractual

6f. Total of subcontract with institutions. Subcontracts should be included in proposal budget—USOE must approve.

Construction

6g. Not applicable for this project. NA.

Other

6h. Released time for teachers, substitute salaries, consultant fees, travel for policy board, etc., printing, telephone, equipment rental.

Total Direct Costs

6i. Sum of a through h.

Indirect Cost

6j. Fixed rate; information available from LEA (or IHE if IHE grant).

Total

6k. Sum of i + j; dollar amount requested.

* If district Regulations do not permit subcontract negotiations before the grant is awarded, describe the expected terms. Include estimated cost for USOE approval.
This section F. is the most important. It should be done on separate sheets and keyed to the object class categories (lines a-k, section B) in as great detail as possible. Readers who review proposals will look at these pages before looking at the forms.
### PART III - BUDGET INFORMATION

#### SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FEDERAL CATALOG NO.</th>
<th>ESTIMATED UNOBLIGATED FUNDS</th>
<th>NEW OR REVISED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>FEDERAL (C)</td>
<td>NON-FEDERAL (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Centers</td>
<td>13,416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT CLASS CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Teacher Centers</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Personnel</td>
<td>$65,566</td>
<td>$65,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$19,775</td>
<td>$19,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Travel</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Supplies</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Contractual</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other</td>
<td>$10,878</td>
<td>$10,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Total Direct Charges</td>
<td>$132,719</td>
<td>$132,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Indirect Charges</td>
<td>$7,216</td>
<td>$7,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. TOTALS</td>
<td>$139,935</td>
<td>$139,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. PROGRAM INCOME</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) GRANT PROGRAM</th>
<th>(b) APPLICANT</th>
<th>(c) STATE</th>
<th>(d) OTHER SOURCES</th>
<th>(e) TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. FEDERAL</td>
<td>$139,935</td>
<td>$69,968</td>
<td>$23,323</td>
<td>$23,322</td>
<td>$23,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. NON-FEDERAL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TOTALS</td>
<td>$NA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) GRANT PROGRAM</th>
<th>(b) FIRST</th>
<th>(c) SECOND</th>
<th>(d) THIRD</th>
<th>(e) FOURTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Teacher Centers Program</td>
<td>$119,935</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. TOTALS</td>
<td>$139,935</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION**

See line-by-line budget and budget explanations on the following pages.

The indirect cost rate, 7.2%, is predetermined by the SEA. In this project, the amount of indirect costs is $7,216. LEA indirect costs will not be applied to (IHE) contracted services.

**PART IV - PROGRAM NARRATIVE** (attach per instructions)
Title of Program: Teacher Centers Program

Dates: July 1, 1978 - June 30, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Rates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$19,222</td>
<td>$19,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19,222</td>
<td>19,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19,222</td>
<td>19,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>7,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fringe Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirement (Pedagogical)</td>
<td>11,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.85% x 57,666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement (Secretary)</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.35% x 7,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>3,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1% x 65,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 x 425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 x 275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,016 x .005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 2B: ITEMIZED SAMPLE BUDGET A (continued)

AFTER-SCHOOL COMPONENT
Teacher (Hourly for Workshops)
2 H/D \times 105 D = 210 H \times 7.75/H

TEACHER CENTERS POLICY BOARD
School Secretary (Per Diem)
25 D \times \$22/D
Social Security
6.12 \% \times 550
Local Travel for Policy Board Members
Office Supplies
Postage
Conference/Meeting Expenses

OTHER THAN PERSONAL-SERVICES (OTPS)
Instructional Supplies & Materials
2 sites \times 750
Audiovisual Supplies & Materials
2 sites \times 250
Library Resource Materials
Repair of Equipment
2 sites \times 100
Office Supplies
2 sites \times 150
Postage
Advertising of Project Activities
Telephone
Local Travel (Project Staff)
Out-of-Town Travel (Project Staff/Policy Board Members)
Conferences and Related Expenses
Printing for Dissemination

\text{\textit{continued}}}
EXHIBIT 28: ITEMIZED SAMPLE BUDGET A (continued)

Rental of Duplicator
Consultants
30 D x 100/D

Contract for University Services
(Evaluation, Training, Program Development
and Research Activities) $32,500

(See + below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental of Duplicator</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract for University Services</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Evaluation, Training, Program Development and Research Activities)</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (LEA) 100,219

INDIRECT COSTS* (7.2% x 100,219) 7,216

Subtotal 107,435

Contract 32,500

GRAND TOTAL $139,935

* LEA indirect costs will not be applied to contracted services.

* Official rate for 1978-79, as determined by the State Education Agency.
Subject to grant award, it is expected that the following in-kind contributions will be made to the Teacher Centers Consortium:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTION</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE DOLLAR VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations with Faculty</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BUDGET ITEM

| Instructional Supplies & Materials | 2 sites x 750 | To provide materials and supplies including workbooks, instructional kits, reprograph paper, and other required workshop materials. |
| Audiovisual Supplies & Materials | 2 x 250 | To provide filmstrips, cassettes, overhead transparencies, and supplies for teacher-made materials. |
| Library Resource Materials | 2 x 300 | To provide magazine subscriptions, educational journals, reference books on resource materials, and other items requested by teachers attending workshops for the development of a professional library at each school site and the Clearinghouse. |
| Repair of Equipment | 2 x 100 | No equipment will be purchased. All equipment required by the project will be provided by participating sites/districts/offices. A small allowance has been included for the repair of equipment. |
| Office Supplies | 2 x 150 \ 1 x 100 | To provide materials for typing, filing, duplication paper, stationery items, etc. |
| Postage | 2 x 100 | For all project correspondence, mailing of project curriculum materials, and announcement of meetings, etc. |
| Advertising of Project Activities | 5,000 | To inform personnel of workshop offerings. Notification will be advertised monthly/bimonthly in the official newspaper publication of the collective bargaining agent. This publicity will provide a cost-effective mechanism (relative to staff time and postage costs) for informing every teacher and paraprofessional, each of whom receives the newspaper, as well as... |

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ITEM</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>For monthly telephone costs incurred in the operation of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Travel (Project Staff)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>For project staff at the two sites to visit project activities throughout the city, for attending site meetings, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-Town Travel (Project Staff/Policy Board Members)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Trips to Washington, D.C. to visit USOE on program matters, for a regional conference which USOE will be organizing, and for project staff visits to other Teacher Center sites in nearby areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences &amp; Related Expenses</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Meeting expenses for workshops and for parent, paraprofessional and supervisory sessions after-school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing for Dissemination</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Project manual will be produced at the end of the first year, for national dissemination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental of Duplicator</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>One duplicator will be rented to duplicate all project materials, agents, and correspondence for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants for Training</td>
<td>30 D x 100/D</td>
<td>Reknowned educators in various curricular and instructional areas will provide specialized program training and development activities unavailable through Board of Education personnel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 30: ITEMIZED SAMPLE BUDGET B

FOR FIRST YEAR PROJECT
USOE ADJUSTMENT INCLUDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Category</th>
<th>Description/Justification</th>
<th>OA Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>100% time x Teacher Salary</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>15% of $103,433</td>
<td>2,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$18,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>15% of $128,870</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Developer</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$18,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>15% of $128,870</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secretary</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>15% of $56,400</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"These salaries represent highest possible salaries, i.e., top of Teacher Salary Schedule (Ph.D with maximum years’ experience.) Realistically, the salaries will range from $12,000 to $20,000, including benefits.

Cherioff Hourly

Wages                  | 210 hrs. x $3.70/hr. | $777
SUBTOTAL               |                      | $20,956
EXHIBIT 30: SAMPLE BUDGET B
(continued)

Although it is reasonable to hope that the essential components of a local project will not be cut from the budget at the time of funding, samples from the first year review indicate that drastic cuts are made. These changes made by USOE in an original proposal's budgeting request.

TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE

Center Staff
Travel
Consultants
Travel
Per Diem
External Evaluator
Travel
Per Diem
Subtotal

Other Direct Costs
Office Supplies
Postal and Telephone (Long Distance Only)
Printing and Duplicating
Instructional Materials
Computer Time
Processing Evaluation (Internal & External)
Assessment Data

Teacher Release Time
Substitute Teachers Pay
To cover up teachers to attend Inservice Offerings, Develop Local Curriculum, Conduct Classroom Based Research, etc.

Indirect Costs Recovered
Overhead on All Budgeted Items

Total Costs $319,187

4,000
4,000
6,100
4,300
284
720
8,260
5,000
504
10
0.5
15
1,576 days $30/day
$15,719

30,000

20,234

34,334

30,000
EXHIBIT 31: ITEMIZED TEACHER CENTER BUDGET

Sample C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$ 3,976</td>
<td>21,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Assistant</td>
<td>$19,320</td>
<td>$2,076</td>
<td>21,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>$19,320</td>
<td>$2,076</td>
<td>21,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>$17,603</td>
<td>$ 1,938</td>
<td>19,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics Artist</td>
<td>$17,603</td>
<td>$1,938</td>
<td>19,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Aide</td>
<td>$12,968</td>
<td>$1,807</td>
<td>14,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk/Typist</td>
<td>$11,127</td>
<td>$2,774</td>
<td>13,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-time Personnel SUBTOTAL ............ $135,068

Substitute Pay

- $25/day x 80 days (8 policy board members x 10 meeting days) 2,000 182 2,182
- $25/day x 20 days (for speaker participation at center activities) 7,000 455 7,455

Personnel SUBTOTAL .................... $152,558

"In support of requirement of Section 197.11(c)(2) regarding "adequacy for reporting on the effectiveness...and for determining the extent to which the objectives are accomplished."

Supplies and Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational (Make and Take)</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equipment

- Typewriters (2) 4 $2,000
- Calculator         400 $2,400

Miscellaneous

- Copying Machine and Paper 15,000
- Printing             3,000
- Postage             300 18,300

Travel/Conference Attendance

- Out-of-town 2,000
- Conference Fees 200 2,200

Periodicals

- Non-Personnel Subtotal ........................................ $30,300

Indirect Cost 6.7% (less equipment) 12,483

Project Total 819,876

Additional, unbudgeted expenses might include: Stipends, travel, tuition, contractual services, and local travel.
**IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION FROM DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Director</td>
<td>$19,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Assistant</td>
<td>$2,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>$19,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Developers</td>
<td>$2,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration Teachers</td>
<td>$171,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitute Pay</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$35/36 x 200 days (for teacher participation at center activities)</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Space Rental &amp; $5.00 to $5.50 per square foot</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate value of small building (20,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Utilities (for small building, including heat, electric, telephone, etc., per year)</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Custodial/Operating Costs (small building per year)</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Repairs (small building per year)</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Audio-Visual, including overhead projectors, tape recorders, movie projectors, slide projectors, thermostats, etc.</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Office equipment, including desks, chairs, tables, cabinets, bookcases, etc.</td>
<td>Currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Educational Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>BESA Title IV-3 Contributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books for professional library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/software items</td>
<td>$20,000-50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project** | $419,599
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FORMAT OF THE PROPOSAL

DO'S AND DON'TS

Now that the proposal is completed, focus on your long range plan - having the proposal funded. Before this happens, it will be read and evaluated by reviewers chosen by the SEA and USOE.

David B. Sherman*, outlined suggestions for your consideration. His points were confirmed by AFT members who reviewed teacher center proposals '78.

WARNING: CHECK THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

**DO**

✓ complete all necessary information on the application forms
✓ include a one-page abstract describing the project
✓ compile a detailed table of contents
✓ prepare illustrative charts/tables/graphs to facilitate presentations of information
✓ explain abbreviations and acronyms used throughout the narrative
✓ describe the geographic location of the area to be served, assuming that the reader is totally unfamiliar with the area
✓ carefully index the proposal
✓ document all statistics used in the proposal
✓ bind the document securely, and use a 2-1/2 inch clip through holes punched at the top
✓ assume nothing!

* David B Sherman, Bureau of Special State and Federal Programs, New York City Board of Education
**APPLICATION FORMALS**

**EXHIBIT 32**

1. **Application**
2. **b. Date completed**
3. **Completed by SEA**

---

**FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

- **b. Funding**
- **State**
- **Eligible**
- **Federal**
- **District**
- **Year**

---

- **Completed by LEA or IHE**
- **Refers to §23**
- **a. 13.416**
- **b. Teacher Centers Program**
- **List Name of Project only**
- **Identify one or combination (A to G, I)**

---

- **Already completed. A**
- **List all cities or counties in service area**
- **List number of persons (teachers) to be served**
- **For first Year: A new**
- **For refunding B renewal**
- **Request for Funds—**
  - a. List amount of Federal request
  - List b, c, d, e if appropriate
  - f. Sum of the above (TOTAL)
  - a. Congressional District(s) in which grantee (#4) is located
  - b. Congressional District(s) in which service area is located

---

- **NA**
- **Check OE schedule for award of grants; project can begin shortly after that date**
- **Grants are awarded for 12 months**
- **Check schedule for submission by State to USOE**
- **NA**
- **Send to State agency; not to Washington, D.C.**
- **Check YES if more space is needed to explain (#1 to 20); use following page**
- **b. Check with SEA for requirement**
- **Signed by legally authorized rep of LEA or IHE**

---
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DO INCLUDE AN ABSTRACT OF THE PROJECT

Federal guidelines request an abstract, a summary of the project. This description should follow the application forms.

The following examples are included as aids to policy board members. The length varies from one page to 1 1/2 pages (double spaced).

EXHIBIT 34 ABSTRACT A

The need for a Teacher Center to support the educational and professional growth efforts of the teachers of the School... was established by several recent developments affecting the teachers and students of this city. Specific reference is made to the mandate of the Board of Education to implement a Competency-Based Curriculum; the identification and prioritization of the School System's Instructional Goals; the revised Teacher Appraisal procedures; the enactment of Public Law 93-403, Section 204(a) requiring teacher recertification; a decline in the achievement scores of students in the priority areas of reading and mathematics; and the need to provide assistance and support for teachers as they assume more responsibility for their own professional enrichment.

The major focus of the Center will be inservice training designed for and by teachers based upon their perceptions of the kinds of assistance that will help them meet the educational needs of students. To accomplish this the Teacher Center will provide an environment in which teachers can grow professionally and intellectually through formal and informal peer's structured educational experiences, workshops, conferences, seminars, and other individual, small group, and large group activities.

The programs planned for the Teacher Center are based on a three year projection. The expected outcomes are that during that time the teachers of the Public Schools will have gained significantly increased opportunities for inservice training as will be evidenced by data on the numbers of teachers who have used the Center for recertification or other purposes; and that the students of these teachers will have made significant and more positive attitudes toward school.
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ABSTRACT

Teacher Center Proposal

An abstract describing the teacher center project follows the application forms. The following example summarizes a district teacher center project.

EXHIBIT 35

ABSTRACT B

The Teacher Center of ____________________________ is funded for teacher directed and managed programs that will be governed by a fifteen member policy board of which 53% are classroom teachers.

The Teacher Center will support educational and professional growth efforts of the teachers of ____________________________.

The major focus of the center will be inservice training designed to implement a competency-based curriculum. Seminars and lectures will be given to assist teachers with the new teacher appraisal procedures designed to increase teacher accountability, to meet recertification requirements; workshops for teachers and parents designed to help raise the achievement scores of the students and support for teachers as they assume more responsibility for their own professional enrichment.

The Teacher Center will have a professional library with print and non-print materials, curricula, current documents and direction emanating from central administration, regional and union offices; activities or programs of exemplary teachers and students available for use by teachers upon request.

The Teacher Center will design programs and activities, parent/teacher conferences, parent/teacher/student seminars and exhibit centers, informal meetings and opportunities for parent/child interaction.

The Center expects to accommodate more than 6,000 public and non-public school teachers in addition to parents and students.

The environment will be one in which teachers can grow professionally and personally through formal and informal interaction with a wide range of people throughout the city who have an interest in children and how they learn.
### Section of Proposal

#### Application Cover Page
- Page 1

#### Table of Contents
- Overall Table of Contents
- Table of Contents for USOE Evaluation Criteria
- Table of Contents for Additional State Criteria
- Table of Figures for Needs Assessment
- Table of Exhibits

#### Remarks:
- Approval Signatures of Teacher Centers
- Policy Board Members
- Letters to USOE

#### Project Approval Information
- Page 16

#### Assurances (Part V)
- Page 17-24

#### List of Abbreviations
- Page 25-27

#### Budget Information
- Federal Budget
- Line-by-Line Budget
- Budget Explanations
- In-kind Contributions

#### Project Abstract
- Page 42-43

#### Teacher Centers Policy Board (TCPB)
- Composition of TCPB
- Role of TCPB
- By-laws of the TCPB
- Local Advisory Committee
- Documentation Concerning TCPB Members and Planning of Proposal
- Educational Activities of the UFT
- TCPB Budget
- Minutes and Agenda of Final TCPB Meeting

#### Needs Assessment
- Student Needs
- Teacher Needs

#### Project Overview
- Page 132-143

#### Objectives - Activities - Evaluation
- Component #1: After-School Workshops
- Component #2: Clearinghouse Resource Center
- Component #3: Individualized Professional Development

#### Schedule of Implementation
- Page 191-193

#### Potential to Impact Upon and Improve the LEA's Program of Inservice Training for Teachers
- Page 194-205

#### Data Collection/Evaluation Plan
- Page 207-222

#### Qualifications and Experience of Personnel
- Page 223-230

#### Site, Scope and Duration of the Project
- Page 231-233

#### Facilities and Resources
- Page 234-235

#### Nature of New and Expanded Activities
- Page 237-239

#### Cost in Relation to Anticipated Results
- Page 240-242

#### Preliminary Plans for Second and Third Years of Project
- Page 243-245

#### Exhibits
- Page 246-349

*This example is used as model because it is all inclusive. We recommend less than 200 pages.*
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### EXHIBIT 38 - APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix I</td>
<td>Letters of Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix II</td>
<td>Minutes of Policy Board Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix III</td>
<td>Agreement Between Board of Education of the Municipal School District Number One and Classroom Teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix IV</td>
<td>Letters of Certification, Policy Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix V</td>
<td>Needs Assessment Supporting Data, Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix VI</td>
<td>Public Schools Needs Assessment Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix VII</td>
<td>Governor's People's Forum on Education Needs Assessment Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix VIII</td>
<td>Public Schools, Educational Philosophy, Goals, and Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix IX</td>
<td>Teachers' Needs Assessment, Target Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix X</td>
<td>Fuller Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XI</td>
<td>Statement of Impact, Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XII</td>
<td>Personnel Policies on Hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XIII</td>
<td>Evaluation, Teacher Response Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XIV</td>
<td>Supply Budget Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XV</td>
<td>Salary Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XVI</td>
<td>Mileage and Per Diem Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XVII</td>
<td>Cost of Employee Fringe Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XVIII</td>
<td>Vitas: Applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix XIX</td>
<td>Assurances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DO INCLUDE CHARTS, TABLES, GRAPHS
support needs assessment and to explain the
geographic location of the area

EXHIBIT 39 : TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ranking of Enrollment of School Systems</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Enrollment of 10,000 and More, Fall 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Enrollment in Public Schools,</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Level and Ethnic Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Enrollment in Nonpublic Schools, by Grade and Ethnic Background</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enrollment in Full-Time Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, by Level</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and by State: Fall 1975 and Fall 1976.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enrollment of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: Fall 1975</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pupils Reading Achievement Levels Citywide by Grade, 1977</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pupil Reading Achievement Levels Citywide, by Grade, 1976</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community School District in</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pupil Reading Achievement Levels, by District, 1977</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How to Improve the Public Schools: Public Opinion</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. National Assessment of Educational Progress for Age 9, by Subject and</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Selected Characteristics of Participants: United States, 1968-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. National Assessment of Educational Progress in Reading for Ages 9, 13, and 17</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Selected Characteristics of Participants: United States, 1970-71 and 1974-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students Participating in Bilingual Programs (All Districts, All Language</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Selected Felony Arrests in New York City, by Type and Age, 1976.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Problems Facing the Public Schools: Public Opinion</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supply and Demand for Beginning Teachers</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a. Classroom Teachers in Regular Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, by</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control and Organizational Level: United States, Fall 1965 to 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b. Classroom Teachers in Regular Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, by</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control and Organizational Level: United States, Fall 1965 to 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 39 (CONT.)

19. Degree Status of Classroom Teachers in School
20. Years of Experience of Teachers
21. Age Distribution of Teachers in School
22. Elementary and Secondary School Staff, by Sex
23. Status of Compensatory-Based Teacher Education
24. Teacher Needs in Terms of Proposed Teacher Center Services
25. Teacher Needs in Specific Areas
26. Teacher Needs Concerning Approaches to Inservice Education
27. Teacher Needs in Specific Areas at Proposed Elementary School Sites
28. Teacher Needs Concerning Approaches to Inservice Education at Proposed Elementary School Sites
29. Teacher Needs in Specific Areas at Proposed Junior High and High School Sites
30. Teacher Needs Concerning Approaches to Inservice Education at Proposed Junior High and High School Sites

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>School Board Resolution and Approval for LEA Members on Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Survey of Teacher Center Needs for UFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Survey of Teacher Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Preliminary Concept Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>UFT Testimony on Teacher Centers Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Memorandum from UFT to Chapter Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>LEA’s Inservice Courses for School Year 1977-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Letters to Local Districts and Non-public School Representatives Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Proposed Project Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DO INVENT AN INDEX—SYSTEM

Divide sections of the proposal so that there is easy identification of each.

Some successful proposals used:
- index tabs for reference
- carefully labeled sections
- different type to set off important statements

Use a cross-index system for easy reference. All information on criteria components can be identified quickly.

EXHIBIT 40

Table of Contents for USOE Evaluation Criteria (197.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Pages in Handbook Which Address Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The extent of the teacher center policy board's authority and responsibility for supervision of the project (10 points).</td>
<td>12, 16, 44-81, 135 and Exhibit 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The potential of the proposed teacher center for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students (20 points).</td>
<td>82-121, 123, 138-143 and Exhibit 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| c. The soundness of the proposed plan of operation, including consideration of the extent to which—\n  1. The objectives of the proposed project are sharply defined, clearly stated, and capable of being attained by the proposed procedures (10 points); and  
  2. The adequacy of provisions for reporting of the effectiveness of the project and dissemination of its results, and for determining the extent to which the objectives are accomplished (10 points). | 138-193, 207-222 and Exhibits 62 & 6       |
| d. The appropriateness of size, scope, and duration of the project so as to secure productive results (5 points). | 138-145, 191-193, 231-233 243-245         |
| e. The adequacy of qualifications and experience of personnel designated to carry out the proposed project (5 points). | 223-230 and Exhibit 69                    |
| f. The adequacy of the facilities and resources (5 points). | 39-41, 234-236                           |
| g. The reasonableness of estimated cost in relation to anticipated results, including the proportion of the budget represented by costs for released time or substitutes (5 points). | 20-41, 138-145, 240-242                   |
| h. The potential of the teacher center to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall program of inservice training for teachers (15 points). | 135, 194-206, 237-239 and Exhibit 87      |
| i. The representativeness of the teacher center policy board under sec. 197.4(h) (10 points). | 12-16, 44-81, 135 and Exhibits 41, 6 & 8  |
| j. The extent to which Federal funds will support new or expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources (5 points). | 194-206, 237-239 and Exhibit 87           |
EXHIBIT 41: GEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Describe the area served; provides an environmental setting for the project.

1. Initial Service Region (1978-79)
   - County: 874 teachers
2. Phase II: Service Region (1979-80)
   - County: 506 teachers
   - County: 672 teachers
3. Phase III: Service Region (1980-81)
   - County: 626 teachers
   - County: 309 teachers

Initial Service Region Data
1. Population - 100,500
2. School population (participants - 14,327
3. Number of participating school buildings - 38
4. Number of cities or villages - 26
5. Villages less than 1,500 population - 20
6. Villages less than 1,000 population - 14
7. Largest city in county - 24,670
DO EXPLAIN ABBREVIATIONS USED

It is important to explain abbreviations and acronyms used in the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>American Federation of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Congressional District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFDA</td>
<td>Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>Community School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAA</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA</td>
<td>Elementary Secondary Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHE</td>
<td>Institution of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Local Education Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO</td>
<td>Nonprofit Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Nonpublic School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE or USOE</td>
<td>Office of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; D</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD-3</td>
<td>United States Office of Education Teacher Center Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1832 M Street, N.W., Suite 819, Washington, D.C., 20036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(202) 653-5839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>State Education Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Teacher Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPB</td>
<td>Teacher Centers Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USOE</td>
<td>United States Office of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DO INCLUDE DOCUMENTATION

...this will validate project events as well as support from educational and community leaders.

include letters of endorsement from federation president, administrators (LEA and IHE) as well as any from community leaders and business.

EXHIBIT 43

City of

March 17, 1970

Dr.
Department of Research and Development
Public Schools
230 East Ninth Street

Dear Dr.,

We are pleased to learn of your joint efforts with the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers in applying for funds to develop a teacher training center. There is a great need for such a training facility in Cincinnati.

We are in full support of your application, and our Education Division is looking forward to working with you in the area of training school personnel.

If we can be of further assistance in developing the teacher training center, please feel free to contact us at your convenience.

Good luck in submitting your proposal.

Sincerely,

Executive Director

Equal Opportunity Employer
DO BIND THE DOCUMENT PROPERLY
for copies submitted to USOE
- punch holes at top of proposal
- use a 2½ inch metal clip to securely bind the proposal

DON'T EXPECT THE DOCUMENT TO STAY TOGETHER IF YOU USE:
- staples
  or
- rubber bands
  or
- paper clips

IMPORTANT SECTIONS CAN BE MISPLACED AND VALUABLE POINTS LOST IN THE EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSAL.

MAKE SURE THE PROPOSAL LOOKS GOOD!
DO USE FUNDING TERMS
and demonstrate an understanding of their meaning

FUNDING TERMS

- Section 532 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as enacted by Public Law 94-482.

- The Congressional action of setting aside funds earmarked for a particular federal agency or program to spend or lend. Appropriations made up the "budget authority." The actual expenditure does not have to be made in the fiscal year the money is appropriated, but USOE must make the grant during that year.

- Basic substantive legislation (as opposed to appropriations) enacted by Congress which sets up a federal program or agency either indefinitely or for a given period of time. Such legislation sometimes sets limits on the amount that can subsequently be appropriated, but does not usually provide budget authority.

- Refers to standard printed sections, paragraphs, or pages that have repeated use and application in various contracts or proposals. Boilerplate includes resumes, institutional descriptions, etc.

- The period of time (within the project period) covered by a specified budget. The budget period is generally 36 months, but may be more or less if appropriate to the project. The beginning and ending dates of the Budget Period are found on the Grant Award.

- Project money that is allocated on the basis of both the type and extent of benefit to be derived from the project. Generally, categorical funds are awarded for specific types of activity and/or in response to specific priorities of the sponsor.

- An interim stop-gap measure passed by Congress at the end of each fiscal year to continue the flow of money to programs whose regular appropriation bills have not been funded.
FUNDBUNG TERMS (continued)

CRITERION REFERENCED TEST
- A criterion referenced test is one that is deliberately constructed to yield measurements that are directly interpretable in terms of specified performance standards: mastery of a specific skill or detailed learning objective.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES
- The designing, acquiring, disseminating and integrating of learning materials associated with technology and the new media.

ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS
- In addition to teachers, as defined in Section 197.2, the persons to be served by the teacher center may be determined by the teacher center policy board to include paraprofessionals, teacher aides, preschool teachers, teachers of adults below the college level, counselors, principals, other administrators, supervisors, curriculum specialists, librarians, media specialists, elementary and secondary school students, the parents of elementary and secondary school students, substitute teachers, part-time teachers, teachers who are unemployed or former teachers employed in other capacities who intend to return to teaching, and intern teachers assigned to teach in a school where the teachers are being served by a teacher center assisted under the Act (Teacher Center Regulations).

EQUIPMENT
- A movable or fixed unit of furniture or furnishings, an instrument, a machine, an apparatus, or a set of articles which meets all of the following conditions: (1) it retains its original shape and appearance with use; (2) it is nonexpendable, that is, if the article is damaged or some of its parts are lost or worn out and costs more than $300, it is usually more feasible to repair it rather than replace it with an entirely new unit; (3) it represents an investment of money which makes it feasible and advisable to capitalize the item; (4) it does not lose its identity through incorporation into a different or more complex unit or substance.

EXEMPLARY
- Exemplary as applied to an educational program, project, service, or activity, means one designed to serve as a model for a regular school program.
FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Refers to evaluation that is conducted during the operation of a program for the express purpose of providing evaluative information to program directors for their use in improving the program.

GOAL

A broad, general statement setting a sense of direction from which objectives and tasks can be developed.

GUIDANCE

Those activities which have as their purpose helping pupils assess and understand their abilities, aptitudes, interests, environmental factors and educational needs. Also included are activities which assist pupils in increasing their understanding of educational and career opportunities through the formulation of realistic goals. These activities include counseling pupils and parents, evaluating the abilities of pupils, assisting pupils to make their own educational and career plans and choices, assisting pupils in personal and social adjustment, and working with other staff members in planning and conducting guidance programs.

IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION

Goods or services having monetary value made available to the project as a contribution. If your organization makes a mobile van available for use in a project, it makes an in-kind contribution. If your organization puts up money to buy the van, the contribution is a cash contribution and not an in-kind contribution.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

A public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administration control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school (Teacher Center Regulations).
The lack of something which, according to the best information available, is necessary for the self-actualization of individuals for the improvement of the quality of life in the community.

A nonprofit elementary or secondary school operated or controlled by other than a public authority, and which is licensed or approved by the State in which it is located or attendance at which satisfies applicable State compulsory school attendance laws (Teacher Center Regulations.)

An objective achievement test intended to provide valid discrimination among students of all levels of achievement. This test shows the relationship of the student to a specified population.

The official document that notifies the grantee of the award of a grant.

A description of what you are willing to be accountable for as a result of spending the sponsor's funds.

Direct, nonprofessional staff support services to licensed or certified education. This may be instructional or non-instructional.

Money allocated to an LEA for a period of one year. Projects are not competitive at the end of that time but will receive full funding for project upon approval of project evaluation. At the end of the first year the proposal must also meet criteria (Teacher Center Regulations 197.11.)

The general organization and administration of related educational projects designed to improve coordinated aspects of education consisting of components, activities and objectives.

The total time for which support of a project have been programmatically approved. A project period may consist of one or more budget periods. The total project period comprises the original project period and any extensions thereof.
FUNDING TERMS (continued)

SITE
- The location or locations where the curriculum development and training activities of the teacher center take place.

SPECIAL EDUCATION
- The education of pupils (e.g., the deaf, the blind and partially seeing, the mentally subnormal, the gifted) who deviate so far physically, mentally, emotionally, or socially from the relatively homogeneous groups or so-called "normal" pupils that the standard curriculum is not suitable for their educational needs. Such projects involve the modification of the standard curriculum in contact, methods of instruction, and expected rate of progress to provide optimum educational opportunity for such pupils.

STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY
- The State Board of Education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION
- Refers to evaluation conducted at the end of a program for the express purpose of judging the worth or effectiveness of that program for potential users for whom it has been developed.

SUPERVISION
- The setting of policy and any appropriate managerial or supervisory activities not prohibited by State or local law (e.g., the employment of operating staff, consultants or expert, budgeting and expenditure of funds, and the formulation of recommendations for subcontracting to secure technical and other kinds of assistance (Teacher Center Regulations.)

SUPPLANTING
- A procedure whereby an applicant shifts the burden of support for some type of a required, customary, or desirable activity to an agency. Supplanting by a recipient agency is frowned upon or legally restricted by most sponsors, but it is difficult to prove. If you get a grant to do X, but you would have done X anyway, and then you go ahead and do something else with the money you were originally going to spend doing X, then you are supplanting (Teacher Center Regulations.)

TEACHER
- A regular, full-time classroom teacher engaged in teaching elementary or secondary school students, including a special education or vocational education teacher (Teacher Center Regulations.)
Some Potential Turn-offs in Funding Teacher Centers Proposals

The special educational needs of the students of the teachers to be served by the TC are not substantially documented.

The TCPB is neither representative of the teachers to be served by the program nor composed as required by Regulation.

The application was not approved by the TCPB or the SEA.

The program meets neither the purpose of the legislation nor the criteria of the regulations.

The proposal is sloppy/illegible/vague/unclear/pompous/unrealistic/frivolous....

The applicant lacks the capacity to administer the program.

The budget has too many unjustified, miscellaneous or "contingency" items.

It appears that the proposal was written for the sake of a grant, not the TC program.

The program appears to have been sculpted to fit the budget.

The proposal suggests that the funding source owes the applicant a grant.

The proposal packaging is too glossy...or it is not glossy enough.

The proposal looks like a reworked proposal from another funding source.

"We wanted to fund it, but we ran out of money. Try again next year."

The project is too gimmicky/unimaginative.

The budget is excessive; or, the budget is too limited to achieve the objectives.

The project involves supplanting.

The idea is good but the proposal is poorly written.

The application does not reflect the collaborative planning required for the development of a TC program.

Try a little harder.

( ) Approved  (x) Not Approved
For further information on proposal writing, refer to the following references:


Hill, William. Grant Writing Made Easy. Grant Development Institute, 2140 South Holly, Denver, Colorado, 80222. (1973) $3.50

DON'T BE PROVINCIAL. THIS IS A NATIONAL COMPETITION....
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS TO BE CHECKED/COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the composition of the Teacher Center Policy Board include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a majority of teachers representative of all the teachers in the area to be served, including teachers involved in special and vocational education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- two or more persons representative of, or designated by, the school board(s) of the LEA(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- at least one representative designated by IHE(s) in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the majority of TCPB representative of all the teachers in the area to be served, including nonpublic school teachers, where applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have the teacher members composing the majority of the TCPB been selected by one of the options outlined in Sec. 197.4 (b) (1) (ii) (A-F) in the Regulations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If the application proposes a multi-year project (up to 3 years), does the proposal include an explanation of the need for multi-year support, an overview of the objectives and activities proposed, and budget estimates to achieve the objectives in subsequent years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are all costs listed in the proposal budget allowable? (See Sec. 197.8(a)(1-6) of the Regulations.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposal budget free of costs for construction/remodeling of facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS TO BE CHECKED/COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the proposal designate the specific area, LEA(s), schools (public and nonpublic) to be served by the TC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the proposal include documentation concerning the membership and method of selection of the TCPB?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal include documentation that the TCPB has participated fully in the preparation of the application and has approved it, as submitted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the proposal include appropriate statements concerning the participation of nonpublic school teachers, as per Sec. 197.9(a)(3) of the Regulations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has a one-page abstract of the proposed project been included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the proposal include a statement on the special educational needs of the students to be served by teachers participating in the TC, and an explanation on how those needs were determined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If the proposal concerns the operation of an existing TC, does the application contain information outlined in Sec. 197.9(b)(1-3) of the Regulations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has the proposal been submitted for approval to the SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have five (5) copies been submitted to the SEA on or before March 30, 1978, or postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service on March 27, 1978 or earlier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS TO BE CHECKED/COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Has the SEA set its own criteria for its review of TC proposals? If so, does the proposal respond to these criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Does the proposal address each evaluation criterion included in Sec. 197.11 of the Regulations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Does the proposal describe the extent of the TCPB's authority and responsibility for supervision of the project? (10 points)
- Does the proposed TC have the potential for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students? (20 points)
- Does the proposal contain sound objectives, which are sharply defined, clearly stated, and capable of being attained by the proposed procedures? (10 points)
- Does the proposal provide a plan of operation for reporting on the effectiveness of the project; dissemination of its results; and, determining the extent to which the objectives are accomplished? (10 points)
- Is the project of appropriate size, scope, and duration in order to insure productive results? (5 points)
- Are the qualifications and experience of personnel designated to carry out the project adequate? (5 points)
- Are the facilities and resources described in the proposal adequate for the project? (5 points)
- Is the cost of the proposal budget reasonable in relation to anticipated results, including the proportion of the budget represented by costs for released time or substitutes? (5 points)
# Checklist for Teacher Centers Proposal Development

## Items to be Checked/Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the TC have the potential to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall program of inservice training for teachers? (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the TCPB adequately representative under Sec. 197.4(b) of the regulations? (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal explain the extent to which Federal funds will support new expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources? (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the LEA application is for a planning grant, does the proposal budget fall within $10,000 to $25,000?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the application is for an operational grant, does the proposal budget fall within $50,000 to $250,000?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the following application forms been completed (and signed, where required) as per the instructions found on pp. 81 - 84 of the application package:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cover Page (p. B5); Project Approval Information (p. B9); Budget Information (pp. B10 - B11)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has all required additional information been attached to the above mentioned forms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the following assurance forms been completed and signed as per the instructions which precede each of the following forms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assurance for Title VI (p. C6); Assurance for Title IX (pp. C11 - C14); Protection of Human Subjects (p. C15); Assurance for Section 504 (p. C17)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPPORTING WITH PROJECT RESOURCES
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AFT TEACHER CENTER ADVISORY GROUP

Zita J. Areman, President
Great Neck Teachers Association
Local #2686
345 Lakesville Road, Phipps Annex
Great Neck, New York 11020
516/829-9070

Myna Cooper, Director
New York City Teacher Centers Consortium
City University of New York
Room 1206
33 West 42 Street
New York, New York 10036
212/921-0202 or 921-0203

Rod Davis
FSEA/United
208 West Pensacola Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/224-1161

Thomas Feeley
Chicago Teachers Union
201 North Wells Street, #1342
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312/346-1828

Nancy Kleinintop, President
Rush-Henrietta Education Association
688 Eastbrooke Lane
Rochester, New York 14618
716/334-5440 Ext. 203

Julia Koppich
San Francisco Federation of Teachers
655 - 14th Street
San Francisco, California 94114
415/621-4438

Francis M. Martin
Executive Secretary Treasurer
Massachusetts Federation of Teachers
114 Western Avenue
Lynn, Massachusetts 01905
781-99-6800

David Masirow
Portland Federation of Teachers
2136 N.E. 20 Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97212
503/223-1198

Earline Rogers
Gary Teachers Union
1301 Virginia Street
Gary, Indiana 46407
219/886-7320 (Office)
219/949-7578 (Home)

Jack Steinberg
Philadelphia Federation of Teachers
1816 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
215/561-2722

Margaret Tuovilla
Detroit Federation of Teachers
7451 Third Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202
313/875-3590

Jacqueline Vaughn
Chicago Teachers Union
AFT Vice President
201 North Wells Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312/346-1823

Lynwood Williamson
Vice President
Washington D.C. Teachers Union
1675 Myrtle Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20012
202/452-8129
AFT TEACHER CENTER RESOURCE EXCHANGE
STATE NETWORK

AZ Geri Clifford
Scottsdale Federation of Teachers, #1719
8344 E. Cheery Lynn
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
602/949-6470

CA Julia Koppich
San Francisco Federation of Teachers, #61
655 - 14th Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
415/621-4438

CO Edna Tourtelot
Englewood Federation of Teachers, #1920
2791 South Ogden Street
Englewood, CO 80110
303/789-1121 or 744-7026

CT Barbara Y. Doyle
Bristol Federation of Teachers, #1464
90 Jewel Street
Bristol, CT 06010
203/583-3472

DE Kenneth S. Garner.
New Castle County Federation of Teachers, #762
3708 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19802
302/762-5295

FL Phil Larson
Alachua County Education Association, #3749
2004 N.W. 36th Terrace
Gainesville, FL 32605
904/372-7405

GA Edith Knowlton
Atlanta Federation of Teachers, #1565
115 Dogwood Drive, S.W.
Apt. 27
Atlanta, GA 30311
404/696-1499

HI Al Southard, President
Hawaii Federation of Teachers, #1127
547 Halekauwila Street, #217
Honolulu, HI 96813
808/523-1634

IL Irene Hackett
Venice Fed. of Tgs., #965
700 Broadway
Venice, IL 62040
618/876-7088

KY John Schmidt
Louisville & Jefferson County Federation, #672
200 Fenley Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206
502/637-3982

LA Brenda Pickett
United Teachers of New Orleans, #527
3127 Milan Street
New Orleans, LA 70125
504/895-2466

MD Barbara F. Jackson
Baltimore Teachers Union
#340
3105 Goodnow Road
Baltimore, MD 21206
301/396-9172 or 325-1665

* Network roster will be updated as additional names are made available from states not listed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Joan A. Buckley</td>
<td>Massachusetts Federation of Teachers, #66 114 Western Avenue Lynn, MA 01904</td>
<td>617/599-6800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Theresa Lorio</td>
<td>Center for Professional Growth and Development Wayne State University Detroit, MI 48202</td>
<td>313/577-1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Jim McDermott</td>
<td>Minnesota Federation of Teachers 175 Aurora St. Paul, MN 55103</td>
<td>612/227-8595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maryann L. Graczyk</td>
<td>Harrison County Federation of Teachers, #3261 Rt. 6 - Box 138-37 Biloxi, MS 39532</td>
<td>601/432-7834 or 435-3039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Winona D. Oakes</td>
<td>St. Louis Teachers Union #420 5475 Cabanne Avenue, #402 St. Louis, MO 63112</td>
<td>314/231-0820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>JoAnn Harutunian</td>
<td>Albuquerque Teachers Federation, #1420 3305 Bismarck, N.E. Albuquerque, NM 87111</td>
<td>505/255-4680 or 298-2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Roslyn Herman</td>
<td>New York State United Teachers 80 Wolf Road Albany, NY 12205</td>
<td>518/459-5400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Wendell E. Eysenbach</td>
<td>Forsyth Federation of Teachers, #2363 2309 Lyndhurst Avenue Winston-Salem, NC 27103</td>
<td>919/727-2859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Louise A. Dompier</td>
<td>Oregon City Federation of Teachers, #1080 6815 Seaman Road Oregon, OH 43618</td>
<td>419/836-6111 or 836-6982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Brenda K. Martin</td>
<td>Oklahoma City Federation of Teachers, #2309 611 North Western Avenue Oklahoma City, OK 73106</td>
<td>405/236-1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>David S. Mesirow</td>
<td>Portland Federation of Teachers, #111 136 N.E. 20th Avenue Portland, OR 97212</td>
<td>503/287-7496 or 288-7211, Ext. 63/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Jack Steinberg</td>
<td>Philadelphia Federation of Teachers, #3 1816 Chestnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19103</td>
<td>215/561-2722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Marcia B. Reback</td>
<td>Providence Teachers Union, #958 199 Academy Avenue Providence, RI 02908</td>
<td>401/421-4014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>John Cevasco</td>
<td>Charleston Federation of Teachers, #2434 17-1/2 Chalmers Charleston, SC 29401</td>
<td>803-722-4908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Marsha Sharp</td>
<td>Austin Federation of Teachers, #2048 7303 Woodhollow, #206 Austin, TX 78731</td>
<td>512/827-6810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Celia Houghton</td>
<td>Goddard College Staff Federation of Teachers, #327 P.O. Box 164 Plainfield, VT 05667</td>
<td>802/454-7336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WA  Jerry Salstrom  
    Washington Federation of Teachers  
    1322 Harding Road  
    Aberdeen, WA 98520  
    206/533-0904

WI  Terri M. Cahill  
    Superior Federation of Teachers, #282  
    3218 North 21st Street  
    Superior, WI 54880  
    715/392-8945

GU  Conrad Stinson  
    Guam Federation of Teachers, #1581  
    Box 2301  
    Agana, GU 96910  
    472-8449

VI  Barbara Isaac  
    St. Thomas-St. John  
    Federation of Teachers, #1825  
    P.O. Box 573  
    St. Thomas, VI 00801  
    809/774-5969

ID  Barbara Byrne  
    Pocatello Teachers Guild, #1087  
    1040 Wingate  
    Pocatello, ID 83201  
    208/237-7357
WASHINGTON, D.C.

U.S. Office of Education:
Teacher Center Program
W. Thomas Carter...202/653-5839
Allen Schmieder
Saundra Freeman
Laverna Washington
Bruce Garder
Reginald Pierman

STATE COORDINATORS: NATIONAL TEACHER CENTER PROGRAM

AL MONTGOMERY
William C. Barryman
Director, Division of
Instruction
205/832-3400

AK JUNEAU
Marilou Madden
Director, Division of
Educational Support
907/465-2830

AZ PHOENIX
Thomas R. Reno
Associate Superintendent
602/271-4363

AR LITTLE ROCK
Austin Z. Hanner
Coordinator of Teacher
Education Certification
501/371-1474

CA SACRAMENTO
William E. Webster
Coordinator, Department
of Education
916/322-5588

CO DENVER
Arvin C. Blome
Executive Assistant,
Federal Relations
303/892-2212

CT HARTFORD
Roberta Howells
Consultant for Physical
Education
203/566-3873

DE DOVER
Ervin C. Marsh
State Director of Certifi-
cation and Personnel
302/678-4601

DC WASHINGTON
Joan Brown
Special Assistant for Compe-
tency-Based Curriculum
207/722-4222

FL TALLAHASSEE
James Parris
Associate for Teacher
Education
904/488-0642

GA ATLANTA
Roberta Christian
Consultant, Teacher Edu-
cation
404/656-2431

HI HONOLULU
Mitsugi Nakashima
State Department of Edu-
cation
808/548-6583

ID BOISE
Miles D. Williams
State Department of Edu-
cation
208/384-3475

IL SPRINGFIELD
Arnette Rauschel
Education Consultant, Teacher
Centers, Planning and Devel-
opment
217/782-0359
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Coordinator Name</th>
<th>Title and Department</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Ronald A. Boyd</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent</td>
<td>317/833-4762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Donald Cox</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent - Instructional and Professional Education</td>
<td>515/281-5609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Mary Martin</td>
<td>Program Specialist</td>
<td>913/296-3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Taylor Hollin</td>
<td>Assistant Bureau Head, Bureau of Education</td>
<td>502/564-3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Pamela Cox</td>
<td>Coordinator, State Department of Education</td>
<td>504-389-2471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Daryl Hahn</td>
<td>State Department of Educational and Cultural Services</td>
<td>207/289-2321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Richard McKay</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>301/796-8300 (x320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>James Case</td>
<td>Director, Bureau of Certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Paula Bricenton</td>
<td>Director, Office of Professional Development</td>
<td>517/373-3608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Patricia J. Coralski</td>
<td>Specialist, Division of Special Services</td>
<td>612/296-1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Bob McCard</td>
<td>Assistant State Superintendent of Education</td>
<td>601/354-7011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Richard King</td>
<td>Staff Coordinator of Curriculum Services</td>
<td>314/751-2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>John Voorhis</td>
<td>Manager, Teacher Education &amp; Certification</td>
<td>406/449-3150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Sharon M. Meyer</td>
<td>Consultant, School Management Services</td>
<td>402/471-2295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Edward H. Howard</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Educational Accountability</td>
<td>702/885-5700 (x245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>George Lewis</td>
<td>Consultant, Commissioner's Office</td>
<td>603/271-3144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Maryann C. Peifly</td>
<td>Assistant Deputy Commissioner of Education</td>
<td>609/292-4452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE COORDINATORS: NATIONAL TEACHER CENTER PROGRAM. (CONTINUED)

NM SANTA FE
Jim Pierce
Department of Public Instruction
505/827-2282

NY ALBANY
Vincenzo Gazzetta
Director, Division of Teacher Education & Certification
518/474-5844

NC RALEIGH
Earle Harper
Division of Staff Development
919/733-3813

ND BISMARCK
Lowell Jensen
Deputy State Superintendent
703/224-2262

OH COLUMBUS
William Phillips
Division of Education Redesign and Renewal
614/466-2979

OK OKLAHOMA
Stan Cobb
Administrator, Teacher Education Section
405/521-3607

OR SALEM
Ray Talbert
Specialist, Grants Management
503/378-8004

PA HARRISBURG
Randall S. Bauer
Regional In-Service Coordinator
717/783-1830

PR RATO REY
Iris Vazquez de Burnat
Assistant Secretary for Planning and Development
809/765-3493

RI PROVIDENCE
Edward L. Dambruch
Department of Education
401/277-2675

SC COLUMBIA
Albert H. Dorsey
Supervisor of Teacher Education
803/758-3291

SD PIERRE
James O. Hansen
Assistant Superintendent of Instructional Services
605/224-3315

TN NASHVILLE
Joe Minor
Chief of Curriculum Services Section
615/741-2265

TX AUSTIN
James Kidd
Division of Teacher Education
512/475-3271

UT SALT LAKE CITY
LaMar Allred
Coordinator, In-Service Staff Development
801/533-5431

VT MONTPELIER
Henry S. Bissex
Assistant Director, Teacher & Continuing Education
802/828-3131

VA RICHMOND
Everette B. Howerton, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent Administrative Field Services
804/786-2612
STATE COORDINATORS: NATIONAL TEACHER CENTER PROGRAM (CONTINUED)

WA OLYMPIA
Lillian Cady
Director, Professional Education & Certification
206/753-1031

WI MADISON
Robert Skeway
Supervisor, In-Service Staff Development
608/266-3803

WY CHEYENNE
Robert G. Schrader
Superintendent of Public Instruction
307/777-7673

SAMOA, AMERICAN
Joe Oakey
Department of Education
633-5673
PROGRAMS WITH COMPONENTS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL*

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Rm 2049
Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. James Spillane
202/245-7292

ARTS EDUCATION PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
Donohoe Building, Rm. 3728
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. Harold Arberg
202/245-8912

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Title VII
United States Office of Education
Reports Building Rm. 420
300 Seventh Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Dr. John Molina
202/245-0861

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
7th & Streets, S.W. Rm. 3108A
Washington, D.C. 20201
Dr. Sidney High
202/245-2331

CONSUMER EDUCATION PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20201
Dr. Dustin Wilson
202/245-0636

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED.
Jasper Harvey
Director of Educational Personnel Development Branch
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
400 6th Street, S.W. Rm 4805
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/245-9886

Global Perspectives Program, USOE
7th & Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. Robert Leestman
OE Associate Commissioner for Institutional Development and International Education

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Rm. 2009
Washington, D.C. 20202
Jesse Jordan, Chief
202/245-2465

METRIC EDUCATION PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
7th & D Streets, S.W. Room 5620
Washington, D.C. 20201
Dr. Floyd David
202/245-3354

RIGHT TO READ PROGRAMS
United States Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Rm. 2131
Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. Gil Schiffman
202/245-7950

TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
Donohoe Building, Rm. 1700
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. Preston M. Royster
Dr. William Smith
202/245-0355

Vocational Education Personnel Development

* Reference: Dr. William L. Smith Chairperson; Dr. C. Emily Feistritger, Coordinator, Analysis of U.S.O.E. Discretionary Programs, Having a Professional Development of Educational Personnel Component, National Teacher Development Initiative, May, 1978.
OTHER FUNDING SOURCES

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT PROGRAMS
United States Office of Education
Donohoe Building
Room 2011, ROB #3
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
212/245-8230

COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
7th & D Streets, S.W. Room 5622
Washington, D.C. 20201
Dr. Paul Tremper
202/245-0656

Energy Education
Wilton Anderson
Director, Energy Education Program
Reporter's Building, Rm. 514
7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202/472-3730

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Rm. 2025
Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. Walter Bogen
202/245-9231

ETHNIC HERITAGE PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
7th & D Streets, S.W. 3928
Washington, D.C. 20201
Dr. Stan Wilson, Acting Chief
202/245-2293

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM
United States Office of Education
Donohoe Bldg., Rm. 3835 ROB #3
Washington, D.C. 20202
Dr. Dorothy Sisk
202/245-2482
Federal Funds

Guide to OE-Administered Programs, Fiscal Year 1978

The federal government is a major source of financial support and technical assistance to the nation's schools and colleges, chiefly through the U.S. Office of Education (OE). As a major component of the Education Division of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE administers programs covering virtually every level and aspect of education. These programs, and the fiscal year 1978 funds appropriated by Congress in support of them, are listed on the following pages.

For easy reference, the programs are presented in categories or groupings that indicate whether they serve individuals or institutions, and the nature of their support—for example, research or construction. Since the several phases of one program or activity may serve more than one category, a given program may be listed more than once.

GROUP I: TO INSTITUTIONS, AGENCIES, AND ORGANIZATIONS

PART A—For Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE</th>
<th>AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION</th>
<th>APPROPRIATION ($)</th>
<th>WHO MAY APPLY</th>
<th>WHERE TO APPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arts in Education Program (18.694)</td>
<td>Education Amendments of 1974, Special Projects Act, Sec. 409</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>State and local education agencies</td>
<td>OE Arts and Humanities State Office of the Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bilingual education basic programs (18.695)</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title VII (includes in-service training components)</td>
<td>3,975,000</td>
<td>Local education agencies, institutions of higher education applying jointly with one or more LEAs</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Office of Bilingual Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bilingual education support services (18.696)</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title VII (as amended by P.L. 93-365)</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
<td>Local education agencies, institutions of higher education applying jointly with one or more LEAs; state education agencies may apply only to operate training resource centers</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Office of Bilingual Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community education program (18.697)</td>
<td>Education Amendments of 1974, Special Projects Act, Sec. 405</td>
<td>3,553,000</td>
<td>State and local education agencies, institutions of higher education</td>
<td>OE Division of State Educational Assistance Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educational innovation and support (18.698)</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-C</td>
<td>177,750,000</td>
<td>State education agencies</td>
<td>OE Division of State Educational Assistance Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Educationally-deprived children (18.699)</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I</td>
<td>1,926,726,832</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
<td>State education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Educationally-deprived children—urban (18.680)</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Sec. 122</td>
<td>145,759,940</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
<td>State education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Educationally-deprived children in rural-state-administered institutions serving neglected and delinquent children (18.681)</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Sec. 123</td>
<td>29,821,338</td>
<td>Eligible state agencies</td>
<td>State education agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal year 1978 funds which have been appropriated to OE currently total almost $9.3 billion. The OE total excludes programs administered by the Assistant Secretary for Education and the National Institute of Education, the other components of the HEW Education Division.


Compiled by GWENDOLYN D. SMITH OE Office of Public Affairs staff

Education, March 1978
### PART B—Strengthening Organizational Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Purpose of Assistance</th>
<th>Authorizing Legislation</th>
<th>Appropriation ($)</th>
<th>Who May Apply</th>
<th>Where to Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82. Alcohol and drug abuse prevention programs (18.428) To organize and train alcohol and drug</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>Public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (Information from OE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Elementary education institutional assistance programs (18.428) To provide technical</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>4,375,000</td>
<td>Qualifying state education agencies</td>
<td>Office of Bilingual Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Indian education—special programs and projects (18.486) To provide special elementary</td>
<td>Community Services Act</td>
<td>14,400,000</td>
<td>Nonlocal education agencies</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (Information from OE Office of Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Higher Through (18.4.06) To extend into primary, junior high, and college preparatory</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>Local school districts</td>
<td>Education (Information from OE Office of Indian Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Indian education (18.4.01) To encourage greater state and local expenditures for</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>34,965,000</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (Information from OE Office of Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Statewide education (18.4.01) To encourage education agencies to prepare for the</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>9,065,000</td>
<td>Nonlocal education agency schools on or near reservations, LEAs other than</td>
<td>Education (Information from OE Office of Indian Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Teacher centers (18.4.10) To provide federal assistance for planning and operating</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>8,250,000</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (Information from OE Office of Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Women's educational equity (18.4.08) To support development and implementation of</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>8,085,000</td>
<td>Public agencies, private nonprofit organizations, and individuals</td>
<td>Education (Information from OE Office of Indian Education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriation ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,690,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,593,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,965,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,965,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,085,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION</td>
<td>APPROPRIATION ($)</td>
<td>WHO MAY APPLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Educational television facilities (18-215). To aid in the establishment and improvement of educational television facilities and educational radio and TV centers.</td>
<td>Communications Act of 1964, Part IV, Title III</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>Public education agencies, state TV or radio stations, public or nonprofit higher education institutions, nonprofit educational agencies or municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Educational television and radio (18-224). To aid in the establishment and improvement of educational radio and TV centers.</td>
<td>Education Amendments of 1976, Special Projects Act, Sec. 409</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>Public and private agencies, corporations, associations, institutions, and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Environmental education (18-482). To aid in the development of environmental education programs for children, youth, and adults.</td>
<td>Environmental Education Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-410)</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>Higher education institutions; local and state education agencies; regional educational research organizations; and other public and private organizations (including libraries and museums)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Library and learning resources (18-690). To aid in the establishment and operation of comprehensive library services and learning resources programs in secondary and secondary schools.</td>
<td>Library Services and Construction Act, Title III</td>
<td>3,337,000</td>
<td>State library administrative agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Library and learning resources (18-690). To aid in the establishment and operation of comprehensive library services and learning resources programs in secondary and secondary schools.</td>
<td>Library Services and Construction Act, Title III</td>
<td>167,500,000</td>
<td>State education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Public libraries (18-644). To establish and maintain public libraries and library services.</td>
<td>Library Services and Construction Act, Title I</td>
<td>56,800,000</td>
<td>State library administrative agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. State student financial assistance training (18-385). To aid in the development and improvement of state student financial assistance programs.</td>
<td>Higher Education Act, Title IV-F</td>
<td>407,000</td>
<td>States providing matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Teacher Corps (18-406). To aid in the establishment and operation of teacher training programs.</td>
<td>Higher Education Act, Title V</td>
<td>37,500,000</td>
<td>Higher education institutions, local education agencies, and state education agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART C—For Postsecondary Education Programs**

| 34. Advanced institutional development (18-444). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Higher Education Act, Title III | 68,000,000 | Developing institutions with demonstrated progress | OE Division of Institutional Development |
| 35. Basic institutional development (18-484). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Higher Education Act, Title III | 52,000,000 (includes Title I) | Accredited colleges and universities in existence less than five years | OE Division of Institutional Development |
| 36. Bilingual education-training programs and institutional assistance (18-690). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title VII (as amended by P.L. 92-318) | 10,000,000 | Institutions of higher education, local education agencies, and state education agencies | OE Application Control Center (Division of Bilingual Education) |
| 37. College library resources (18-690). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Higher Education Act, Title II-A | 9,975,000 | Higher education institutions | OE Application Control Center (Division of Libraries and Resources) |
| 38. College work-study (18-689). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Higher Education Act, Title IV-C | 382,250,000 | Higher education institutions, accredited private schools, and proprietary institutions not otherwise covered | OE Bureau of Student Financial Assistance |
| Community service and education centers (18-589). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Higher Education Act, Title I | 18,000,000 | Higher education institutions | OE Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education |
| Cooperative education programs (18-589). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Higher Education Act, Title VIII | 15,000,000 | Higher education institutions | OE Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education |
| Educational information systems (18-589). To aid in the establishment and operation of new postsecondary educational institutions. | Higher Education Act, Title IV-A | 2,000,000 | Higher education institutions, public and private agencies, and organizations, and local educational agencies in combination with a higher education institution | Institutions should apply to states; states should apply to OE Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs |
AUTHORIZING

LEGISLATION

APPROPRIATION ($) WHO MAY APPLY

WHERE TO APPLY

Higher Education Act, Title IV
5,000,000 Institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions, public and private non-profit agencies and organizations:
OE Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs

Higher Education Act, Title IX, Parts A and B
3,350,000 Institutions of higher education:
Graduate Training Branch, Division of Training and Facilities, OE Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education

Education Amendments of 1978
12,000,000 Postsecondary institutions and related organizations:
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Office of Assistant Secretary for Education

Higher Education Act, Title IV-C
33,447,000 Higher education institutions:
OE Bureau of Student Financial Assistance

Higher Education Act, Title IX
1,000,000 Accredited law schools:
OE Bureau of Student Financial Assistance

Higher Education Act, Title IV
325,515,000 Higher education institutions:
OE Bureau of Student Financial Assistance

Higher Education Act, Title III (included in item 33)
Institutions of higher education:
OE Bureau of Institutional Development

Higher Education Act, Sec. 1203
3,500,000 State commissions:
State Planning Commissions Program Office

Higher Education Act, Title IV
63,750,000 State education agencies:
OE Bureau of Student Financial Assistance

Higher Education Act, Title IV
51,000,000 Accredited institutions of higher learning or consortiums:
OE Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs

Higher Education Act, Title IV
269,962,000 Higher education institutions:
OE Bureau of Student Financial Assistance

Higher Education Act, Title IV-A
11,000,000 Higher education institutions and combinations of such institutions, public and private agencies and organizations:
OE Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs

Higher Education Act, Title V-B
8,250,000 Institutions of higher education:
OE Division of Educational Systems Development

Higher Education Act, Title VI-A
7,500,000 Higher education institutions, including vocational and technical schools and hospital schools of nursing:
OE Application Control Center (Information from OE Office of Libraries and Learning Resources)

Higher Education Act, Title IV-A
44,000,000 Higher education institutions and combinations of such institutions, public and private agencies and organizations:
OE Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs

Higher Education Act, Title IV
23,750,000 Higher education institutions:
OE Veterans Program Branch

Education of the Handicapped Act, Title VI-C, Sec. 632
14,000,000 Public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions:
OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

PART D—For the Education of the Exceptional and the Handicapped

Ouanties and services for disabled children (18-21), to provide special and related instruction and rehabilitative and supportive services to deaf-blind children and their families through regional centers:
OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
PART E—For Developing and Strengthening International Studies Programs

78. Institutional services for foreign cultural specialists (18.444). To bring foreign cultural specialists from the U.S. to serve programs overseas to their home countries

Education of the Handicapped Act, Part D, Sec. 633

(Included in Item 64)

220,000

Public agencies and private nonprofit organizations

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

STATE AND PURPOSE

77. Early education for handicapped children (18.444). To assist state and local educational agencies in developing model preschool and early education programs for handicapped children

Education Amendments of 1974, Special Projects Act, Sec. 404

Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Sec. 633

2,540,000

State and local educational agencies, higher education institutions, appropriate nonprofit institutions or agencies

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

78. Early education for gifted and talented children (18.445). To develop programs for gifted and talented children to maximize their capacity and leadership potential for them to serve the country

Education of the Handicapped Act, Part D, Sec. 633

1,000,000

Public or private nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, or agencies

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

AUTHORIZED LEGISLATION

APPROPRIATION ($) WHO MAY APPLY

WHERE TO APPLY

Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B as amended by P.L. 94-142

465,000,000

State education agencies

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

State and local educational agencies, higher education institutions, public and nonprofit private agencies, professional organizations, and volunteer associations

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-C

19,750,000

Higher education institutions

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Sec. 121

121,590,837

Eligible state agencies

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

OE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

OE Division of International Education
TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE

78. Foreign language and area studies research (13.434). To improve foreign language and area studies through systematic research, training, and development of specialized instructional materials.

79. Group projects abroad for non-Western languages and area studies (13.433). To train U.S. education personnel abroad in language and international studies; to develop comprehensive language programs for U.S. institutions.

80. International studies centers (13.435). To upgrade training resources of centers for international studies, including foreign language and area studies.

81. International studies programs, graduate and undergraduate (13.435). To establish international studies resources at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

PART F—For Occupational, Adult, Vocational, and Career Education

77. Adult education (13.430). To provide adult basic-education programs up to sublevels competency.

78. Bilingual vocational instructional materials, methods, and techniques (13.536). To develop instructional materials and encourage research programs and demonstration projects to meet the shortages of such instructional materials available for bilingual vocational training programs.

79. Bilingual vocational training (13.536). To assist in conducting bilingual vocational training programs so that vocational training programs are available to persons of limited English-speaking ability.

80. Career education (13.534). To demonstrate effective methods and techniques in career education to develop exemplary models.

81. Consumer and homemaking education (13.484). To help states conduct training programs in consumer and homemaking education, especially in economically depressed or high unemployment areas.

82. Indian education (13.538). To provide adult basic education and GED programs for Indian adults.

83. Vocational education basic programs (13.484). To maintain, extend, and improve vocational education programs, to develop programs in new occupations, to help states conduct vocational education programs of cooperative work-study arrangements, and to provide work opportunities for full-time disadvantaged vocational education students.

84. Vocational education contract programs for Indian tribes and Indian organizations (13.538). To make contracts with Indian tribal organizations to plan, conduct, and administer programs of training and development and to assist in meeting the needs of Indian tribes which have contracts with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Vocational Education Act of April 18, 1974.

85. Vocational programs for persons with special needs (13.484). To provide vocational education programs for disadvantaged persons who have not succeeded in regular schools.

86. Vocational education—state advisory councils (13.536). To advise the state board for vocational education on the development and administration of state plans; to evaluate vocational education programs, services, and activities.

PART G—for Desegregation Assistance

87. Desegregation assistance, grants to school organizations (13.435). To provide aid for community-based special programs and projects in support of school district desegregation plans.

AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation ($)</th>
<th>Who May Apply</th>
<th>Where To Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Education Act, Title VI</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Higher education institutions, state education agencies, other organizations, and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act and F.L. 83-880 (in excess foreign currency countries)</td>
<td>919,710</td>
<td>Colleges, universities, consortiums, local and state education agencies, nonprofit organizations, and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Education Act of 1963, Title VI</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>Higher education institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Education Act of 1963, Title VI</td>
<td>1,440,000</td>
<td>Higher education institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Act*</td>
<td>90,750,000</td>
<td>State education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1963, Part II, subpart 3</td>
<td>(included in Group II, item 3)</td>
<td>State agencies, public and private educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1963, Part II, subpart 3</td>
<td>(included in Group II, item 3)</td>
<td>State agencies, local education agencies, postsecondary institutions, and other public or private organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Amendments of 1974, Special Projects Act, Sec. 408</td>
<td>10,135,000</td>
<td>State and local education agencies, higher education institutions, and other nonprofit organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1963, Part A, subpart 5</td>
<td>40,994,000</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education Act (P.L. 92-310) Title IV, Part C</td>
<td>4,410,000</td>
<td>Indian tribes, organizations and institutions, state and local education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1963, Part A, subpart 2</td>
<td>430,286,000 (includes item 54)</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1963, Part A</td>
<td>(included in Item 53)</td>
<td>Indian tribal organizations or Indian tribes which have contracts with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Act of April 18, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Educator's Act of 1963, Sec. 102(b)</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1963, Sec. 104</td>
<td>5,068,000</td>
<td>State advisory councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adult Education Act includes: Parts A and B, subpart 4; Parts C and D, subpart 2; Parts E and F, subpart 3.
### TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Authorizing Legislation</th>
<th>Appropriation ($)</th>
<th>Who May Apply</th>
<th>Where To Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation assistance, basic grants to Little (18.338) To provide aid to desegregating school districts for educational programs.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>157,600,000</td>
<td>Local public school districts</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation assistance, special programs (18.338). To help desegregating school districts provide special help in areas of unusually heavy problems to overcome minority group isolation.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>32,250,000</td>
<td>Local public school districts</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation assistance, bilingual programs (18.338). To help desegregating school districts provide bilingual-educational programs for children of limited English speaking ability.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>Local public school districts and private nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation assistance, educational TV (18.338). To develop and produce integrated children's educational television programs.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>8,450,000</td>
<td>Public or private nonprofit organizations, agencies, or institutions</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation assistance, special programs and projects (18.338). To lessen minority group isolation by supporting efforts of special merit and funded under other parts of ESAA legislation.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>51,250,000</td>
<td>Local public school districts, public and private nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation assistance/civil rights training and advisory services (18.338). To aid school districts in hiring history specialists to train employees and provide technical assistance in matters related to desegregation on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or language ability.</td>
<td>Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV</td>
<td>34,700,000</td>
<td>Local education agencies, state education agencies, colleges and universities, and public or private nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAA evaluation (18.341). To evaluate programs and projects under the Emergency School Aid Act.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>Private organizations, institutions and agencies, state education agencies, and higher education institutions</td>
<td>Requests for proposals published in Commerce Business Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnet schools, university/business corporations (18.338). To support magnet schools as a method of school desegregation, and to conduct education programs in cooperation with colleges, universities, and businesses.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>20,000,000 (includes item 97)</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral site planning (18.338). For development of plans for neutral sites.</td>
<td>Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII (P.L. 92-318)</td>
<td>(included in item 98)</td>
<td>Local education agencies</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROUP II: TO INDIVIDUALS—FOR TEACHER AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND FOR STUDENT ASSISTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Authorizing Legislation</th>
<th>Appropriation ($)</th>
<th>Who May Apply</th>
<th>Where To Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic educational opportunity grants (18.338). To provide financial assistance to undergraduate postsecondary students.</td>
<td>Higher Education Act, Title IV</td>
<td>2,140,000,000</td>
<td>Postsecondary education students at eligible institutions</td>
<td>P.O. Box 84, Washington, DC 20044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual education graduate fellowships (18.338). To provide financial assistance to graduate students training to be bilingual education teacher educators.</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title VII</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>Graduate students enrolled on a full-time basis in approved colleges and universities</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Bilingual Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual vocational instructor training (18.338). To provide training for instructors of bilingual vocational-training programs.</td>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1983, Part B, subpart 3</td>
<td>2,800,000 (includes Group I, item 78; Group II, item 79)</td>
<td>States and public and private educational institutions</td>
<td>OE Application Control Center (information from OE Division of Research and Demonstration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Work-Study (18.443). To promote part-time employment of postsecondary students in great financial need.</td>
<td>Higher Education Act, Title IV-C (see Group I, item 36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating institutions (information from OE Division of Student Financial Assistance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National direct student loans (18.471). To provide low-interest loans to postsecondary students.</td>
<td>Higher Education Act, Title IV</td>
<td>(see Group I, item 45)</td>
<td>Participating institutions (information from OE Division of Student Financial Assistance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic mining and mineral and mineral fuel conservation fellowships (18.447). To assist graduate students in domestic mining and mineral and mineral fuel conservation, including all minerals, coal, oil, and uranium.</td>
<td>Higher Education Act, Title IX, Part D</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>Advanced degree candidates</td>
<td>Participating institutions (information from OE Division of Training and Facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for the Public Service (18.448). To attract and prepare students for entrance into state, local, or federal service.</td>
<td>Higher Education Act, Title IX, Part C</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>Graduate students planning public service careers</td>
<td>Participating institutions (information from OE Division of Training and Facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elender fellowships (18.448*). To assist the Close Up Foundation of Washington, DC, with its program for increasing understanding of the federal government among secondary school students and their communities.</td>
<td>P.L. 92-500</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>Economically disadvantaged secondary school students; secondary school teachers</td>
<td>The Close Up Foundation, 1054 Thomas Jefferson Street NW, Washington, DC 20007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Fellowships abroad for doctoral dissertation research in foreign languages and area studies (15.411). To develop research knowledge and instructional capabilities for specialized, advanced work abroad.

6. Fellowships abroad for faculty in foreign languages and area studies (15.412). To promote instruction in international studies through grants and faculty projects for overseas work.

7. Foreign language and area studies fellowships (15.414). To provide opportunities for graduate work in modern foreign languages and area studies.

8. Guaranteed student loan program (15.416). To provide low-interest insured loans to postsecondary students.

9. Indian education (15.548). To assist Indian professional and graduate students in engineering, medicine, low, business, forestry, and related fields.

10. Librarian training (15.448). To increase opportunities for training in librarianship through fellowships, institutes, and traineeships.

11. Medial services and captioned film training grants (15.448). To train persons in the use of educational media for the handicapped.

12. National teaching fellowships and preceptors seminar (15.454). To strengthen the teaching resources of developing institutions.

13. Personal training for the education of the handicapped (15.454). To improve and increase the supply of education personnel trained to work with handicapped children.

14. State student loan programs (15.448). To encourage states to increase appropriations for students or to develop such grant programs (grants are on a matching 50:50 basis).

15. Supplemental educational opportunity grants (15.418). To assist students in exceptional financial need.

16. Teacher Corps project grants (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

17. Teacher Corps project (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

18. Teacher Corps project (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

19. Teacher Corps project (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

20. Teacher Corps project (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

21. Teacher Corps project (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

22. Teacher Corps project (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

23. Teacher Corps project (15.487). To improve the quality of instruction available to disadvantaged children.

24. Vocational education graduate leadership development awards (15.532). To meet state needs for qualified vocational education personnel by making awards to vocational educators and institutions.

25. Vocational education certification fellowship programs (15.579). To provide opportunities for previously certified teachers to upgrade and expand their knowledge and skills.

GROUP III: FOR RESEARCH

1. Bilingual education research, demonstration, and evaluation activities (15.483). (1) Review of existing language assessment practices; (2) establishment of ranges of entry-exit criteria for students in bilingual education projects; and (3) development of basic curriculum objectives for dissemination to the field.
**TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE**

1. Instructional materials and instructional methods (18.645). To develop instructional materials and teaching methods for the handicapped and to aid school districts in providing easily accessible educational programs for handicapped children.

2. Consumer education (18.645). To support research and development and demonstration projects designed to provide consumer education to the public.

3. Foreign languages and area studies research (18.645). To improve foreign language and area studies programs through support to research and demonstration projects, development of specialized instructional materials.

4. Library research and demonstration (18.645). To promote library and information science research and demonstration projects.

5. Research and demonstration for the handicapped (18.645). To improve educational opportunities of handicapped children through support of research and development, demonstration and model program activities.

6. Strengthening research library programs (18.645). To improve educational opportunities of handicapped children through support of research and development, demonstration and model program activities.

7. Vocational education program improvement and supportive services (18.645). To conduct applied studies and development in vocational education.

8. Women's educational equity program research (18.645). To support development and implementation of programs which contribute to women's educational equity and have a possible national impact.

**AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION**

- Vocational Education Act of 1963, Part B
- Higher Education Act, Title II-B
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Sec. 811
- National Defense Education Act, Title VI

**APPROPRIATION ($)**

- Education of the Handicapped Act, Part E
- Higher Education Act, Title II-C
- Vocational Education Act of 1963, Part A, sub part 3
- Education Amendments of 1974, Special Projects Act, Sec. 408
- (see Group I, Item 21)

**WHO MAY APPLY**

- State agencies, public and private educational institutions, appropriate nonprofit organizations, and individuals
- State agencies, public and private educational institutions, appropriate nonprofit organizations
- Higher education institutions, state education agencies, and other organizations
- Higher education institutions, state education agencies, and other organizations
- Qualifying public and private nonprofit library institutions
- State education agencies, higher education institutions, public and private agencies, and institutions
- Public agencies, private nonprofit organizations, and individuals

**WHERE TO APPLY**

- OE Application Control Center (Information from OE Division of Research and Demonstrations)
- OE Office of Consumer Education
- OE Application Control Center (Information from OE Division of International Education)
- OE Application Control Center (Information from OE Office of Libraries and Learning Resources)
- OE Office of Libraries and Learning Resources
- OE Women's Program Staff, Office of the U.S. Commissioner of Education

**GROUP IV: FOR CONSTRUCTION**

1. Public schools (18.679). To aid school districts in federally aided areas in providing minimum school facilities and to aid school districts suffering economic distress.

2. Vocational facilities (18.615). \("To construct area vocational education facilities in the Appalachian region.

- School Aid to Federally Impacted and Disaster Areas (P.L. 86-213)
- Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1955 (operated with transfer funds from Appalachian Regional Commission)
- State education agencies in the Appalachian region

**194 Education, March 1978**

---

1 Refers to identifying number as it appears in the Office of Management and Budget Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance. Where asterisk (*) appears, the identifying number is not official, but for OE's internal use only.

2 Amounts shown represent advance funding from FY 77.

3 Administered by the Assistant Secretary for Education, another component of the Education Division.

4 Included in the total of $197,500,000 available for Educational Innovation and Support (Group I, Item 5), of which approximately ten percent is set aside for the handicapped.

---
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Annotations are included to assist you in your reading selections. Much of the literature documents the implementation of existing teacher centers or inservice projects that had short-term funding. A survey of the literature will provide a framework for the interpretation of the federal teacher center legislation.

The following subject is suggested for easy reference in note taking and organizing a teacher center reference library. The U.S. Office of Education Teacher Center Reference Library materials will be organized along similar lines.

1. System-wide overviews
   a. National
   b. State
   c. Local
2. General (covers many aspects of centering)
3. History
4. Philosophy/Rationale/Theory
5. Organizational Structures
6. Management/Staffing Patterns
7. Program/Curriculum Development
8. Participation Incentives
9. Governance
10. Finance/Support Systems
11. Evaluation/Assessment
12. Research

You will find that as your project takes shape and you begin to articulate ideas to interested persons, the notes will provide ready references to support your statements.

MICROFICHE COPIES OF ALL REFERENCES LISTED IN THIS BIBLIOGRAPHY FROM THE ERIC SYSTEM ARE AVAILABLE ON LOAN FROM:

AFT Teacher Center Resource Exchange
11 Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

ERIC Numbers are included for convenience when ordering.

Copies of ERIC documents are available for purchase from:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
Bibliographies


This bibliography reflects the teacher center experience of the past several years and provides a reference pool for those interested in developing and/or improving teacher center programs. The materials cited are listed alphabetically by author and cover many different aspects of centering, including something of the experience in several other nations. Most of the publications cited were written during the past five years, but older documents have been included if they address high priority teacher center issues or represent benchmark studies or statements. A subject index cross-references the citations under 29 major topics. Standard bibliographic citations have been supplied for all materials. Citations of documents announced in ERIC's journal of abstracts, Resources in Education, are followed by an ED accession number; an EJ number follows journal articles announced in Current Index to Journals in Education. Most ED entries are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service; a current order form is included. Items generally were not included unless they could be obtained either as study documents or for permanent collections. Some of the main sources for the documents are identified in Appendix A. Appendix B lists periodicals found to be helpful to those interested in teacher centers.


A comprehensive listing of resources on teacher centers through March 1977. The publication includes numerous publications not cited in other bibliographies. This guide was prepared for the Teacher Center Communication Program and is available through the Illinois Office of Education.


Ways in which student teaching and inservice and preservice teacher education can be made into a continuum of teacher education services, especially for vocational education teachers are explained. EJ143869.


This report addresses the issue of inservice training of teachers in Japan. Part One is a formal overview of the policy and activities of the Minister of Education regarding inservice education and training of teachers (INSET). It discusses the concept of inservice education and training, states specific examples—the National Training Course for Educational Personnel and the Teachers' Overseas Inspection Program, discusses the ways and merits of inservice education, and talks about teacher supply and demand. Part Two presents several cases of INSET in detail to give actual accounts of their functioning. In this section, short overseas tours for study and observation are presented along with activities of educational research and training centers, a description of school-based research projects, and a description of the audiovisual educational center.


This booklet is a compilation of articles by educators who are, or have been at one time, coordinators of teacher education centers. The contributions are organized into three sections. The first deals with organizational arrangements in centers. The second section describes innovative ideas that can be used to make centers more effective. In the third section, challenges facing coordinators of teacher centers and suggestions for future improvements are discussed.


This document presents an overview of the objectives, organization, and modes of university participation in the Fort Worth, Texas, Teacher Center. The Center was initiated with four objectives in mind: (1) to improve both participating schools and the education of teachers through field-oriented experiences; (2) to develop a viable educational enterprise involving a public school district, an educational service center, teacher training institutes, and the community; (3) to set up a plan for curriculum and
staff development; (4) to develop a program for integrating the Professional Competence in Teaching concepts. The Center operates through an Advisory Council composed of representatives of the Fort Worth School District, Professional Teachers Association, classroom teachers, mayor's council, community members, higher education institutes, and student teachers. The Center serves in a cooperative capacity to improve teacher education through preservice and inservice meetings. University participation includes the placement of several hundred students in community classrooms in observation, volunteer worker, and teacher aide positions, and also through university classes meeting in the school buildings, utilizing local teachers as resource persons. Appended to the paper is a diagrammatic representation of the organization, membership components, and field activities.


Innovation in inservice education and training of teachers of teacher education in Canada and by means of two case studies of INSET programs—Perfectionnement des Maitres en Mathematiques (PERMAMA) and the Atlantic Institute of Education (AIE). It is stated that, at present, most INSET activities fall into two large families. First, there are those activities planned and carried out by Ministries of Education either regionally or locally. This family has an incredible variety of approaches to teacher education; it is almost impossible to describe and assess its programs because they occur in ten different provinces without a unifying central agency. The second family of INSET activities is those that are either university based or related. PERMAMA and AIE were chosen as representative of this family. Both programs contain several aspects that may be pointing to future directions in INSET in Canada. These aspects are offered as tentative conclusions to this examination of INSET: (1) INSET planners must shift the center of focus to the teacher-on-the-job and make every attempt to understand the problems teachers face in today's schools; (2) INSET is basically a curriculum problem where the learners are teachers; (3) teacher education seems to have been largely concerned with producing teachers as technicians in the transmission of knowledge; (4) in education, including INSET, we are still living off the 19th century—its schools, its educational laws, its systems of beliefs, attitudes and values, and its educational structures.

Bell, Harry H., and Peightel, John W. "What Is the Role of Higher Education in Teacher Centers?" In Teacher Educator, 12, no. 1, Summer 1976, pp. 5-9. EJ152521.

University-school system cooperation in the formation of teacher centers has benefits for both parties—the school system can use the university resources, educational materials, research facilities, and scholarly expertise, while providing to the university training sites and field-based research opportunities.
Problems of turning theory into practice have made it difficult to apply research findings to language teaching. The student-teacher variable factor calls for knowledge of theory and flexibility in the teacher. It is the function of the AVL to bring research findings together and make them available to language teachers.

Boeder-Rijdes, Elisabeth S. See Deen, Nathan.


This report on the inservice education and training (INSET) of teachers in England and Wales has two purposes: (1) it describes and critically analyzes five major, significant, and potentially adaptable innovative INSET practices; and (2) it relates these five case studies to the national INSET context and explores some of their implications for the future of INSET nationally and internationally. Section One talks about the development of INSET, previous programs leading up to its establishment, present functioning and objectives, and outlines the contextual framework for INSET innovations. Five case studies of innovative approaches to INSET in England and Wales are presented in Section Two. They include: Teacher Induction Pilot Schemes Project; Colleges of Higher Education and INSET; INSET at a Distance; the Open University; Local Curriculum Development and INSET; and School-Focused INSET. The final section identifies some of the major issues arising from the first two sections and explores their implications for INSET policy in England, Wales, and elsewhere. A bibliography is included.


This paper focuses on the preservice teacher education center, particularly on those which encourage the optimal use of college and school personnel and resources in the field-based aspects of teacher education training programs. The paper is organized around five main topics. First, a brief historical view of the teacher center is presented. The second section scans the teacher center literature. The third section discusses emergent themes from the literature important in developing effective teacher education centers including discussion of such topics as: governance; the integration of college and school-based learning experiences; role changes; and teacher training and education renewal. The fourth section presents common problems in developing field-based teacher education. These problems specifically are related to the conventional roles played by the various participants in teacher education and the role conflicts that are experienced when more than structural or cosmetic program changes are attempted. The fifth section offers suggestions for
consideration in the development and operation of a functional teacher education center. The suggestions give particular attention to the human factors involved in a teacher education center and the interplay between these and the many organizational features, distribution of responsibility, and procedures that are part of a teacher center. As a brief summary, advantages inherent in a successful implementation of a teacher education center are listed. A bibliography is appended developed by the authors from their own readings and from a computer search of the ERIC data base.

Boyle, Virginia, and Grinnell, Robert E. "Teacher Centers as Viewed from the Classroom." National Council of States on Inservice Education. Syracuse University. In Inservice, March 1978, pp. 7-10.

The article states that teachers possess a broad range of staff development interests that teacher centers must address. The authors conducted a survey of eight schools which included a sample population representing teachers from urban, suburban, and rural areas. Data gathered from this study gives further insight into the interests, motivations, and circumstances that will affect teachers participation in teacher center activities.


Describes a program in which resource teachers train other teachers in developing interpersonal skills that will foster better relationships among teachers, parents, and students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds.


The basic functions of teacher centres now are to help teachers in curriculum development and solving classroom problems, to serve as information centres, to back up resources of schools, and provide social and professional interchange between teachers; it is hoped they will grow to provide broader views of the philosophy and practice of teaching.


An observer of Japanese teacher centers reports on their purpose, scope, and activities—using British and American centers as a frame of reference.

Buxton, Amity P. "Teachers' Active Learning Center (TALC): A Case Study." In Educational Leadership, 33, no. 6, March 1976, pp. 428-33. EJ149014.

Inspired by study of British teacher centres, an active learning center was developed based on the belief that emphasis on needs of individual teachers and voluntary teacher involvement in designing programs would lead to progress and classroom changes by providing practical group studies in a nonevaluative supportive atmosphere.

Based upon the data collected in this research into the effectiveness of the consortium approach to preservice teacher education, such an approach does not seem to offer any special advantages in the acquisition of teaching skills, but did seem to have some positive attitudinal effects and certain benefits for each consortium participant not to be found in traditional preservice programs. Seventy-two preservice teachers in field-based programs in the Dallas Independent School District formed two control and two experimental groups, with the experimental groups receiving extensive consortium-based training in the competencies specified in the Competency Indicator Scale. Training was later extended and reinforced through videotape feedback and supervision. Performance data drawn during and after the subjects' eight-week student teaching experience revealed:

1. no statistically significant difference in posttest achievement on the acquisition of teaching competencies between control and experimental groups;
2. no statistically significant difference in the extent of observable specified teaching behaviors; and
3. no significant difference in the way elementary or secondary students perceived the performance of the experimental or control groups. Appendixes include (1) a model of instruction; (2) a listing of Dallas Teacher Center Competency Clusters; (3) the Competency Indicator Scale; and (4) a student-rating questionnaire on student teacher performance.


The author reports on a semester-long study of British teacher centers, an examination that includes purposes, structure, and administration of the British models, and a comparison of these models to current efforts in the establishment and operation of teacher centers in the United States. From the research undertaken, it is concluded that: (1) the British "model" exists in reality only to the extent that British educators agree on the basic purposes of teacher centers; otherwise, generalization is not possible; (2) the British model gives more responsibility for inservice education to practicing teachers; (3) the British utilize teacher centers less for preservice work than U.S. centers, and they have little intention of using them as vehicles for certification. The body of the document elaborates on these three conclusions by describing:

1. basic purposes of British teacher centers;
2. curriculum development functions, their sources, and objectives;
3. differences between American perceptions of British teacher centers and the actual situations; and
4. characteristics of successful centers in Britain. It is noted that the opportunity for American education to emulate British successes and avoid British shortcomings in teacher center development depend to a large degree on America's understanding of both the similarities and differences in British and American concepts of the movement.

Shared responsibility between school districts and universities for training teachers in large metropolitan school districts seems to offer advantages over the traditional preservice education curriculum. Seventy-two preservice teachers were selected from six universities participating in a consortium teacher center program. Each student teacher was randomly assigned to either an experimental or a control group. The experimental group was provided with training implemented through the teacher center aimed at developing teaching skills that contribute to the creation of a positive learning environment. The control group received no such training and proceeded instead through the teacher preparation curricula provided by their respective organizations. A competency Indicator Scale was used to observe teaching behaviors directed at developing affective outcomes in learners. Based on the data collected, the teacher center consortium did not seem to offer any special advantages to helping preservice teachers acquire and demonstrate specialized teaching skills. The cooperative teacher center effort, however, did seem to have positive effects on the program participants. (A discussion of the Dallas Teacher Education Center is included.)


Continuing education for teachers was the theme for the University of British Columbia Conference on Teacher Education, chosen because of growing concern with the question of what forms continuing education should take once all teachers hold degrees. The conference did not attempt to provide definitive answers to the questions: Is graduate study the only appropriate path to professional improvement? What new structures must be built, and what older structures altered to accommodate needed changes in continuing education for teachers? It did, however, open for discussion the issues and problems in continuing education and the strategies and delivery systems that are currently being tested. Conference topics included: continuing education for teachers—an unromantic view; the teacher association view; strategies for improving continuing education for teachers; readiness for teachers' centers; program development by teachers as a strategy for continuing education; recommendations for facilitating teacher learning; research, scholarship, and the continuing education of teachers; the open access study plan; developing short courses for teachers; continuing education diplomas; continuing education for teachers in rural settings; getting resources to teachers; and the who, what, and how of continuing education.
The process used to develop a cataloging and retrieval system for career awareness materials is presented in this project report. It is noted that the system would enable teachers to request materials from a resource center under a wide variety of classifications which complement many different teaching approaches. The procedures and outcome for developing a catalog of career materials, evaluating the materials, and devising a method for circulating materials for teacher use are outlined. Appendices include: (1) personnel involved in the project; (2) guidelines for establishing a resource center; (3) materials evaluation form; (4) systems evaluation report; (5) Career Awareness Resource Materials Catalog, which lists the names and addresses of 48 publishers and includes an annotated bibliography; (6) report of teachers' evaluation of a trial career resource catalog; (7) sample interview questions about career resource catalog use; and (8) teacher comments from the career awareness resource catalog interviews.


A study of the potential influence teacher controlled teacher centers will have on inservice education.


Sections of this paper deal with the place of inservice teacher training in the total teacher training pattern, the purposes of inservice training, the politics determining which institutions govern inservice programs, the approaches to planning activities, and the content of programs. Among the general principles espoused are that the training of teachers should be planned as a continuum in which aspects of the training are conducted when and where appropriate; the notion that professional development is concerned with teacher growth is more acceptable and more general than the notion of correcting defects; teacher/school district control of inservice programs is recommended; institutional planning systems are in general preferable to ad hoc systems because they provide for a broader range of programs and for continuity; and seeking an acceptable balance between system and teacher needs, via an objective and precise diagnostic system, is essential if the overall objective of improving instruction is to be met.


The School Based Teacher Educators Project (SBTE) had as one of its major goals the development of a set of competency specifications for the role
of school-based teacher educators. This paper describes the process that was used to identify the competencies. A number of different approaches which have been advocated by various educators for identifying the competencies include some type of role or task analysis, review of literature advocating new functions for the roles. The competencies presented in this paper were identified through the following process: (1) a comprehensive review of the literature related to inservice and preservice education which provided the basic information on the functions and tasks of the school-based teacher educator's role; (2) interviews conducted with 19 supervisory personnel representing five school districts provided practicing professionals' perceptions of the school-based teacher educator role; (3) an initial list of competency statements was drawn, and to further analyze and validate the list, an external expert review was organized and conducted; (4) competency statements were again reviewed and revised several times. This paper concludes with a list of 20 competency statements along with the remark that at the time of the paper's writing more specific competency statements were still being developed.


This study is an analysis of the opinions of 13 client groups concerning the Harrison County Teacher Education Center (HCTEC) and is a sequel to a previous study. This study of 13 client groups about the perceived needs for the HCTEC; and (2) how do these client groups differ in their opinions of the needs of the HCTEC. The data was obtained from the answers to 34 questions given by the 13 client groups in the previous study. The Fisher Least Significant Difference Formula was used to analyze the data. The results of this study revealed that the existence of a center to perform a wide variety of important functions in Harrison County's educational structure elicited a strong, positive reaction from all groups surveyed. Further, there was a strong homogeneity among all groups, indicating unanimity of opinion. The most notable exception to this pattern were college supervisors. Those functions of a teacher center that elicited the highest and the lowest homogeneity are given. The author recommends that a larger, more comprehensive study be done, preferably one involving all seven centers in the state of West Virginia. Tables are included. Appended are the survey instrument used and a list of terms and their definitions.


This paper contains an analysis of the data gathered from the 1975-76 Harrison County Teacher Education Center (HCTEC) needs assessment survey. The original study analyzed the opinions of 13 client groups concerning the HCTEC. The study concentrated on two major questions: (1) what are the opinions of the 13 client groups about the perceived needs for the HCTEC; and (2) how do these client groups differ in their opinions of the
needs of HCTEC. The results of this study revealed that the existence of a center to perform a wide variety of important functions in Harrison County's educational structure elicited a strong positive reaction from all groups surveyed. Respondents to the original questionnaire suggested some changes in the questions. These suggestions were then reviewed by two out of state consultants who prepared a new survey. A strong continuity of results showed up in the comparison of results from the two surveys despite the changes in the instrument. The only new recommendation in terms of ongoing HCTEC programming concerns the pre-student teacher group. Some unfavorable perception of the center caused the new survey as reviewed, edited, and revised by seven teacher education center directors.


This report examines the innovations in inservice education and the training of teachers in the Netherlands. Section One deals with inservice education and training of teachers (INSET) in relationship to Dutch education. The Dutch educational system is discussed along with various aspects of teaching, issues pertaining to education, and the role INSET plays in the Dutch educational network. Section Two discusses and analyzes four case studies that have utilized some aspect of INSET activities. They include a television course, an experimental counselor training program at Utrecht University, the role of INSET in the creative arts, and a program for reorientation in mathematics teaching in vocational schools. Section Three proposes several conclusions in regard to the four case studies discussed in Section Two. It was also concluded that INSET has to be a voluntary act of the individual teachers in the Dutch school system and should not by any means be imposed upon them. An appendix contains a description of support (teacher) centers in the Netherlands.


Publication of the manual as well as other documents of the Detroit Center provides leaders in the teacher center movement with a comprehensive overview of the Center's purpose and operational guidelines. The center began operating in March 1976 and was the first Michigan state-supported professional development center established as a direct response to the challenge of improving student achievement through staff development. The document includes staff policies as well as copies of forms used. Schematic charts are included and give insight into governance procedures.


This report represents the record of project activity which has not already been detailed in the First Milestone Report of October 1974 and the second milestone project, "Exploring Teachers' Centers." The National Institute of Education Group on School Capacity for Problem Solving
A teacher center is defined as a program providing continuing education for practicing teachers (mostly elementary teachers), which aims to be responsive to teachers' own definitions of their continuing learning needs rather than to the imposed agendas of school administrators, college professors, or curriculum committees. This study recommends that the GSCP bring these several strands of interested people together by establishing a small agency that could sustain the informal networking now existent.

An exchange for and about teachers' centers should be designed not as a technical assistance agency but as a networking to perform the following functions: (1) collect, write, and circulate information about teachers' centers; (2) set up an information central to receive and respond to requests for information and to make referrals among people interested in teachers' centers; (3) arrange for and subsidize personnel exchanges and meetings among educators experienced in and interested in teachers' centers; and (4) document activities pursuant to the above functions and conduct research about the effects on networking and about teachers' centers as a form of inservice education. (A questionnaire and analysis of replies; a list of teachers' centers; and a report of networking documentation are contained in the appendixes.)


This essay captures elements of the accumulated experiences of different teachers' centers, and presents possible alternatives for efforts to establish new centers. Characteristics of a "typical" teachers' center are presented, according to origin, setting, facilities, program, governance, participation, and staff. Common differences between teachers' center programs and conventional school district/university inservice programs are noted, as well as the differences between teachers' centers and curriculum resource/media centers. The value of centers to teachers are expressed in terms of warmth, concreteness, and connection, opportunity for time and thought, and ingredients for successful innovation. The implied challenge contained in the Teacher Center Law for collaboration between centers and local school administration is examined. Bureaucratic concerns (governance, incentives, needs assessment, scale, pace) and nonbureaucratic concerns (leadership, teacher contributions, equality of participant status, informal assessment) are discussed.

Devaney, Kathleen. "What's a Teachers Center For?" In Educational Leadership, 33, no. 6, March 1976, pp. 413-16. EJ149011.

The basic purpose of helping teachers to enrich the curriculum of their own classrooms is a common bond between teacher centers where teacher participation and individualized training develop professional creativity, and emphasis is placed on the fact that the major influence upon children's schooling is the teacher.

This collection of essays on teacher centers reports the thinking of teachers' centers participants and leaders as they endeavor to improve, sustain, and extend their programs. While the function of teacher centers is, in a broad sense, to encourage teachers to continue to grow in their profession and remain open to new educational innovations, these essays enlarge on this theme with personal approaches to basic problems commonly faced by teachers. The value of sharing ideas and experiences with others in the same profession is underscored in this collection. The effect of teachers' centers in increasing self-esteem, confidence, and willingness to seek and share advice emerges as one of their major contributions to improving teacher performance.


Teachers' centers encourage both local curriculum development and in-service education.

Dillon, Elizabeth A. "Staff Development: Bright Hope or Empty Promise?" In *Educational Leadership,* 34, no. 3, December 1976, pp. 165-170. EJ150141.

Decreasing teacher turnover, public criticism of the school, and other factors are leading to new efforts in the area of staff development—many occurring at the local building level.


This monograph on the teacher center movement in the state of Maryland is divided into four sections: (1) The Center Concept and Center Research; (2) The Center Coordinator, Catalyst in Professional Development; (3) Professional Development through Inservice; and (4) The Center and its Make-Up. The first article traces the development of the teacher center movement in Maryland, a cooperative venture by the Maryland State Department of Education, the Montgomery County School System, and the University of Maryland at College Park, which began in 1964 and continues to the present. Research findings about center operations at the University of Maryland are reported in relation to the basic question of whether or not there are observable differences between teachers who participate in the centers and those who do not. The role of the teacher center coordinator is seen as one of a catalyst, motivating the educators in the center until all objectives are achieved. Inservice programs in one teacher education center involving a junior and senior high school are described, and principles concerning in-service education derived from the center's activities are identified. A model for the articulation and integration of personnel needs through collaborative efforts of several centers in the inservice program is also presented. Other articles discuss the ways various centers operate on an extension of the concept of management by objectives; a center is viewed from the vantage point of an educator assuming various positions in the center; and a representative year's program is detailed. The final article addresses
four functions for a center and reflects upon the future of the teacher center movement.

Drumm, George B. "The Center for Open Education: A Center Without Walls." In Educational Leadership, 33, no. 6, March 1976, pp. 441-3. EJ149016.

The Center for Open Education sends consultants to schools to work on-site with teachers; all personnel of the school are involved in planning in-service programs based on school needs; and through affiliation with the University of Connecticut, credit courses are available to participating teachers.


This document briefly examines the concept of "teacher centers," citing several definitions of the term based on functional emphases and preferences. A rationale for the existence of teacher centers includes the views that (1) fundamental reform in education must come from those charged with basic policy, and from teachers, (2) teachers are unlikely to change their ways of doing things just because they are told to, and (3) teachers will take reform seriously only when they are responsible for determining problems and needs, and for working toward solutions. The most urgent, current need in the teacher center movement is the training of teachers capable of bridging the theory-practice gap, particularly in areas relating to PL 94-142, requiring the provision of (1) inservice training for general and special education teachers, instructional and related services, and support personnel; (2) procedures ensuring a comprehensive staff development program to carry out PL 94-142 provisions, and (3) methods for the dissemination of information on handicapped child education methods.


Author reports on one school's attempt to become its own teachers' centre.


This guide is designed to present and deal with the major concerns of all those responsible for evaluating, installing, and maintaining a performance-based teacher education (PBTE) program. It is also intended, in a wider sense, for all who are interested in exploring the potential of performance-based education at any level and in any subject matter field. Systematically, the requirements for an optimal program are described and possible solutions to problems are presented. Wherever feasible, alternatives are given that may be adopted or adapted to suit a wide diversity of educational settings. Content is presented under the following headings: An Awareness Program for PBTE; Planning for Change or PBTE; PBTE Program Patterns; Selection of Teacher Competencies for the PBTE Program; Development of Instructional Materials; Instructional Program Management; Learning Facilities for PBTE; School, University, and Education Agency Coordination; Grades, Credits, and Recordkeeping; Certification for PBTE; Financial Support for PBTE; and Personnel Development for PBTE.

The graduate courses and inservice teacher education workshops in Harrison County, West Virginia, serve as a flexible model for inservice design. The description presented in this paper incorporates the following components of the teacher center model: (1) semi-annual needs assessment; (2) broad course topics; (3) team teaching techniques; (4) number of class meetings; (5) blending of theory and practice; (6) field-based, problem-based project work; (7) planned time for sharing ideas; (8) cross-fertilization of personnel from public school, higher education and the state department of education; and (9) flexible scheduling. Charts illustrate the organizational structure and a brief evaluation of the project is offered.


Considers what teacher centers actually are, what they do, what they are supposed to do, and how they are formed. Discusses three types of centers, their organizational structure and function, and the theory underlying them.

Feiman, Sharon. "Patterns of Teacher Behavior in a Teacher Center." In Interchange, 6, no. 2, 1975, pp. 56-62. EJ141926.

Data are presented on teachers' general patterns of physical and verbal behavior as observed in a Chicago teacher center.


This monograph is one of a continuing series initiated to provide materials for teachers, parents, school administrators, and governmental decision-makers that might encourage reexamination of a range of evaluation issues and perspectives about schools and schooling. This monograph is a descriptive study of the Teacher Curriculum Work Center, which opened in October 1972. It tries to capture the way of life of one functioning teacher center by exploring the viewpoints of various participants. The findings of the study are organized around the following topics, which head each of the eight chapters: (1) History; (2) Philosophy; (3) Setting/Environment; (4) People Who Use the Center; (5) Organizational Structure; (6) Program Highlights; (7) Teacher Behavior in the Center; and (8) Major Themes. Most of the empirical results are drawn from three sources: (1) sign-in/out forms; (2) personal data sheets filled out by visitors; and (3) observational data. In addition, all the Centers' written records were reviewed and taped interviews conducted with the staff. The chapters are preceded by an introduction and followed by appendices that include: a sample of personal background forms; a map of schools the Center draws from; a sample of the Center newsletter; a list of workshop topics; a sample of sign-in forms; a sample of the observation form; and a bibliography.

The volume contains the papers commissioned for the Seminar on Teacher Centers in June 1977, with the support of the Ford Foundation. Papers focus on “Perspectives of the Teacher Center Concept,” “The European Experience,” “Analysis of Issues,” and “Discussion of Policies and Research.” This exchange of views about teacher centers provided a forum for an examination of their implications for professional development. As teacher centers take new forms, they are likely to reflect a trend toward a greater role for teachers in shaping the content, the scheduling and the terms of their inservice education.

Friedman, John S. "Teachers Helping Teachers." In *American Educator*, 1, no. 4, December 1977, pp. 16-17.

Few teacher centers in the 1970's have been supported by teacher organizations and have served large numbers of teachers. The Detroit Center for Professional Growth, as described in this publication, is funded by the State of Michigan. In a period of one year, the center had a cumulative attendance of over 21,000. Being responsive to client needs and teacher involvement in governance are noted as ingredients that make this a successful teacher center.


The primary purpose of the Alabama Learning Resource Center is to keep special education personnel aware of current developments in instructional materials, media, and technology. A separate questionnaire was developed and circulated to each of three groups: special education teachers, university chairmen of special education programs, and coordinators of special education. The questionnaires used are not presented. However, teacher responses included: the names of the most used instructional materials by commercial name and by academic areas, their source of information for these materials, and the frequency of personal use of the Alabama Learning Resource Center. University chairmen responses included: the adequacy of methods courses to acquaint students with commercial aids, the geographic inaccessibility of learning centers for most students, and the frequent use of the Alabama Learning Resource Center as a major source of audiovisual aids. Coordinators of special education responses included: the need for learning center availability, the adequacy of instructional materials within a center, and the suggested percentage of budget that should be allocated to certain instructional materials. It was included that more services need to be offered to teachers, including equipment and materials training. It was also suggested that funding priorities be divided away from a centralized learning center and toward increasing accessibility to materials.


This paper is a summative review of responses received from teachers who participated in Teacher Corps projects during 1975-1976. The survey sought
to determine involvement by teachers in Teacher Corps training, planning, evaluation, work-related activities, network activities, and in decision-making about training events. In addition, teachers were asked to rate individual training events they attended during the year and indicate three things that should be modified to make Teacher Corps projects more effective. The survey elicited 54 responses, most of them indicating that: (1) teachers did not feel parity in decision-making; (2) they did not feel training programs were planned, implemented, or evaluated by them; (3) they confused network and university support; (4) they sought improvement of skills to work with interns and other teachers towards improving teaching skills, curriculum, and the use of the school plant; (5) they felt projects were not planned, implemented, or evaluated with them; (6) they reported increased expertise in use of special education, reading, math, and other specific curriculum materials, and techniques in classrooms; (7) some expressed concern about community and parental involvement; and (8) a few were aware of the new demonstration focus in Teacher Corps projects.

Grinder, Robert E. See Boyle, Virginia.

Hall, Gene E. See Loucks, Susan F.


This document is a report on the activity of Texas Teacher Centers over a two-year period. The two-year study that this report is part of had as its focus assessing the activity of the teacher centers and the degree of awareness and use of concepts and products developed by the School-Based Teacher Educator Project. The stated goals of this project include developing a set of competency specifications for school-based teacher educators, training and recognizing experienced teachers for this role, and, in the process, encouraging cooperation among Texas teacher centers. Three questionnaires were sent to the centers over this period of time, and this report presents the results of the third questionnaire. Two basic questions, with several subquestions, were asked: (1) what is the present state of the scene in Texas Teacher Centers? and (2) what is the extent of dissemination of School Based Teacher Educator concepts and products twenty months after initiation of the Project? Replies to the questionnaire are tabulated and evaluated. A sample of the questionnaire is appended.


This study represents the first portion of a two-year program designed to gather baseline data indicating the present state of teacher centering in Texas. The questionnaire designed for the survey focused on three areas: (1) the organization and workings of the teacher center; (2) the communication paths and media within and between teacher centers; and (3) the training and credentialing of school-based personnel who work with preservice and in-service teachers. In order to select a representative sample to respond to...
the questionnaire, the 64 teacher center contact persons designated by the Texas Education Agency were asked to nominate then individuals. As a result, 513 questionnaires were mailed. Of these, 294 were returned. In terms of the findings of the study, teacher centers are dealing primarily with three areas: (1) procedures and practices related to student teaching, assignment of student teachers, and selection of inservice cooperating teachers; (2) undergraduate program designed to gather preparation programs; and (3) inservice-oriented staff development. Contact between teacher centers appears to be infrequent. Only 38 percent of the sample reported contact with another teacher center; 6 percent reported contact with as many as four. An issue of prime concern to teacher centers is the selection, training, and credentialing of individuals who work in the schools with preservice teachers. The large majority of teacher centers are involved in training supervising teachers. This is an important area that would profit greatly by communication among the centers.


Some specific elements of the model planning—a high school teacher center, business education teacher preparation, and high school/college articulation—are described in this article.


In this study teacher centers are explored as one successful approach to professional inservice training. A descriptive study of one teacher center and the observed behaviors of the teachers involved is presented as an example of the problems faced by a typical center and how they are overcome. Practical questions of developing a teacher center, funding, and evaluating its success in meeting the needs of those involved are discussed. The study concludes with an examination of the issues involved in the development of teacher centers and possible resolutions of these issues. Included in the appendixes are a list of Illinois teacher centers and a resource guide to articles on teacher centers.

Hasch, Peg. See Lickona, Tom.

Heidelbech, Ruth Ann. See Sunal, Cynthia Szymanski.


Describes the teacher's center created in the Memphis, Tennessee, schools to provide inservice education on reading instruction.

Horwitz, Robert. See Levin, Corinne.
This report presents the results of a survey of personnel professionally employed in education and training within the United Kingdom in order to assess the potential market for information services in the field of education. The categorization of personnel is based on a two-dimensional matrix in which one axis represents employer or employing institution while the other represents occupational category. The main results of the survey for each of the occupational categories are presented in turn. Individual tables, accompanied by textual commentary, provide data on subcategories within the occupational groups. The totals derived from the individual tables are collated in a group table for each of the three occupational categories and then in a master table covering all occupational categories. Secondary or supplementary information which may be relevant to the planning of information services is also provided.


The basic question addressed in this monograph is whether credentialing pre-service or in-service school-based teacher educators is necessary and desirable. To study this question, a series of related issues were posed and investigated: (1) Is there a need for credentialing? (2) What institution would award the credential, and should recognition be local or statewide? (3) To what extent should individuals and institutions be required to participate in the credentialing system? (4) Would the credential be permanent or renewable? (5) What is the basis for the credential? (6) What procedures would determine the award of the credential? and (7) What would be the form of the credential? In Section I, each of the above issues is discussed. Section II reports a study of professional perceptions concerning each of these issues gathered from 152 educators.

Texas teachers, administrators, and teacher educators in Houston, Galena Park, Abilene, Waco, and Tyler responded to a survey that was completed as part of a regularly scheduled professional meeting. The state Teacher Education and Standards Committee also completed the survey. Section III reports on the deliberations of 85 educators at a state SBTE conference in the spring of 1976. Twelve small groups worked independently to design a system for credentialing (SBTE). Each of these proposals is described with general conclusions. Appendix A concerns the Credentialing/Recognition System for School Based Teacher Educators; Appendix B, the Recognition of SBTE; and Appendix C, a Recognition System for SBTE.


The results of the research and planning activities for the first year's operation of the School Based Teacher Educator (SBTE) project are reported in this document. Two goals were established for the project. The first
was to develop competency specifications and prototype training materials for the school based teacher educator. The second goal was to develop a cooperative network among Texas Teacher Centers for developing the SBTE role. Section I of this report explains the purpose of the project. Section II outlines the organization of the project as it works toward the second goal. The process for specifying competencies involved extensive analysis of the literature, interviews with persons engaged in SBTE, reactions of national experts and state educators, and considerations of clinical practice modes of operation; this process is summarized in Section III. The efforts of the Training Task Force in developing general guidelines for alternate procedures for preparing school based teacher educators are reported in Section IV. Section V explores the basic question of whether credentialing the school based teacher education would increase competency. The project evaluation is reported in Section VI. Section VII lists unpublished project documents that provide greater detail on each project activity. The Recognition System for SBTE is appended.


The goal of this project is twofold: first, to improve teacher education by developing a set of competency specifications for the role of school based teacher educators and developing a prototype set of training materials for this role; second, to develop a cooperative network among teacher centers for developing, training, and recognizing the competence of school based teacher educators. For the purpose of clarifying these goals, this document translates them into six specific objectives. These are: (1) specify competencies for school based teacher educators; (2) design a system to assess the demonstration of those competencies; (3) develop and test training systems for selected competencies; (4) survey interests and concerns of teacher centers regarding the school based teacher educator's competency demonstration; (5) organize a network of teacher centers for interaction with project activities; (6) involve selected teacher centers in prototype and field tests of school based teacher educator training systems. This report includes sections discussing the following topics in detail: (1) an overview of the project; (2) competencies, assessment, and resources for school based teacher educators; (3) instructional materials development (4) building an educational network; (5) external evaluation of the project; and (6) a bibliography of publications on the subject of school based teacher educators.


There is presently a great diversity of objectives within the concept of inservice teacher education; definite standards and guidelines are needed to give a better perspective on the basic goals of this kind of continuing education.

This document presents proceedings of the Midwest Regional Teacher Center Conference, designed to create an awareness of Illinois' teacher centers, as an opportunity for staff development for center personnel, and to provide a forum to explore the potential, rationale, evaluation processes, and vital issues of the teacher center concept. Presented in the document are reports on (1) an overview of center development, funding sources, and future plans in Illinois; (2) an explanation of the rationale behind PL 94-482 (the Teacher Centers Bill) and the role of federal and state agencies in its implementation; and (3) views on teacher staff development and in-service training, history and development of the concept, and political and educational factors responsible for the teacher center movement. The document also reports on (1) work being done in Illinois to coordinate in-service training opportunities for both regular and special education teachers in regional special education, gifted, and teacher centers; (2) implications of PL 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and (3) studies of working models of various forms of teacher center operation and governance.


Jenkins article is a description of the teaching centers established by Appalachian State University in concert with the public school systems in its region.


The Inservice Teacher Education (ISTE) Concept Study gathered information from educational professionals and policy-makers. The resulting mass of information and concepts is presented in this overview of the nature of ISTE and its problems. The general structural problem of ISTE involves the interaction of several dimensions: (1) the governance system, composed of the decision-making structures which legitimize activities and govern them; (2) the substantive system, composed of the content and process of ISTE and that deals with what is learned and how it is learned; (3) the delivery system, including incentives, interfaces between trainees, trainers, and training and staff, which deals with motivation, access, and relevance to the role of the individual professional; and (4) the model system consisting of the forms of ISTE, ranging from sabbaticals abroad to intensive on-site institutes. These dimensions and their interaction are discussed.


This article describes a British program for new teachers during their probationary first year of teaching. The program established courses at teacher centers and provided teacher-tutors in a system that formerly gave no support to beginning teachers.


The role and function of a college of education should continue to be analyzed.


A discussion of the current trends in teacher center development and the impact of the new teacher center legislation. Teacher controlled inservice education will provide new opportunities for professional growth for teachers and the responsibility that teachers accept for improving the conditions for learning.


This report is designed to assist the personnel of organized teacher centers in instituting the School Based Teacher Educators program. The first section explores some basic assumptions and general principles underlying the concept of teacher centering as it is currently being employed, including collaboration, governance, societal role, diversity of opinion, goal specifications, career-long development, research efforts, etc. A standard definition of "teacher center" is offered, built on the premise of collaboration between various segments of the profession. The major members of a teacher center are identified and their roles discussed. An implementation plan is offered, devoted to suggesting objectives, action steps, and assessment procedures for each segment of a management plan: planning, organization, staffing, procedures, governance, and evaluation. A selected bibliography of 24 items concludes the report.

Kirby, Dan. "How Do You Do It and Live To Tell About It?" The University of Georgia Teacher Education Program in English. In English Education, 7, no. 4, Summer 1976, pp. 227-30. EJ144503.

A description and defense of a field centered approach to inservice teacher education.


Excerpts from a few of the many papers submitted for inclusion in this issue.

Kreitzman, Ruth. See Lance, Jeanne.
This directory has three major sections. The foreword is a brief essay describing the purpose of the Teachers' Centers Exchange, the "network" of teachers' centers, and the reasons for compiling and publishing this directory. The second section gives descriptions of 78 teachers' centers in the Exchange's network. These descriptions highlight each center's program, resources, staff, setting, participation, fees and credit, affiliation, support, decision-making, origin, and printed information about the center. The third major section is a list of curriculum publications and materials produced by center staffs or by teachers who work closely with centers. The list is annotated and organized by type of publication (e.g., newsletters and journals) or by curriculum area. The materials listed are available for purchase from the address given.

LaPoint, James D. "A Model for a Physical Education and School Health Education Student Teaching Center." ED137275.

A model student teaching center in physical education was developed in Minneapolis-St. Paul by representatives of the local school district and the University of Minnesota. Twelve advantages resulting from the student teaching program at the center are identified: (1) the curriculum is enriched through the improvement of equipment and resources; (2) student teachers brought new ideas to the center's staff; (3) many student teachers had areas of expertise which improved the center's program of instruction; (4) a more flexible program was offered due to the additional staff; (5) intramural and interscholastic athletic programs functioned more effectively due to additional coaching from the student teachers; (6) interaction with the student teachers encouraged the staff to reexamine their own teaching methods; (7) student teachers enhanced the teaching staff's enthusiasm and spirit; (8) seminar speakers kept the staff up-to-date on current issues and ideas; (9) the involvement with three levels of education enabled the staff to view curriculum in terms of progression and total content; (10) the student teaching program kept the staff in closer contact with the teacher education program at the University; (11) the center's physical education and health education department gained respect and recognition; and (12) the student teachers brought to the staff skills and expertise in new areas. Benefits to the University include: (1) excellent supervision for the student teachers; (2) a progressive program for the student teachers to become acquainted with on a first-hand basis; (3) observational opportunities for sophomore and junior education majors; and (4) assistance for seminars and speakers for curriculum classes.


This teacher-run center provides opportunity for teachers to share ideas and improve skills as well as serving as an information center including an extensive education library, summer workshops, an arts and crafts area,
innovative displays of classroom materials, and advisory services to teachers and the community.


This document supplements the publication of the official regulations of the Teacher Centers Program in the *Federal Register*, January 11, 1978, which is the only source of USOE policy on the Program. The booklet is meant only as an added resource for state education agency personnel but because it further delineates the guidelines, it can be a valuable resource. Discussion includes the role of the state education agency, most commonly asked policy questions and an annotated bibliography. The list of National Teacher Centers Program: State Coordinators, is provided for handy reference.


An evaluative study of teacher centers suggests that they make an impact upon classroom performance of teachers, improving their confidence and their relationship with pupils.


Loucks, Susan F., and Hall, Gene E. "Texas Teacher Center Activities and Networking With Special Attention to School-Based Teacher Educator (SBTE) Activities: Part II. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University, 1976.

This document is the second in a series of evaluation reports by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin, assessing the state of teacher centering in Texas and the effects of the University of Houston's Project on School-Based Teacher Educators (SBTE), initiated to create a network of teacher centers in Texas to develop competency-based training materials and a credentialing system for school-based educators. In the present evaluation, questionnaires mailed to the same individuals queried in the previous survey solicited information on (1) on-going activities of Texas teacher centers, affecting the SBTE project's goals; (2) extent of dissemination and diffusion; and (4) the state of networking among Texas teacher centers, especially with respect to the SBTE innovations. The data obtained serves to inform future decision-making by SBTE Project staff and indicates to what extent the objective of involving teacher centers in an SBTE network are being met. The general conclusion is that the SBTE project has been so far successful in the development and use of diffusion strategies.

Loucks, Susan F. See Hall, Gene E.
A brief overview of the mainstream of development in English primary education in the last 10-15 years is presented and linked to broader educational developments that have facilitated the establishment of teacher centers.


A small center stressing voluntary participation makes information available to teachers for improving sources and ideas for creation of their own curriculum materials, while programmed workshops supplement the work of the center by exploring single topics in depth.


Positive feedback was received on workshops at a Teacher Education Center; however, the author consistently found low teacher participation at the workshops. Data was obtained connecting low attendance to demands on teacher time. This study investigates teacher time demands.


Describing the organization and development of the Brookline Teacher Center in Massachusetts, this article points out the advantages of teacher centers and describes some of Brookline's funding problems.


Funded through local resources and an ESEA Title IV-C Federal grant, Project RISE (Regional In-Service Education) is an inservice center serving teachers, administrators and support staff in public and private schools in eastern central Connecticut. During the planning year, the professional growth needs of teachers of grades K-8 were assessed. Staff development "planning teams" were established at every school in a five-town region. These teams reviewed the needs assessment, cooperatively planned school-based programs to meet the expressed needs, and suggested programs appropriate for town-wide and regional presentation. Today Project RISE serves nine rural towns. RISE consultant/advisors are assigned to a limited number of schools, visiting approximately one-half day per week and/or as requested. The RISE Learning Exchange center
is open for specific hours and has specific themes, people, projects and/or materials. Curriculum development is conducted at the regional level. Project RISE also helps teachers achieve their growth goals. More emphasis is placed on university and community involvement. Decisions are made by a teacher governing board, the school planning teams, the project director, a Teacher Advisory Board, and a Superintendents' Advisory Board. Project RISE's long-range plans are to meet the concerns of all groups—teachers, principals, superintendents, boards.


To respond rationally to the challenges of the next decade, educational practitioners need a solid foundation of professional knowledge.


The objectives of this study are to determine the relationships of curriculum development and inservice activities in British teacher centers under real and ideal conditions, the effects of selected organizational variables on centers, and the degree of teacher involvement in programs. Data were collected from 58 teacher center directors and from visits to 18 centers. Priorities for curriculum and inservice activities differed significantly under real and ideal conditions. Work with individual teachers or schools was favored over national projects. Teacher involvement was related to certain center characteristics and other factors. Implications for the United States are discussed.


The purposes of this study were: to measure the perceived needs for skill training of student teachers, public school teachers, and other educational personnel involved in teaching center activities; to see if some of these needs related to the same underlying concepts; and to profile individual teaching centers according to some of these underlying concepts or factors. Results indicated that subjects felt needs for training in individualizing, stimulation, communication, emphasizing affective growth and expression, supervision, and evaluation. Implications of the findings for supporting responses to individual teaching centers are discussed.


This document is a teacher-developed handbook to the Meridian (Mississippi) Public Schools' Teachers' Center. The materials contained in the handbook include: (1) steps involved in implementing the model; (2) organization charts; (3) center rationale and objectives; (4) teacher center tasks; (5) operation of the center in the areas of teacher renewal, educational reform, curriculum development, and dissemination; (6) organization and functions of a teacher center; (7) a subjective evaluation of the Meridian Teachers' Center; (8) basic economic concepts; and (9) a summary report of research design.
The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) study on teacher education is divided into four sections; (1) placing the problem of the ongoing need for teachers in perspective; (2) policy recommendations to the IBHE on relevant aspects of teacher education; (3) the rationale for recommendations made to the IBHE; (4) ideas and programs that could improve teacher education but would be appropriate as policy recommendations to the IBHE. The appendices contain the subcommittee reports and a national perspective on teacher supply and demand.

This study was designed to determine if there were significant differences in the opinions of two groups of student teachers regarding their teaching experience. One group completed student teaching in a teacher/teaching center, the other completed student teaching outside of a teacher/teaching center. Their opinions were measured with 12 variables of the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire, which was administered to all student teachers completing. Scores for both groups were analyzed by the use of the t-test, and pooled and separate variances estimates were obtained. The results of the study show significant differences in favor of the center-student-teaching group in four of the 12 variables measured: (1) school facilities and services; (2) student-teacher rapport with the principal; (3) curriculum issues; and (4) student-teacher rapport with the students. Significant differences in favor of the non-center group were found in relation to one variable only: student-teacher rapport with other teachers. The data indicated no significant differences between the two groups on the remaining seven variables: (1) teaching as a profession; (2) student-teacher rapport with university supervisor; (3) student-teacher load; (4) satisfaction with housing; (5) professional preparation; (6) student-teacher rapport with supervising teacher; and (7) community support of education. Eight recommendations for student teaching programs are offered in conclusion.

The Georgia State Department of Education engaged in the development of three Career and Vocational Teacher Education Centers (located at the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, and Georgia Southern College) during the 1972-73 school year. Their primary purpose was to provide an interdisciplinary approach to their teacher-education programs by offering more relevant short-term inservice training for teachers and administrators who were beginning to incorporate career education into their respective classrooms and schools. The centers presented workshops during the summer of 1972, provided technical assistance to school districts through onsite visits during the school year, and coordinated the efforts of their own institutional departments in terms of career education. In this final evaluation report, sections 1 and 2 describe the procedures used by the evaluation team in collecting and analyzing data.
obtained from the questionnaires mailed to both summer workshop participants and to nonparticipants. Sections 3 through 6 deal with data presentation, data interpretation, and evaluation findings on a component by component basis for each center. The data presentation and data interpretation for the questionnaire administered to superintendents and principals is described in section 7 along with the information obtained from the onsite interviews and related evaluation findings. Section 8 presents the major recommendations of the evaluation team based upon the evaluation findings.

Mosley, Jo. See Beach, Don M.


Teachers' centers have been established in England and Wales for the purpose of curriculum development and inservice teacher education. The philosophical basis for the centers are the principles that the motive power in curriculum development should come primarily from local groups of teachers accessible to each other and that there should be effective and close collaboration between teachers and all those who are able to offer cooperation. The centers are controlled by teachers and supported by local tax money. The report highlights the current status and organization of teachers' centers at Cheshire, Cornwall, and Surrey; the stated purpose of the centers; and the types of centers. The future direction of the centers is discussed in light of the recommendations made by a Committee of Inquiry Into Teacher Education and Training (the James Report) and an official government White Paper.

Murphy, Michael J. See Dhand, Harry.


This guidebook is written to assist groups planning to create a responsive and efficient teacher center. It includes a general description of teacher centers, goal options, steps in setting up and staffing teacher centers, program management, and facility planning. Examples of work materials, equipment, catalogues, and curriculum materials are given. There is also an extensive bibliography of reading material on the subject. Budget preparation is discussed, and a plan for evaluation of the total teacher center is presented.


A project was designed to demonstrate that the inservice education of adult basic education teachers could be individualized. To accomplish this objective, the project (1) developed a self-instructional training course for teachers of English as a Second Language to adults, (2) used these course materials as the basis for training (on an individualized basis) over 600 teachers of adults in New York State, and (3) distributed nationally the self-instructional training
course materials. The self-instructional nature of the training materials was designed to enable teachers to study on their own, working on individual needs, at their own rates of learning and at times of their own choosing. The materials were also designed to permit teachers to begin study at any point in the academic year. The first half of this document is the project report, which covers background information, objectives, procedures, conclusions, and recommendations. Appendixes comprise the second half and include project correspondence (used with teachers and to set up national dissemination), tables of contents from final versions of the training materials, selections from final versions of the training materials, and the national distribution pattern.


This paper outlines the growth and development of teacher centers in England. These centers grew out of a general dissatisfaction on the part of classroom teachers with existing in-service programs. It was the feeling that certain priorities for teachers were being overlooked, such as methods of dealing with learning difficulties, class organization, developing curriculum, using space wisely, finding new teaching materials and, in general, handling the day-to-day functions of the classroom. Out of these dissatisfactions the English teacher centers gradually took shape. Teachers felt the need to meet as equals for intellectual cross-fertilization, exchange of ideas and practices, and social relaxation. The English teacher center is a flexible and relaxed place on helping and supporting new teachers who are just beginning their classroom experience. The center has become, in effect, a special assisting branch of inservice education.

Nutter, Barbara. See Feaster, Anne.


This document presents regulations regarding the implementation of certain sections of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and governs grants to local educational agencies to plan, establish, or operate teacher centers, and to institutions of higher education to operate teacher centers. The regulation also governs compensation to state educational agencies for services under the program. The document presents the purpose of teacher centers as understood by the legislation, an overview of the program and regulation, a summary of major issues, citations of legal authority, and the actual amendments to Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations regarding grants to the teacher centers program authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

This report on the education professions covers the current federally funded teacher centers, the antecedent Federal role in the development of teacher centers, and teacher center development in several other countries. It is divided into four major categories. Part one contains two articles—one on the history of the Federal role in the development of teacher centers, the other on the scope and rationale of inservice education and teacher centers. In the second part current efforts in teacher center development are discussed with descriptions of several active centers. The third section examines possible new directions for teacher centers. The final part consists of two appendixes: a comprehensive indexed bibliography and a directory of centers.


This "Operations Notebook" is written especially for administrators interested in and concerned about staff administrators interested in and concerned about staff development efforts. The publication attempts to answer such questions as: What is staff development? Who should have it? Where is help available? What pitfalls should be avoided? In answering these questions, the actions of Federal and State government and of colleges, universities, and county offices are examined; three studies on staff development are reviewed; descriptions of functioning programs are given; and the presentation of a principal made to his staff in outlining a process plan for staff development is included.


This is a collection of six papers concerning teachers as innovators. The first is entitled, "The Types of Environment Most Likely to Favor the Active and Effective Participation of Teachers in Educational Innovation." It is concerned with the commitment of the teacher to permanent participation in the adaptation of the education system in the changing context of the professional activity of teaching. It answers two questions: (1) What structures of support and incentives will best help teachers to engage effectively in educational innovation? and (2) What mechanisms of participation, dialogue, and confrontation will best facilitate the implementation of educational innovations. The second paper, "School-Based Curriculum Development and Teacher Education Policy" argues the case for school-based curriculum development, presents a model for school use of the curriculum development, presents a model for school use of the curriculum development process, discusses objections to and difficulties encountered in school-based curriculum development and the implications of school-based curriculum development for teacher education. The third paper is about "Teacher Centres—Some Reflections on the British Experience." The fourth paper, "The Teacher's Role in Curriculum
Development: A French View," addresses the ambiguity of teacher education vocabulary and educational innovations. The fifth paper, "Teachers and New Teaching Techniques: Some French Experiences," points out that the introduction of new teaching techniques is essential as a means of responding to pupils' new demands. The sixth paper, " Teachers and School Buildings," describes the contribution of educators in the provision of new school buildings and the adaptation of existing ones and looks at measures needed to help teachers make full use of the school building as an educational tool.


The article focuses on the needs of secondary teachers in contrast to those of elementary teachers often met by the small, warm independent teacher center. Since secondary schools usually have larger faculties, discipline problems and excessive paperwork, inservice often fails to provide help to teachers in their specialized problems. Through an exploration of the concept of teacher centers and their role in teacher education renewal, the author points out that teacher centers for secondary teachers may take on a different emphasis. Secondary teachers are not neophytes, and have considerable knowledge and expertise in their work; renewal will most likely happen by providing new information or new viewpoints and stimulating teachers to look at different approaches to their responsibilities. The author describes the impact of teacher centers on their clients and cautions about negative as well as positive effects of the movement.


This paper focuses on evaluation questions for teacher centers, with the emphasis being that the question is as important as the answer. The questioning may be ordered in nine points: (1) For whom are the questions and answers useful? (2) What effects are desired? How should teachers change after the program? (3) How will the change be observed/described/measured? (4) What are the success/failure criteria for change? At what level/degree are effects expected? (5) What activities and processes are to be used in effecting change? (6) How will the implementation of selected processes be observed/described/selected? (7) What are the success/failure criteria for process/activity implementations? (8) What is the relationship between processes and change? Is there a relationship? (9) What do the answers to the preceding questions mean? What has been learned that gives a direction for action? When these questions have been answered, and a plan formulated to reflect those answers, evaluation may profitably begin.


The seven case studies presented in this publication are representative of successful programs for the professional development of practicing teachers. They were selected to give a sampling of the variety in programs under way across the country. Two describe teacher centers jointly operated by a
school system and a university; another, a Teacher Corps project involving an R&D laboratory with the university/school district collaboration. Two originated in the staff development offices of public school systems, but differ markedly in their structure; one of these works primarily with a single school site and a single university center toward a specific goal; the other uses the resources of community agencies, area higher education institutions, and individuals for a multitude of discrete offerings. Two programs feature cooperation among several universities; in both of these programs, the roles of teacher organizations, administrator associations, school districts, and state department of education are essential components. The final case study describes the concept of a two-year internship or residency for beginning teachers, how it may be funded, organized, and governed.


This publication chronicles the activities at the June 1977 conference sponsored by the Rhode Island Teacher Center to explore the teacher center model as a means of meeting staff development requirements of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The stated objectives of the conference were as follows: (1) to acquaint professionals in special education programs with the teacher center model as a staff development delivery system; (2) to acquaint professionals in preservice and inservice education with the staff development requirements detailed in the "Comprehensive System of Personnel Development" section of Public Law 94-142; (3) to bring together both types of professionals to discuss such issues as roles, responsibilities, needs, and resources to fulfill the mandates of PL94-142 and the teacher center section of PL94-482; (4) to provide an overview of the products, practices, and research knowledge bases available in these areas; and (5) to present a forum for discussing the regulations for teacher centers authorized by recent federal legislation.


This report summarizes and highlights the major formal activities and outcomes of the Bay Area Learning Center (BALT) conference. Two major areas of concern are (1) teacher centers and (2) knowledge bases. Excerpts from oral presentations, notes from reporters, summaries of discussions, and an interview with the BALT chairperson are presented. A list of conference participants is appended.

Porter, James. See Bolam, Ray.


This paper discusses the development and design of an analysis model for governance of teacher centers organized in consortium form. A consortium is described as "an organization of autonomous bodies or individuals which bond
together by some relatively formal agreement to secure some benefit. The consortium generally functions in a collaborative manner through representatives with authority to act within defined parameters. To analyze the concept of governance, five reference analysis factors have been identified: (1) benefits; (2) control; (3) protectionism; (4) rights; and (5) veto. The basis of the analysis model is couched in asking for questions in reference to each of the five analysis factors: (1) who; (2) what; (3) how; and (4) why. Apply each of these questions to the interactant: center, individual, represented organization, and clientele group. After all questions have been completed, the composite can be drafted for each interactant, for each analysis factor, and for each question. The concept of risk is the final factor. It involves three basics by nature: (1) the amount of resources for which continued existence is not assured; (2) the length of time to which resources are committed; and (3) the proportion of resources committed to a single venture. In the final view, the organizational workability of all the interactants is largely dependent on the benefits realized versus the risks taken and the resources and independence given away.


This 1974 examination of Massachusetts state colleges developed a report centering on six areas of concern in teacher education. (1) "Reform and renewal"—an examination of factors promoting or hindering renewal resulted in proposals to establish projects exploring alternative structures and processes and to evaluate the results for replication. (2) "Supply and Demand"—the educator employment situation indicated that colleges should become multi-career training centers, develop more intensive counseling and placement services, and become more involved in program and certification approval. (3) "Alternatives and Constraints"—colleges should strive to attract the best candidates, provide complete evaluation of all phases of their education product, enhance curriculum flexibility, deploy and fully utilize all existing resources, and develop new programs. (4) "Laboratory Schools"—the laboratory school has evolved from facilities for observation and student teaching into teacher training centers designed for child study, program development, technique dissemination, and preservice and inservice implementation of programs; recommendations were made to develop and expand center role and to facilitate interaction between centers. (5) "Certification and Accreditation"—the certification procedure should be amended to include periodic reevaluation based on continued professional growth, and inservice programs should be expanded. (6) "Partnerships for Teacher Education"—preservice and inservice should be viewed in a continuum, and a collaborative effort of training institutions and school districts should be developed. Appendixes include evaluation instruments, surveys of practices, and a description of a teacher center-college collaborative effort.


The consortium/teacher education council approach to collaboration in teacher education centers seems to close the gap between token school involvement and actual involvement.
Subject-centered conventional education of teachers in the U.S. should be augmented by the growth open to teachers in the informal and innovative atmosphere of teacher centers that develop talents and confidence in the individual and emphasize the more child-centered view that is held in British schools.


This paper presents a "state-of-the-art" in teacher education in the United States. The clinical study of teaching and the rationale for Oklahoma State University's preservice language arts clinical experiences are discussed. An systematically organized structure for the utilization of clinical experiences, the "Teaching Clinic," is described and a documentary of its contribution to improved teaching is presented.


ON-SITE (Oklahoma Nucleus for School Involvement in Teacher Education), an innovative teacher education program, is a cooperative effort between the College of Education at Oklahoma State University (OSU) and the Stillwater Public Schools (SPS). The program was initiated in 1973 and is maintained as a free partnership whose program development is based on the accommodation of the needs and goals of both OSU and SPS. ON-SITE provides early and intensive involvement in elementary education through a three-semester program for university students with junior standing. Participants have the opportunity to work with four different cooperating teachers at different grade levels (K-8) and in different schools in Stillwater. The program provides for a variety of learning experiences related to classroom instruction and management—a designated amount of time is provided for both methods classes and classroom participation. Completion of the program qualifies graduates for the Standard Elementary Certificate (K-8). Students spend six hours per week in elementary classes for two semesters, prior to student teaching, and are expected to work in small groups and with individual pupils under the supervision of both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. At the conclusion of the program, participants will have completed 180 clock hours of classroom observation/participation and nine credit hours (12 weeks) of student teaching. Appendixes contain: (1) schedules; (2) evaluation forms; (3) certificates of accomplishment; (4) teacher certification at OSU; (5) application for admission to student teaching; (6) suggested activities; and (7) a description of ON-SITE.

Rothberg, Robert A. See Sullivan, Timothy J.

This report represents a summary of a larger, on-going investigation in teacher education committed to providing a detailed description of the differences found in teacher center and noncenter programs. Part one describes the design, and then summarizes the findings, of the initial phase of the center study by providing the answers to the six specific questions investigated. Part two includes possibilities and recommendations for subsequent phases of the study. Part three is speculative and questions the adequacy of current models serving as bases for teacher information from eleven separate audiences: early preservice students, cooperating teachers, student teachers, university supervisors, and principals of schools—both in and outside of centers—and center coordinators. The professional induction experience is reflected through a variety of specific training options, supervisory behaviors, and levels of concerns. The analysis of the data consists of comparisons center and noncenter settings, elementary and secondary levels, and between school systems and individual center locations. The basic question underlying the study is whether there are observable differences between centers and noncenters and, if so, what are the distinguishing features. For early preservice students, student teachers, and inservice personnel there appear to be a greater number and variety of exposures to training practices and instructional experiences in centers than in noncenters.

Rutherford, William L. See Bown, Oliver H.


The West Genesee/Syracuse University Teaching Center consists of a three-person staff coordinating supervision of students, organization of staff development programs, and instructional and leadership responsibilities. Financial support is divided between the University and the school district. Tuition credits are offered by the University to the district in exchange for aid in field-based programs; the financial liability incurred from these credit grants is offset by monies from out-of-center, tuition-paying registrants. In addition to a wide range of successfully completed and ongoing projects, the Center has sparked a great deal of pride among participants as well as improved teachers' knowledge of what they as individuals can do to improve their own, and the profession's, standing. Two major tasks facing the Center are: (1) the problem of the gap between theory and practice in preservice education and the narrowing of that gap; and (2) building the district's long-term staff development program.

Seabrook, Patricia. See Hammer, George.


Looks at the future prospects for teachers' centers.
Two specific questions were addressed in the study: (1) Do student teachers from randomly selected in-center situations verbally interact with students differently than randomly-selected non-center student teachers? and (2) Do center student teachers have concerns that are different from those of non-center student teachers? Data was gathered from the Teachers Concerns Checklist and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire completed by both groups of student teachers. Non-center student teachers were placed in metropolitan school settings with no enrichment program input from the university. The teacher education center student teachers participated in a program consisting of: (1) content seminars on discipline, reinforcement strategies, and questioning techniques; (2) an orientation day to acquaint the student teacher with the center prior to the student-teaching experience and to facilitate placement with the cooperating teacher; (3) analysis of their teaching through the use of audio and video tapes several times during the teaching experience; (4) individualized student teaching programs through the use of objectives that were summarized as a basis for their final evaluation; and (5) daily consideration in placing this research in perspective is the lack of a well-developed program at the teacher education center used for this research. Results indicate that in order to make a significant difference, a teacher education program needs to provide experiences that will result in behavioral changes.

Smith, Joyce M. "A Comparative Study of the Verbal Interaction and Concerns of Center Student Teachers With Non-Center Student Teachers." Research paper submitted for the Association of Teacher Educators 1975-76. 1975. ED132144.


Describing existing English provisions for the support of rural in-service teacher needs, this paper reviews: (1) the role of the Local Educational Authority (LEA) and its advisory staff (helping probational teachers, running courses for other teachers, and providing on-going support in the schools); (2) the role of teacher centers (varied in terms of building size and location and the degree of cooperation and coordination afforded the LEA, these centers are described as providing an array of working parties, discussion groups, and workshops focussed on teaching outcomes); (3) national bodies disseminating educational research and project materials (the National Foundation for Educational Research and the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations (the latter having a teacher member majority currently subjected to some criticism); (4) institutional support coming from the University and Polytechnic Departments of Education and the Colleges of Education (since the colleges currently are undergoing drastic reductions, there is increasing opportunity for the remaining colleges to broaden their bases of contribution); (5) the way in which Keswick Hall College of Education (Norwich, England) is currently providing in-service support to rural areas (development of: a course in rural education teacher training, a pilot scheme to involve teachers in the rural areas in the preparation of future teachers, a mathematics curriculum planned and executed in close collaboration with the LEA).
Although general agreement exists about the importance of inservice teacher education, there is general dissatisfaction with its typical large-group implementation. A more successful strategy is to devise inservice programs that are based on the individual objectives of individual teachers. In such programs principals plan cooperatively with each teacher for inservice programs, a variety of options are determined by individual teachers, and evaluation of inservice experiences is based on the degree to which the activity actually assists the teacher to accomplish objectives. Schools using an objectives-based approach to teacher evaluation can develop inservice programs to be evaluated. Seven examples of individualized inservice programs are given.


Involving teachers in program planning and offering new incentives for inservice training, the Osceola Teacher Education Center is a cooperative venture of Osceola County (Florida) and Florida Technological University.

Sunal, Cynthia Szymanski, and Heidelbach, Ruth Ann. "The Impact of Teacher Education Centers and Other Field-Based Models on Student Attitudes." ED137281.

The Purdue Student Teacher Opinionnaire was administered to 142 student teachers in an attempt to measure differences in attitude between student teachers in different preparation programs, in different student teaching situations, and in different program situation interactions. The following factors were examined to determine whether attitudes toward them differed significantly among the selected students: (1) rapport with cooperating teachers, (2) rapport with principal, (3) teaching as a profession, (4) rapport with university supervisor, and (5) professional preparation. The study found significantly more positive attitudes towards the five factors among early childhood and elementary students compared to special education students. No differences were found by placement situation. Significant correlations were found between Rapport With Cooperating Teacher and Rapport With University Supervisor. The study strongly suggests that the variables influencing the attitudes of student teachers during his professional training and student teaching experiences are complex and require a search for adequate models of supervision and the types of situations that produce acceptance and enthusiasm in the student.


This report is organized around six chapters: (1) "How This Institute Came About"; (2) "Agenda"; (3) "Teacher Centering in 1976: The Real Experience"; (4) "Description of Teacher Centers"; (5) "Conference Reactions"; and (6) "Conference Directory of Participants." The first chapter discusses the sponsors, and organizers of the conference. Chapter two lists the events at the three-day convention in blocks of time giving titles, organizers, and short summaries of the individual group sessions. The third chapter provides a sampling of
responses by approximately 250 of the conference participants to two questions: (1) What are your most important needs, the kinds of things you want to deal with during this conference, the issues and problems you want help with most now? and (2) What have been your greatest successes, your greatest "lessons learned", the experience you feel would be most helpful to share with others involved in centering? Chapter four provides brief descriptions of the purpose and activities of the teacher centers represented at the Conference. Chapter five lists comments of participants, and chapter six is an alphabetical listing of those who attended the conference including affiliation and address.


Reviews activities of the Amos De-Shalit Science Teaching Center in Israel, established to promote and improve the teaching of science in Israel.


The continued involvement of teacher organizations in the development of Federal Guidelines for the Teacher Center Program is a reflection of the British model as traced by the author. Teacher Centers in England in the 1960's were the fastest growing sector of British Education. Centers varied in size and approach and were welcomed by the unions in the 1970's as a means for teachers to raise their standards. The author views the fundamental issue both in Britain and the United States as whether or not teachers will gain control over their own professional education.


The general goals of the Center for Indian Education are: (1) the preparation of teachers of Indian children through an instructional program which promotes academic excellence, and (2) to provide educational resources and services to those interested in Indian Education, with emphasis in meeting the needs of the Indian community and the students on campus.


A teacher center serving ten small school districts emphasizes reinforcing teachers' skills in classroom management, individualized instruction, and teacher-made classroom materials.

Reports on how teachers are involved in Florida's teacher centers and what teachers have to say about the accomplishments and problems of those centers.


This monograph is a historical document portraying the problems of starting Florida's first ten teacher education centers (1974-75). Its aim is to provide information to individuals and groups considering active participation in teacher education centers. The document is organized as four sections followed by a bibliography and appendix. The first section, "Teacher Education Centers in Florida: An Overview," discusses the basic concepts of teacher centers and the internal organization of centers. The second section, "Start Up Problems of Teacher Education Centers in Florida," catalogs the problems common to Florida Teacher Centers: deadlines and directives, organizational strain, reward systems, needs assessment, grass roots support, incentives and distractions, and external events. Section three of the document, "Inside Calico Teacher Education Center," is a diary of a hypothetical center council. Section four, "Generalizations from the Florida Experience," summarizes observations about the program. An appendix contains an instrument designed to survey the inservice needs of teachers.


Describes the structure and functioning of a state-supported system of teacher centers and compares it with others.

Walter L. James, and Pettifor, Dale. "Designing a Student Teaching Center in a Middle School Setting." In Teacher Educator, 12, no. 3, Winter 1976-77, pp. 33-36.

An innovative program for student teachers from Indiana University/South Bend involves a full semester of one-half day teaching schedules coupled with in-school seminars on the principles of secondary education.


This guide for inservice teacher education is designed for use by teacher groups in planning inservice. Short substantive narratives are followed by practical exercises to help teachers plan and develop inservice education, find resources, use outside assistance, and understand the potential functions of inservice education. The model presented is essentially an approach to planning, beginning with needs assessment, and continuing through delivery of inservice. Emphasis is placed on the special conditions of rural schools and rural teachers, although the materials are generally useful to others. Topics covered include the following: (1) types of teacher inservice education;
(2) needs assessment; (3) meeting and workshop format; (4) parent/community awareness of inservice-teacher education; (5) release time models; (6) institutions of higher education and local education agency collaboration; (7) funding for inservice education; (8) school board awareness; (9) governance; (10) administrative support; (11) negotiations and inservice; (12) the role of the state department of education; (13) rural teacher centers. A bibliography for further reading follows each of the twelve sections of the manual.


This publication is a compilation of four papers on Teacher Centers commissioned for the seventh annual AFT QuEST Conference in Washington, D.C. Theme: "Forging New Alliances for Quality Education" is explored by Allen Schmieder and Charles Lovett, Teacher Center Program; William L. Smith, Director of the O.E. Teacher Corps Program; Christine San Jose, West Genesee/Syracuse University Teaching Center, and Theresa Lorio, The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development. Speakers emphasize new collaboration brought about by the teacher center movement between LEA, IHE and teacher organizations.


In a structured inservice program, implemented by professional staff, teachers are required to participate a minimum of 48 hours per school year in workshops, seminars, and courses with the goal of individual and curricular improvement and professional advancement.


The first section of this report recapitulates the Texas Teacher Center Project in history. The broad goal of the project is to improve teacher education throughout the state of Texas but, for the purposes of this report, this long-range and generalized goal is categorized into four concrete objectives: (1) changing pre-service education programs; (2) upgrading continuing education of practicing teachers; (3) developing systematic cooperation among educational institutions; and (4) providing a communications and a product installation network for continuation of the improvement process. A preliminary analysis of key components of the Texas Teacher Center Project is presented, and the degree to which the components of the project contributed to identified goals is assessed. Detailed program descriptions from five institutions representing major components of the project are included: the University of Houston, Texas Christian University, West Texas State University, the University of Texas, and Dallas Teacher Training Complex. A summary of findings and tentative conclusions complete the report.


In Florida, a legislatively mandated funding program supports statewide staff development efforts, which are primarily school-based.
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DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.
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18.416—Teacher Centers Program
Closing date
To states: January 31, 1979
To U.S.E.: March 1, 1979

Applications are invited for new projects under the teacher centers program.

Authority for this program is contained in section 528, title IV-B, of the Higher Education Act of 1968, as amended.

(30 U.S.C. 1112a.)

This program makes awards to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education.

The purpose of the awards is to assist local educational agencies in planning, establishing, and operating teacher centers and institutions of higher education in operating teacher centers.

Closing date for transmittal of applications: February 1, 1979.

Applications for awards must be mailed (postmarked) or hand delivered to the appropriate State educational agency by January 31, 1979.

All applications must be submitted to the State educational agency of the State in which the applicant is located, for review by that agency. The State educational agency may then transmit to the U.S. Office of Education those applications that it recommends for consideration and approval by the Commissioner of Education.

State educational agencies may set their own criteria for the review of applications which applicants may wish to take into consideration in addition to responding to the application requirements and evaluation program regulations contained in the teacher centers program regulation. The State criteria (if any) can be obtained by writing to the appropriate State educational agency (see the list of addresses of chief State school officers below).

Applications delivered by mail. An application that is sent by mail must be addressed with five copies (three for the U.S. Office of Education) to the chief State school officer of the State educational agency at the address below. The package in which the application is mailed should be clearly marked: Attention: CFDA 18.416—Teacher Centers Program Application. State review required.

Proof of mailing must consist of a legible U.S. Postal Service dated postmark or a legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service. Private metered postmarks or mail receipts will not be accepted without a legible date stamped by the U.S. Postal Service. (Note—The U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Applicants should check with their local post office before relying on this method.) Applications are encouraged to use registered or at least first-class mail.

Applications delivered by hand. An application that is hand delivered must be taken to the office of the appropriate chief State school officer, during their regular business hours.

Closing date for transmittal of applications to U.S.E. Applications for awards must be mailed in three copies (postmarked) or hand delivered by March 1, 1979.

Applications delivered by mail. Applications sent by mail must be addressed to the U.S. Office of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: CFDA 18.416, Washington, D.C. 20060.

Proof of mailing must consist of a legible U.S. Postal Service dated postmark or a legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service. Private metered postmarks or mail receipts will not be accepted without a legible date stamped by the U.S. Postal Service. (Note—The U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Applicants should check with their local post office before relying on this method.) Applications are encouraged to use registered or at least first-class mail.

Each late applicant will be notified that its application will not be considered in the current competition.

Applications delivered by hand. Applications that are hand delivered must be taken to the U.S. Office of Education, Application Control Center, Room 567A, Regional Office Building 3, Seventeenth and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C.

The Application Control Center will accept hand-delivered applications between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. (Washington, D.C., time) daily, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

Applications that are hand delivered will not be accepted after 4 p.m. on the closing date.

Appeals to the Commissioner. Applicants whose applications are not transmitted to the U.S. Office of Education by the appropriate State educational agency may appeal to the U.S. Commissioner of Education to request further consideration by the State educational agency. Such an appeal, signed by an authorized official of the applicant, must be received at the address given below under "Further Information" by March 9, 1979. Applicants who wish to appeal are encouraged to make their latest known by telephone as the number given below under "further information".
NOTICES

Hon. Charles G. Clark, Superintendent of Education, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 3349, Honolulu, Hawaii 96819.
Hon. Roy Truby, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Boise, Idaho 83708.
Hon. Harold H. Neley, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Indianapolis, Ind. 46206.
Hon. Robert D. Benton, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Des Moines, Iowa 50312.
Hon. James E. Graham, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Frankfort, Ky. 40601.
Hon. E. Swain Killett, Jr., Commissioner of Educational and Cultural Services, State Department of Educational and Cultural Services, Augusta, Maine 04333.
Hon. David W. Horneback, Superintendent of Schools, State Department of Education, Baltimore-Washington International Airport, P.O. Box 2177, Baltimore, Md. 21217.
Hon. Georgia R. Rice, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office of the Superintendent, State Capitol, Helena, Mont. 59601.
Hon. Ralph R. DiSibio, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, 400 West King St., Carson City, Nev. 89710.

Hon. Larence D. DeLay, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87503.
Hon. David R. Shortland, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck, N. Dak. 58504.
Hon. Franklin B. Walter, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio 43218.
Hon. Leslie R. Fisher, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73108.
Hon. Verns A. Duncan, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Salem, Oreg. 97301.
Hon. Martin L. Brockett, Commissioner of Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Tex. 78711.
Hon. Walter D. Talbot, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.
Hon. Frank B. Breault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, Wash. 98504.
Hon. Barbara E. Thompson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison 126 Langdon St., Madison, Wis. 53702.
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Applications are invited for noncompeting continuation projects under the teacher centers program.

The purpose of the awards is to assist local educational agencies in planning, establishing, and operating teacher centers and institutions of higher education in operating teacher centers.

**Closing date for transmittal of applications to State educational agencies.**

To be assured of consideration for funding, applications for noncompeting continuation awards should be mailed or hand delivered by March 1, 1979.

**Applications delivered by mail.** Applications sent by mail must be addressed to the U.S. Office of Education, Application Control Center, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Applications are encouraged to be registered or at least first class mail.

Applications delivered by hand. Applications that are hand delivered must be mailed to the U.S. Office of Education, Application Control Center, Room 5673, Regional Office Building 3, Seventh and D Streets SW., Washington, D.C.

The Application Control Center will accept hand delivered applications between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. (Washington, D.C., time) daily, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

**Appeals to the Commissioner.** Applicants whose applications are not transmitted to the U.S. Office of Education by the appropriate State educational agency may appeal to the U.S. Commissioner of Education through the State educational agency to request further consideration by the State educational agency. Such an appeal, signed by an authorized official for the applicant, must be received at the address given below under “Further Information” by March 9, 1979. An appeal must be received before the State educational agency can consider it.

**Application forms.** Application forms and program information packages are expected to be ready for mailing by October 30, 1978. They may be obtained by writing to the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education (Room 819, Riviere Building), 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Applications must be prepared and submitted in accordance with the regulations, instructions, and forms included in the program information packages.

**Applicable regulations.** The regulations applicable to this program are:


b. The regulations governing the teacher centers program (45 CFR Part 197).

**Further information.** For further information, contact: Dr. Allen Schmitter, Teacher Centers Programs, Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education (Room 819, Riviere Building), 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20202, Telephone 202-685-5839.

**Address of Chief State School Officers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1040 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20202, Telephone 202-653-4834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1716 Inninsway Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>102 Northwestern Avenue, Little Rock, AR 72201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2200 California Plaza, Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1035 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20202, Telephone 202-653-4900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>425 State Avenue, Hartford, Conn. 06115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>300 Dover Avenue, Dover, DE 19901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>401 State Capitol Building, Tallahassee, Fla. 32304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1500 State Office Building, Atlanta, Ga. 30334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>315 State Office Building, Honolulu, Hi. 96814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2016 Stage Road, Boise, Idaho 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1919 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>State House, Indianapolis, Ind. 46200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>220 E. State Capitol Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>12500 Johnson Drive, Topeka, Kansas 66614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>401 State Capitol, Frankfort, Ky. 40601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>801 Capitol Avenue, Baton Rouge, La. 70802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>100 State House Station, Augusta, Maine 04333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>101 Edmondson Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass. 02216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>300 West Square Street, Lansing, Mich. 48923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>220 North 2nd Street, St. Paul, Minn. 55101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>404 Capitol Building, Jackson, Mississippi 39201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1201 State Capitol Building, Jefferson City, Mo. 65101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>505 Capitol Avenue, Helena, Mont. 59620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1000 State Office Building, Lincoln, Nebr. 68508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>400 Nevada State Capitol, Carson City, Nev. 89701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>100 State Street, Concord, N.H. 03301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>160 State Street, Trenton, N.J. 08607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>505 State Capitol, Santa Fe, N.M. 87501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>520 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>310 Executive Office Building, Raleigh, N.C. 27601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>308 North 9th Street, Bismarck, N.D. 58502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>25 State Office Building, Columbus, Ohio 43215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>200 State Capitol, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>900 S. State Street, Salem, Oregon 97310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>100 North 17th Street, Harrisburg, Pa. 17101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1 Smith Street, Providence, R.I. 02905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1000 Main Street, Columbia, S.C. 29201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>312 State Capitol, Pierre, S.D. 57501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>307 Capitol Office Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>100 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3400 State Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>250 State Avenue, Montpelier, Vt. 05637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>500 State Office Building, Richmond, Va. 23260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1119 Grand Avenue, Olympia, Wash. 98501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1800 Capitol, Charleston, W.Va. 25305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>215 State Street, Madison, Wis. 53707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>200 West 15th Street, Cheyenne, Wyo. 82001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hon. Charles G. Clark, Superintendent of Education, P.O. Box 2160, Honolulu, Hawaii 96815.


Hon. Harold H. Negley, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indianapolis, Ind. 46206.

Hon. Robert D. Benton, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.


Hon. James E. Oraham, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Frankfort, Ky. 40601.


Hon. E. Savin Millett, Jr., Commissioner of Educational and Cultural Services, State Department of Educational and Cultural Services, Augusta, Maine 04333.

Hon. David W. Hornbeck, Superintendent of Schools, State Department of Education, Baltimore-Washington International Airport, P.O. Box 5717, Baltimore, Md. 21240.
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Hon. Verne A. Dunce, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Salem, Oreg. 97310.


Hon. Cyril E. Busbee, Superintendent of Education, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio 43216.


Hon. Martin L. Brookette, Commissioner of Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Tex. 78701.

Hon. Walter D. Talbot, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.


Hon. Frank B. Brouillet, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, Wash. 98504.
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Hon. Cyril E. Busbee, Superintendent of Education, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio 43216.


Hon. Martin L. Brookette, Commissioner of Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Tex. 78701.

Hon. Walter D. Talbot, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.


Hon. Frank B. Brouillet, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, Wash. 98504.


Hon. Barbara S. Thompson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin Hall, 126 Langdon St., Madison, Wis. 53702.

federal register
SUMMARY: This regulation implements Section 533 of the Higher Education Act of 1968, as amended, which authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to local educational agencies to plan, establish, and operate teacher centers to serve the area to be served. The regulation also governs compensation to State educational agencies for services under the program. The purpose of teacher centers supported under the program is to provide elementary and secondary school teachers with opportunities for training and curriculum development which meet their needs and enable them to serve better their students. Each teacher center is supported by a teacher center policy board, the majority of which is representative of elementary and secondary classroom teachers in the area to be served.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Under section 481(d) of the General Education Provision Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1233 (d)), this regulation has been transmitted to the Congress concurrently with its publication in the Federal Register. Section 481(d) provides that regulations subject to the section shall become effective on the 45th day following the date of transmission to the Congress, subject to the provisions of the Federal Register action and adjournment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Dr. A. Bruce Gardner, Regional Office Building No. 2, Room 5652, 7th and D Streets, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202. Telephone: 202-245-9788.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM AND REGULATION

Section 533 of the Higher Education Act of 1968 (the Act), as enacted by Section 183 of the Education Amendments of 1970 (Pub. L. 94-452), authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to local educational agencies to assist them in planning, establishing, and operating teacher centers. The statute also authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education with ten percent of the program's funds to operate teacher centers.

Section 533(a)(3) of the Act defines "teacher center" as a site which serves teachers from public and nonpublic schools of a State, or an area or community of schools comprising a teacher center, with the assistance of such consultants and experts as may be necessary, to develop and produce curricula, utilize research findings, and provide training to improve the skills of teachers to enable the teachers to meet better the educational needs of their students.

The regulation implements these provisions by broadly defining the term "site" in §197.2, describing allowable activities of a teacher center in §197.3(b), and clarifying the teacher center's obligation to serve nonpublic school teachers in §§197.3(c) and 197.9(d). Section 197.5(d) of the regulation lists eligible categories of participants in teacher center activities. The teacher center policy board (designated by the regular teacher center) decides which of the indicated categories of eligible participants in addition to regular, full-time elementary and secondary school-teachers may participate in that center's activities.

A key innovative feature of the statute is its provision that each teacher center shall be operated under the supervision of a teacher center policy board, the majority of which is representative of elementary and secondary classroom teachers in the area to be served.

Section 197.11 of the regulation sets forth application requirements for the program. The specific requirements call for information which the Commissioner needs to ensure that the applicant and project are eligible for funding and meet requirements in the statute and regulation, to evaluate applications on a competitive basis under the evaluation criteria in §197.11.

Options on allowable and unallowable project costs are in §197.8 of the regulation.

B. SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES

A notice of proposed rulemaking for the teacher centers program, inviting public comment, was published in the Federal Register on June 13, 1977, and public hearings were conducted in Atlanta, June 21; New York City, June 22; San Francisco, June 27; and Chicago, June 29. During the 30-day period following the date of transmission to the Congress, subject to the provisions of the Federal Register action and adjournment, this regulation takes effect.
of public comment, over 1,800 written suggestions and recommendations were received from interested persons and organizations. A summary of these comments and responses is included as an appendix to this document. The comments and responses are identified by the section of the regulation to which they refer. They are presented in the numerical sequence of the regulation. In each case, a brief heading is used to identify the subject of the comment.

The following paragraphs discuss the major issues and how they are resolved.

1. Payment of released time and substitutes. Under the proposed regulation the use of grant funds to pay the cost of released time or substitutes to enable teachers to use the centers during working hours was allowable only in extraordinary circumstances and with prior approval of the Commissioner. This limitation on the use of Federal funds was intended to encourage teacher participation in the centers, to reduce each center's total cost, and thereby to permit funding of more centers. Public comment was overwhelmingly in favor of allowing each teacher center policy board to determine the extent to which Federal funds are used for released-time and substitutes. The commenters' principal rationale was that teacher involvement in training is too important to be limited to after school hours and that teachers should not be required to give up their free time to participate. The regulation (§197.8) makes the payment of released time or substitutes to permit teacher participation in the center's activities or in the teacher center policy board an allowable cost. To address the concern that these costs will require an excessive proportion of program funds, the criterion in §197.11(g) is changed to consider the proportion of the budget represented by these costs.

2. Exclusiveness of the teacher center policy board. The statute clearly gives the teacher center policy board responsibility for “supervising” the center, and this was reflected in the proposed regulation. However, public comment heavily favored increasing the authority of the teacher center policy board and assuring that the policy boards are closely representative of the teachers in the area to be served. On the other hand, there was significant comment to the effect that if policy boards are allowed to make policy and control the center's budgets, conflicts could arise between the policy boards and the school districts' boards of education. Since the intent of Congress is to give maximum control over the centers to the teachers, the regulation (§197.6(b)) provides several optional methods for selecting the teacher representatives who comprise the majority of the policy boards' members, including permitting the teachers' collective bargaining agent or the local teachers' organization with the largest membership to select teacher representatives. Each of the options provides that teacher representatives be selected, either directly or through their teachers' organization, nominate or select the teacher representatives on the center. Many commenters wanted the regulation to state that the only option for selection of teacher representatives is for the teachers' collective bargaining agent or teachers' organization to select them. While this is an acceptable option, to mandate this option alone would be over regulation by the Federal government.

3. Role of State educational agency. Public commenters were sharply divided over the role of State educational agencies in the teacher centers program and the compensation for the State educational agencies' services. Commenters, especially the teachers and their organizations wanted the role and compensation sharply reduced; the State educational agencies and chief State school officers wanted the reimbursement expanded. The ground was that the teacher center program must become an integral part of the States' overall plans for inservice teacher education. The statute requires that State educational agencies review applications, make comments on the applications, and recommend each application that the State agency finds should be approved. In addition, the statute gives the State educational agencies the role of providing technical assistance to and disseminating information from funded centers. In order to insure that the maximum share of program funds goes for direct support of teacher centers, the one-seventh of total program funds, set aside as compensation for the State educational agencies service in the proposed regulation, is reduced to one-tenth in the final regulation.

4. Grants to institutions of higher education. Section 532(f) of the statute provides that up to ten percent of the total program funds may be expended directly by the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education to participate only by contracting with a local educational agency which receives a grant from the Commissioner. Section 532(f) does not expressly address whether an application from an institution of higher education must be submitted through a State educational agency. The regulation (§197.9) provides that the Commissioner may make grant awards directly to institutions of higher education in contrast to section 532(a), which authorizes institutions of higher education to participate only by contracting with a local educational agency that receives a grant from the Commissioner. Section 532(f) does not authorize the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education that are "subject to the other provisions of this Section," which would include provisions for applications to be submitted through a State educational agency. In requiring submission of applications by institutions of higher educ-
tion through the State educational agencies, the regulation reinforces the important role of the State educational agencies in providing technical assistance to, and disseminating information from, funded centers.

(c) Definition of the term "operate." Section 532(k) of the statute authorizes grants to local educational agencies "to operate" teacher centers. This contrasts with the language in section 532(a)(1) which authorizes grants to local educational agencies "to assist such agencies in planning, establishing, and operating teacher centers." Section 197.5(b) of the proposed regulation gave effect to this difference in authorizing language by mandating institutions of higher education eligible for grants only if the teacher center would be in operation at the end of the grant period. Some commenters supported the proposed language in § 197.5(b). However, most commenters objected to the proposed language and argued that it would give no effect to the difference in authorizing language. Institutions of higher education eligible for grants were those institutions of higher education which had already been planned and established using other resources. In response to the public comment and so as to follow more closely the statutory language, § 197.5(b) is changed to make institutions of higher education eligible only for grants "to operate" teacher centers. However, there is no evidence of congressional intent to limit eligibility to only those institutions of higher education which are already operating a teacher center. Under § 197.5(b), an institution of higher education eligible for a grant to operate a proposed teacher center but, unlike a local educational agency, is not eligible for a grant to assist in planning or establishing the new center. Therefore, an institution of higher education must pay the cost of planning and establishing a new teacher center out of funds from sources other than the teacher centers program.

5. Evaluation criteria. Section 197.11 of the proposed regulation contained the criteria which the Commissioner proposed to use in evaluating applications for grants (except applications for continuation grants under § 197.71). Many commenters suggested additional criteria or recommended changing or deleting the proposed criteria. Several commenters asked for changes in the number of points assigned to each criterion. In general, the commenters recommended that more emphasis be given to the qualifications of the proposed teacher center staff, to measures for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, the effective use of a "needs assessment" in planning the center's activities, and to the objectives of the proposed center. The emphasis was placed on the degree of teacher participation and representation, and not enough on the quality of the proposal and its potential to increase the effectiveness of the teachers served.

In response to the public comment, § 197.11 is changed to: (1) Increase the total number of points from 70 to 100; (2) add a criterion on the extent to which Federal funds will support new or expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources.

6. Participation by teachers from non-public schools. Section 532(a)(2) of the statute states that a teacher center "serve teachers, from public and non-public schools," and section 532(b) states that the majority of the participants on the teacher center policy board shall be "representative of elementary and secondary classroom teachers to be served by such center." Section 197.3(a) of the proposed regulation prohibited the policy board from providing that a teacher center "serve teachers employed in both public and non-public schools if non-public schools are located in the area to be served and choose to participate in the teacher center." Most commenters agreed with the regulatory requirement that non-public school teachers be served by a teacher center. However, there was some opposition to representation of non-public school teachers as part of the classroom teacher majority on the teacher center policy board. One rationale was that teachers in non-public schools are required to meet the minimum standards for licensure and certification. These comments also argued that section 532(b) of the statute does not specifically require that the teacher majority of the board include representation of non-public school teachers. Other commenters opposed the inclusion of teachers from segregated schools and academies among the majority members of the policy board or as beneficiaries of the center's services. One commenter recommended that the regulation be changed to allow non-public schools accredited by the State educational agency to participate.

Reading section 532(a)(2) and section 532(b) of the statute together, the Commissioner, in § 197.11 of the regulation interprets the statute to require representation of non-public school teachers as part of the teacher majority on the policy board. Section 197.3(a) of the regulation recognizes that there may be no non-public schools in the areas to be served; or that the non-public schools in a service area may choose not to participate. Section 197.3 of the regulation is changed to add a definition of non-public school in response to the comments concerning non- accredited or substandard private schools. Under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 2000d-2000d-4), teachers from institutions which discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin may not participate in or benefit from programs supported by Federal funds.

7. Definitions of "teacher," designation of eligible participants. In response to a large number of comments, which recommended that the teacher center policy board be authorized to designate the categories of persons eligible for participation in elementary and secondary classroom teachers, and to participate in the activities of a teacher center, the regulation is changed to clearly distinguish between teachers who are eligible for membership in the teacher center policy board, and all other eligible participants. In keeping with the statutory requirement, "teacher" is defined by the Commissioner (§ 197.2) as only teachers employed in classroom elementary or secondary school students, including a special education or vocational education teacher. On the other hand, all other non-teachers may participate in the teacher center policy board (after it has been constituted) broad latitude for determining who, in addition to teachers, may participate in the center's activities. § 197.11(b) gives an inclusive list of eighteen categories of persons, any of all of whom may be designated by the policy board as additional categories of eligible participants. There was considerable support from commenters for the regulation that the teacher board, and all other eligible participants, have the right to invest "supervision," i.e., control and management of the centers, in those who are engaged full-time as teachers. The preponderance of public comment supported this position.

C. Citations of Legal Authority

As required by section 431(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221(a)), a citation of statutory or other legal authority for each section of the regulation has been placed in parentheses on the line following the text of the section. References to "sec." in the citations of authority following provisions of the regulation refer to sections of the Higher Educa-
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(30 U.S.C. 1119a(2).)

(2) Each grant under this part is subject to applicable provisions contained in the general provisions regulations of the Office of Education (Parts 100 and 101a of this chapter), except that the criteria in § 100a.20(b) do not apply to applications under this part.

(3) Purpose. The purpose of the teacher centers program is to meet the educational needs of teachers as defined by teacher center policy boards, thus enabling teachers to meet better the educational needs of their students by-

1. Providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for planning, establishing, and operating teaching centers; and
2. Providing financial assistance to institutions of higher education for operating teaching centers.


§ 197.2 Definitions.

As used in this part:

(a) “Teacher” means only a regular teacher. The teacher center, is defined by teacher center policy boards, and the State board of education or other agency designated by the State board of education for the purpose of formulating recommendations for subcontracting to secure technical and other kinds of assistance.

(Interprets Sec. 533(b), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(b).)

(b) “Teacher” means only a regular, full-time classroom teacher engaged in teaching elementary or secondary school students, including a special education or vocational education teacher.

(Interprets Sec. 533(b), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(b).)

(c) “State educational agency” means the State board of education or other entity or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law (Sec. 1201(f), 20 U.S.C. 1114(h)).

“Supervision” means the setting of policy and any appropriate managerial or supervisory activities not prohibited by State or local law (e.g., the employment of certifying staff, consultants or experts, and regulating and expending funds, an administrative officer or agency designated for the purpose of one, or a combination of the above).

(Interprets Sec. 533(b), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(b).)

Teacher must have all of the following elements:

(a) Area served. It serves teachers employed in both public and nonpublic schools (if nonpublic schools are located in the area to be served and choose to participate in the teacher center).

(1) A portion of single school district.

(2) An entire school district.

(3) Any number of school districts in a State short of the total number of districts; or

(d) An entire State.

(b) Activities. The teachers it serves are afforded the opportunity to-

1. Develop and produce curricula (including the modification or adaptation of existing curricula) designed to meet the educational needs of the students served by the teacher center;

2. Use educational research, findings, or new or improved methods, practices, and techniques in the development of the curricula;

3. Provide training designed to—

(i) Enable the teachers to meet the special educational needs of the students they serve (including training to enable teachers to implement effectively specific curricula); and

(ii) Familiarize the teachers with developments in curriculum and educational research, including the use of research to improve teaching skills.

(See Sec. 533(a),(2), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(a)(2))

(c) Grantee. The teacher center is operated by a local educational agency, an institution of higher educa-

(Interprets Sec. 533(a),(2), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(a)(2))
§ 197.4 Teacher center policy board.

(a) Composition. Each teacher center must be operated under the supervision of a teacher center policy board composed of:

(1) The majority of the members of the policy board shall be representative of all the teachers in the area to be served by the center, including teachers who are in full-time nonprofessional employment at schools, teachers and teacher aides, and teachers of paraprofessionals, teachers at both elementary and secondary levels; if the center has a policy board composed of all the teachers in the area to be served which choose to participate in the teacher center; and

(2) Another method which permits teachers generally, either directly or through their teachers' organization, to nominate or select the teacher representatives on the board; or

(A) Agreement between the local educational agency and the teachers' collective bargaining agent as to the specific teacher representatives or as to the procedures for selecting the teacher representatives;

(B) Appointment of the teacher representatives by the teachers' collective bargaining agent;

(C) Appointment of the teacher representatives by the teachers' organization with the largest number of members;

(D) Voting in which all teachers in the area to be served by the center have an opportunity to participate, either through a general school-by-school election; or

(E) Another method which permits teachers generally, either directly or through their teachers' organization, to nominate or select the teacher representatives on the board.

(b) The options described in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph apply both to teacher centers serving teachers within a single local educational agency and to centers serving teachers in more than one local educational agency.

(c) In the case of a teacher center serving an entire area, in addition to the options in clauses (A) through (E) of this subdivision, (2) The options described in subparagraph (1)(ii) of this paragraph apply both to teacher centers serving teachers within a single local educational agency and to centers serving teachers in more than one local educational agency.

(d) The Commissioner may, after setting aside funds for other purposes, include in the amount set aside for the center such sum as the Commissioner deems advisable to reflect the needs and the resources available to the center.

§ 197.5 Categories of financial assistance.

The Commissioner makes grants of financial assistance-

(a) To local educational agencies to plan, establish, or operate teacher centers;

(b) To institutions of higher education to operate teacher centers. Grant funds may be used by an institution of higher education to plan or establish a teacher center, but may be used to operate a center opened and established with other funds before or after the grant is made.

§ 197.6 Distribution of funds.

(a) The Commissioner sets aside ten percent of the amount appropriated under the teacher center program to fund applications from institutions of higher education to operate teacher centers. Provided, That there are sufficient applications from institutions of higher education which receive the set-aside minimum to be considered for funding under the evaluation criteria in § 197.11.

(b) After setting aside funds for grants to institutions of higher education under paragraph (a) of this section and for compensating State educational agencies for their functions under § 197.13, the Commissioner uses the remaining funds for grants to local educational agencies under § 197.5(a).

(c) In the case of a joint grant to a combination of one or more institutions of higher education and one or more local educational agencies, the amount of the grant charged to the 10 percent set-aside for institutions of higher education is determined as follows:

(1) According to the amount budgeted in the approved application for institutions of higher education; or

(2) If separate amounts for applicants are not budgeted in the application, according to the ratio of institutions of higher education to all recipients of the grant.

(Interprets Sec. 532(a), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(a))

§ 197.7 Project duration.

(a) The Commissioner approves projects under this part for a specified project period which generally will not exceed 36 months, subject to the availability of funds.

(b) An applicant for assistance may project the goals and activities over a period of one to three years. Approval of a multi-year project is intended to offer the project a reasonable degree of stability over time and to facilitate additional long range planning.

(c) An application proposing a multi-year project must be accompanied by an explanation of the need for multi-year support, an overview of the objectives and activities proposed, and budget estimates to attain those objectives in any proposed subsequent years.

(d)(1) Subject to the availability of funds, an application for assistance to continue a project during the project period will be reviewed on a noncompetitive basis to determine the degree to which:

(i) The grantee has complied with the award terms and conditions, the Act, and applicable regulations, and

(ii) The effectiveness of the project in attaining its goals, or the constructive changes proposed as a result of the ongoing evaluation of the project.

(2) In the case of an application to establish or operate a teacher center which would continue a prior planning.
1197.6 Allowable and unallowable costs. (a) Allowable costs under grants to local educational agencies or institutions of higher education under the teacher centers program include—

(1) Personnel costs related to the management of the centers;

(2) Services of consultants and experts;

(3) Service contracts, including service contracts with institutions of higher education;

(4) Released time or payment for substitutes to enable teachers to participate in center activities of the teacher center;

(5) Expenses of the teacher center policy board, including payment of released time or substitutes to enable its teacher members to participate in activities of the board, but not including the expenses of preparing an application for a grant under the teacher centers program;

(6) Other direct and indirect costs incurred by the grantee in carrying out its approved plan of operation, subject to the applicable cost principles set forth in the appendices to subchapter A of this chapter.

(1197.6)(2) and (e), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(a)(2) and (e).)

(b) The following are not allowable costs:

(1) Construction of facilities; and

(2) Remodeling of facilities.

(1197.6)(a)(2) and (e), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(a)(2) and (e).)

§1197.7 Application requirements.

The Commissioner awards a grant to an eligible local educational agency or institution of higher education upon the application of the agency or institution. The application shall be submitted to the Commissioner through the State educational agency of the State in which the application is located.

(a) Each application must include:

(1) Designation of the specific area, school district(s), and schools, both public and non-public, to be served by the center;

(2) Documentation of a teacher center policy board—

(i) Has been established, including information on the membership of the board and the method of its selection, and

(ii) Has participated fully in the preparation of the application and has approved it as submitted;

(3) A statement of the means for assuring equitable participation by non-public school teachers on the teacher center policy board and in receiving the center's services, or documentation that there is no non-public school in the area to be served, or that no public schools in the area to be served have chosen to participate;

(4) A one-page abstract of the proposed project;

(5) A plan of operation which must include—

(i) A statement of the special educational needs of the students to be served by teachers participating in the center, and an explanation of how those needs were determined;

(ii) Information which provides a basis for evaluating the application under each of the criteria in §1197.11.

Failure of an application to contain information responding to a particular criterion in §1197.11 will mean that the applicant will not earn points attached to that criterion.

(b) With respect to applications to operate an existing teacher center, the application, in addition to meeting the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, must contain the following:

(1) A description of the activities of the center during the preceding year, and the cost thereof;

(2) A description of the sources of funding of the center during the preceding year; and

(3) A statement of the kinds of activities that will be undertaken to improve the existing center by use of the Federal assistance requested.

§1197.10 Review of applications by State educational agencies.

The Commissioner will not approve an application unless:

(a) The State educational agency of the State in which the applicant is located has reviewed the application, made comments thereon, recommended that the application be approved, and submitted the application to the Commissioner for approval; and

(b) The appropriate State educational agency has given an assurance that it will provide technical assistance to the proposed center and adequately disseminate information derived from the center, including information on how the State educational agency will carry out the technical assistance and dissemination of a projected budget for those activities.

(1197.10)(a)(2) and (e), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(d).)

§1197.11 Evaluation criteria.

Applications for grants (except applications for continuation grants under §1197.7) are evaluated by the Commissioner on the basis of the criteria in this section. Each criterion will be considered with the total for all criteria being 100 points. An application must receive a minimum of 50 points to be considered for funding. In evaluating an application, the Commissioner considers:

(a) The extent of the teacher center policy board's authority and responsibility for supervision of the project (10 points);

(b) The potential of the proposed teacher center for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students (20 points);

(c) The extent of the proposed plan of operation, including consideration of the extent to which—

(1) The objectives of the proposed projects are clearly stated and capable of being attained by the proposed procedures (10 points); and

(2) The adequacy of provisions for reporting the effectiveness of the project and dissemination of its results, and for determining the extent to which the objectives are accomplished (10 points);

(d) The appropriateness of size, scope, and duration of the project so as to secure productive results (5 points);

(e) The adequacy of qualifications and experience of personnel designated to carry out the proposed project (5 points);

(f) The adequacy of the facilities and resources (5 points);

(g) The reasonableness of estimated costs to generate comparability to anticipated results, including the proportion of the budget represented by costs for released time or substitutes (5 points);

(h) The potential of the teacher center to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall-program of inservice training for teachers (15 points);

(i) The representativeness of the teacher center policy board under §1197.6(b) (10 points).

(1197.11)(a)(2) and (e), 20 U.S.C. 1119a(d).)

§1197.12 Right of appeal.

Any local educational agency or institution of higher education that is dissatisfied with the recommendation of the State educational agency regarding its application under the teacher centers program may petition
the Commissioner to request further consideration of the application by the State educational agency.

(Sec. 532 (c)(2) and (d), 20 U.S.C. 1119a (c) and (d).)

§ 197.13 Compensation to State educational agencies.

(a) The Commissioner compels State educational agencies for the cost of the following services performed in connection with the teacher centers program:

1. Reviewing applications and providing comments thereon.
2. Submitting of recommended applications to the Commissioner.
3. Providing technical assistance to funded centers. Allowable technical assistance expenses of the State educational agency may include consultative services rendered at the teacher center site, workshops and conferences to provide information to teachers (including an exchange of information among teacher centers), and activities of the State educational agency to obtain information on the potential necessity to the provision of technical assistance to funded centers in its State.
4. Disseminating information resulting from activities of funded centers.

(Implements Sec. 532(c) and (d), 20 U.S.C. 1119a (c) and (d).)

(b) The Commissioner sets aside one-tenth of the amount appropriated for the teacher centers program for the compensation of State educational agencies, which sum will be disbursed according to the following stipulations:

(1) Compensation for the combined services noted in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph (a) of this section is at a rate per application set by the Commissioner to not exceed prevailing rates for similar services.

(2) The remainder of the sum reserved for State educational agencies is made available to carry out functions described in subparagraphs (3) and (4) of paragraph (a) of this section.

(3) A State educational agency is compensated for the technical assistance it provides to, and the dissemination of information from, each funded teacher center in an amount for each center no more than that which bears the same ratio to the total funds available for these functions as the amount of the grant award to the teacher center bears to the total funds awarded to teacher centers in the fiscal year.

(Implements Sec. 532(d), 20 U.S.C. 1119a (d).)

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The comments which follow came from (1) teachers, administrators, and interested persons and members of the Office of Education staff, (2) correspondence (nearly 1500 specific recommendations), (3) personal visits by interested persons to the Office of Education, and (4) public comment. The large number of letters expressed a wide range of views on the information made possible to the provision of technical assistance to funded centers. The Commissioner suggests the subject of the comments and does not appear in the regulation. The section numbers are those of the corresponding sections of the regulation.

§ 197.1 Waiver of the regulation.

Comments.

A commenter recommended that the regulation be amended to waive the regulation (i.e., exempting from the regulation) under extraordinary circumstances where the applicant might have with State departments of education a cooperative relationship they have with State departments of education in teacher training and certification justifying the waiver of the maximum set aside authorized by the statute. Since the majority of members of the policy board under a grant to an educational agency or an institution of higher education would have substantially staffed the deficiency in teacher education which has existed before.

§ 197.2 Preference for one site over another.

Comments. A commenter asked whether an application prepared by a teacher center policy board can be submitted for review and evaluation even if it is not approved by the local educational agency. An application cannot be reviewed or evaluated if it has not been approved by the local educational agency. Under the local educational agency's authority to operate teacher centers, the policy board of the teacher center shall not be authorized to provide for the waiver of the regulation.

§ 197.1 Elimination of participation by institutions of higher education.

Comment. A few comments urged that the participation of institutions of higher education as grantees be minimized. Some wanted all participation of institutions of higher education eliminated entirely. Others suggested that institutions of higher education be required to compete with local educational agencies, subject to the ten percent ceiling in the statute. A justification given was that the statute gives the Commissioner discretion to use up to ten percent of funds for teacher training and to institutions of higher education. The comments are grouped under the following captions: from institutions of higher education, from colleges and universities, from state departments of education, and from local educational agencies.

§ 197.2 Curriculum a prerogative of the State and local authorities.

Comment. Several commenters saw potential conflict between the curriculum development and instruction of teacher centers and the fact that determination of the schools' curriculum is a prerogative of the State and local educational agencies in the context of State and local law. These commenters asked for clarification of this issue.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The regulation is intended to resolve this issue by defining "supervision."
may, of course, not exceed the limits prescribed by the State or local law. This is not considered an additional category for further regulation by the Commissioner. 

1197.2 Meaning of “supervisory.” 

Comment. A commenter asked for further clarification of the term “supervisory” as it relates to the functions of the teacher center program. Another commenter advised that the policy board and/or the eligibility of persons to serve on the board would be determined by the governing board of the State. The commenter further stated that the director of the teacher center policy board must be “representative of elementary and secondary classroom teachers to be served and of those students who perform allied work which results in spiriting of teacher changd to state, ‘Teacher” defined to include all persons who perform technical assistance activities by local educational agencies. In §1197.3(d) of the regulation is changed to broaden the categories of persons eligible to participate in teacher center activities. The definition of “technical assistance” in §1197.3(d) of the regulation is deleted from §1197.3, with the effect that the definition applies to the word “teacher” throughout the regulation. 

1197.2 Eligibility of State agencies other than State educational agencies to apply for assistance. 

Comment. A commenter requested that the definition of local educational agency in §1197.2 include those State agencies which are not part of the education system of the State educational agency, but which nevertheless provide elementary and secondary education to special classes of students. Another commenter requested that the definition of local educational agency in §1197.2 be taken directly from the Higher Education Act. It would include public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of local educational agencies as the State may designate in a State as an educational agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. 

1197.2 Eligibility of Indian tribal organizations. 

Comment. A commenter requested that the definition of educational agency in §1197.2 be clarified to define Indian tribal organization as eligible applicants. 

Response. The statute limits eligibility to “educational institutions or agencies having the same legal status as Indian tribal organizations. It has been defined as a political subdivision of the United States and in the Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act, Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (the Bilingual Education Act) and in the Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act, Title III of Pub. L. 81-874, local educational agencies are qualified to receive additional language is. These statutes and their legislative histories indicate the understanding of the Congress that the term “local educational agency” does not, without more specific language, include Indian tribal organizations. While Indian tribal organizations therefore are not generally eligible, particular tribal organizations may qualify as local educational agencies under a particular State’s law to administer or control or to perform a service function for a public elementary or secondary school. 

1197.2 Definition of technical assistance. 

Comment. Several commenters asked that the term “technical assistance” be defined in §1197.2. 

Response. A definition of “technical assistance” is not added to §1197.2. However, §1197.3(d) is changed to indicate the scope of technical assistance activities by the State educational agency. 

1197.3 Persons to be served by a center. 

Comment. Many commenters objected to the limitations in §1197.3(d) regarding categories of persons to be served by a teacher center. Some recommended the specific inclusion of certain additional categories, such
as counselors, paraprofessionals, principals, administrators, supervisors, public school teachers assigned to teach adults,5
teachers who work with students in extracurricular activities, members of teacher associations, and
officials of teachers' organizations, parents who assist with the program of instruction, librarians,
and college professors. Some commenters strongly supported the inclusion of teachers from non-public schools among those to be served by the centers. Other commenters urged that the teacher center policy board have full authority to deter-
mine what categories of persons are eligible to be served by a center. A large number of commenters felt that the policy board is in the best position to make decisions in this matter. One commenter was concerned that inclusion of "non-professional people—alides and para-
professionals—as teachers, diluted the voice of the real teachers." Another commenter felt that administration of the program should be excluded. One large group of commenters wanted school administrators included in the composition of the teacher center policy board, and recommended that their participation not be an option of the teacher center policy board.

197.3 Access to teacher centers.
Comment. Several commenters felt that the size of a teacher center should be limited by regulation to ensure that all centers supported by Federal funds would provide reasonable access to the local teachers to be served.

197.3 Access to teacher centers.
Response. Section 552.4(c) of the statute specifically provides that a center may serve teachers from an entire State, The Commission may not by regulation forbid this option.

197.3 Clarification of the term "area."
Comment. A commenter was confused by the definition of "area" in § 197.2 and the use of the same word in § 197.3(a). Another commenter asked who determines the area to be served by a center.

197.3 Clarification of the term "area."
Response. The definitions of "area," and "community" in § 197.2 are deleted, and a new definition of "area" is added. Under § 197.3(a), the applicant and the teacher center policy board decide the extent of the area to be served by the center. (1) A single school district, (2) an entire school district, (3) any number of school districts in a State school census area, (4) the entire State.

197.3 Courses for graduate school credit.
Comment. Several commenters urged that the regulation specifically permit teacher centers to organize inservice training courses for which graduate school credit may be granted.

197.3 Courses for graduate school credit.
Response. No change is made in the regu-
lation. The substance of teacher center pro-
grams is to serve teachers at the elementary and secondary levels, not postsecondary. The statutory authority for which to provide retraining described by the commenter is clearly allowed.

197.3 Reorganization of teachers to meet changing personnel needs.
Comment. A commenter wanted the regu-
lation to make it clear that a federally-sup-
ported teacher center must provide retraining for teachers who teach subjects for which there are declining enroll-
ments, to enable them to teach in other fields where the demand is greater.

197.3 Reorganization of teachers to meet changing personnel needs.
Response. No change is made in the regu-
lation. Nothing in the regulation prevents the teacher center policy board from cooper-
ating with credit-granting institutions and organizing courses or any other kind of appropriate training.

197.3 Teacher center staff.
Comment. Several commenters objected to what they perceived as over-emphasis on re-
search in § 197.3(b) and (c). One commenter urged that the regulation provide for emphasizing training of a university classroom style rather than revitalization through experience, sharing and personal decision making.

197.3 Teacher center staff.
Response. No change is made in the regu-
lation. The substantive programs of teacher centers should be determined by the applicant and the teacher center policy board, within the limits of Federal law, and within the scope of the activities described in § 197.3(b).

197.3 Preference for consortia or combinations of applicants.
Comment. A commenter wanted to know whether the regulation permits a preference for applications from combinations of eligible applicants, such as a local educational agency in combination with one or more institutions of higher education. The regulation does not give a preference in this matter. Each project ap-
plication will be reviewed and evaluated on its own merits.
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§197.3 Required or voluntary participation.
Comment. A commenter urged that participation by teachers or other eligible persons in a teacher center's program be entirely voluntary.
Response. No change is made in the regulation. The decision as to whether participation is voluntary or required is left to the applicant and the teacher center policy board.

§197.3 Clarification of the term "participation.
Comment. A commenter wanted clarification of the term "participation" in the case of an application by a combination of institutions of higher education and/or local educational agencies.
Response. In the case of a joint application from a combination of eligible applicants, a joint application must be submitted with separate budgets for each applicant, the Commissioner has the option of awarding separate grants to each applicant or one joint award with separate budgets for each, as provided in 45 CFR 100.a.18.

§197.3 Teacher centers to serve teacher centers.
Comment. A few commenters requested that the regulation be changed to allow funding of centers whose primary function would be to train the staff and directors of other teacher centers, to provide for discussion and consultation among them, and to operate "model or demonstration centers.
Response. No change is made in the regulation. The activities of a teacher center in §197.3(b) are taken directly from Section 538(a)(2) of the statute. The statute does not authorize the funding of centers whose primary function would be to train the staff and directors of other teacher centers. As defined in §197.3(b), the purpose of a teacher center is to serve teachers within a given service area. It should be noted that most of the services called for in the comment can be provided by the appropriate State educational agency.

§197.4 Membership on teacher center policy board.
Comment. Several commenters asked that the regulation clarify that various categories of persons, other than those specifically prescribed by the statute, may be selected to serve on the teacher center policy board.
Response. The regulations are clarified to require that representation of parents, principals, librarians, and other adults on the teacher center policy board be "individuals representative of or designated by the school board of the local educational agency served by such center" (emphasis supplied). This is interpreted to require that at least one individual on the board must be an individual from each school board. The school board of each local educational agency must be represented on the teacher center policy board. This does not mean that each individual must be an individual from each school board, but it does mean that schools boards will have to agree upon individuals to represent them.

§197.4 Representation of the local school boards on the teacher center policy board.
Comment. A commenter noted that Section 538(b) of the statute calls for "individuals representative of, or designated by, the school board of the local educational agency served by such center" on the teacher center policy board. The commenter wanted a clarification of the course to be pursued in case of a combined or university board. The commenter applies for Federal assistance to operate a teacher center for several local educational agencies, each with its own board. The regulations are clarified to require that representation of school boards on the teacher center policy board be "individuals representative of, or designated by the school board of the local educational agency served by such center" (emphasis supplied). This is interpreted to require that at least one individual on the board must be an individual from each school board.

§197.4 Objection to "proportional numerically.
Comment. Several commenters pointed out the difficulty in making the categories of teachers on the teacher center policy board (e.g., vocational education teachers, special education, and other classroom teachers) both "comparable" and "comparable" (i.e., comparable on a school district level) proportional numerically to the categories of teachers to be served, including equitable representation of non-public
school teachers. These commenters requested that the requirement of numerical proportion be eliminated on the basis that it would cause school boards and districts to be incapable of supervising the teacher center. One commenter wanted to know whether teachers who are represented only by non-accredited agents or by non-public school teachers would be presumptively excluded from representation on the board.

Response. The regulation as amended continues to require representation of public school teachers among those participating in a program or activity, but it does not require representation by non-public school teachers. The requirement is intended to provide representation of non-public school teachers, if those teachers are eligible to participate in such a program or activity.

§197.2 Definitions.

Comment. A commenter recommended that the definition of non-public school teachers be changed to specify that only those teachers who serve in dependent or private schools or in institutions of higher education be excluded. A comment was made that the definition is ambiguous and should be rewritten to clarify what is included.

Response. The definition of non-public school teachers is unchanged.

§197.3 Selection of the representatives of non-public schools.

Comment. A commenter requested that the requirement of numerical proportionality be eliminated. The commenter suggested that the policy board should be elected by the teachers who are to be served, and that teachers who are not eligible to participate in the policy board should be given no voice in the selection of members.

Response. The requirement of numerical proportionality is retained.

§197.4 Selection of the representatives of non-public school teachers from the board.

Comment. A commenter recommended that the board be elected by the teachers who are to be served, and that teachers who are not eligible to participate in the policy board should be given no voice in the selection of members.

Response. The requirement of numerical proportionality is retained.

§197.5 Selection of the representatives of a statewide teacher center.

Comment. A commenter recommended that there be a provision for the election of representatives by teachers who are not eligible to participate in the policy board. Another commenter requested that the board be elected by the teachers who are to be served.

Response. The requirement of numerical proportionality is retained.

§197.6 Selection of the representatives of non-public school teachers from the board.

Comment. A commenter recommended that the board be elected by the teachers who are to be served, and that teachers who are not eligible to participate in the policy board should be given no voice in the selection of members.

Response. The requirement of numerical proportionality is retained.


RULES AND REGULATIONS

In the case of a teacher center which specializes in a particular subject area or kind of teacher, the teacher center policy board may determine which categories of persons may be served by the center (§107.4(b)). A related comment wanted clarification as to whether the teacher center policy board, which specializes in a particular subject area or kind of teacher, must have a majority of teachers as defined by the teacher center policy board's" (emphasis supplied); B. Rep. No. 90-1016, Cong. 2d. Sess. (1977). The legislative intent to have the policy board determine the needs of teachers to be met would be thwarted if proposals were submitted before the board was established.

§107.4 Operation of the policy board.

Comment. One commenter requested that the regulation establish a method of voting by policy board members which would reflect "fairly" among the groups represented on the board.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. In the absence of any specific statutory authority, it would be over-regulation to include the suggested requirement. The operating procedures of policy boards are best determined by the boards themselves.

§107.4 Selection of policy board members on existing teacher centers.

Comment. Numerous commenters asked for the same kind of specific directions for selecting all categories of policy board members as are provided in §107.4 for selecting the teacher majority. Several commenters asked what should be done in cases where there are no institutions of higher education in the area to be served. Another commenter requested that the regulation stipulate that an applicant local educational agency choose the institution of higher education to be represented, and that the local educational agency and the institution of higher education together designate the individual to represent the institution of higher education.

Response. Specific directions are given for the selection of the teacher representatives to the board because they will constitute the majorly of the board. Other commenters wanted the regulation to allow the teacher members and school board members of the policy board to select or at least approve the representative(s) of institutions of higher education and several comments wanted to restrict the policy board to selecting only with the approval of the board's teacher majority. Another commenter requested that some method of choosing the institutions of higher education representative be outlined, since some areas have many institutions of higher education, and commented that different directions are needed.
subject to approval by the teacher majority. As clarified by a change in \$197.4(a), the Commissioner interprets the statute to require that all institutions of higher education with a history of operation in the area to be served have the opportunity to participate in designing the one or more local or statewide centers for higher education. This would occur after the applicant determines how many representatives from institutions of higher education and local educational agencies would be needed to form the board.

\$197.5 Support of independent existing teacher centers.

Comment. Several commenters, primarily representatives of established, on-going independent teacher centers, expressed concern about the continued existence of these centers, since the teacher centers statute contains specific requirements which would not allow support of these centers in their present independent form. These commenters feared that the new teacher centers program might have a negative effect on many of the successful, on-going independent centers.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. Under the statute, grants may be made only to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education, but applications for grants can be developed by a local educational agency or an institution of higher education for a project to be carried out at an existing independent center. The teacher center policy board formed according to \$197.4(a) and (b). These applications would be reviewed on the same basis as other applications.

\$197.5 Set-aside for planning grants.

Comment. One commenter wanted a percentage of the total program funds set aside for planning grants.

Response. The Commissioner does not feel that predetermined set-asides, either for operating or planning purposes, would be wise at the beginning of a new program. Section 197.4(b) is changed to avoid any implication that any set-aside or priority will be given to planning or other grants.

\$197.5 Definition of the term “operate.”

Comment. Many commenters objected to the proposed definition of “operate” in \$197.5(b) which they said would in effect permit institutions of higher education to plan and establish new teacher centers and put them into operation under the teacher center program. The objection was based on the statute, which permits local educational agencies to plan, establish, and operate centers, but limits institutions of higher education to the operation of centers that had already been planned and established using other resources. One commenter asked whether an institution of higher education has the support to operate an existing independent center. Other commenters strongly supported the definition of the term “operate.”

Response. Section 532(f) of the statute authorizes grants to institutions of higher education “to operate” teacher centers. (This contrasts with the language of Section 532(a)(1) which authorizes grants to local educational agencies “to assist such agencies in planning, establishing, and operating teacher centers.”) Section 197.5(b) of the proposed regulation gave effect to this difference in authorizing language by making institutions of higher education eligible for grants only if the teacher center would be established by an independent center. In order to follow more closely the authorizing language, \$197.5(b) is changed to make an institution of higher education eligible only for grants “to operate” teacher centers. However, there is no evidence of congressional intent to limit eligibility to only those institutions of higher education which are already operating an existing teacher center. Under \$197.5(b), an institution of higher education eligible for a grant “to operate” a new or proposed teacher center but, unlike a local educational agency, is not eligible for a grant to assist in planning or establishing the teacher center.

\$197.5 Features of a planning grant.

Comment. A commenter wanted the amount allowed to a grantee institution of higher education for “operation” of a center to be limited to 10 percent of the grant, and another wanted the grants to be limited to the cost of the teacher center policy board in the associated school district.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. There is no justification for the suggested discriminatory treatment of institutions of higher education that become grantees. There are no cases where the teacher center policy board supervises the center, which may include budgeting and the expenditure of the center’s funds, if the board is not prohibited from performing those functions by State or local law.

\$197.5 Allocation of funds in applications by comparison.

Comment. A commenter requested that the regulation state how program funds will be divided between the 90 percent for local educational agencies and the 10 percent for higher education in the case of an application made by a combination of public and private entities under \$197.3(c).

Response. Section 197.5(c) of the regulation has been revised to provide that, if the application presents separate budgets from each applicant of the combined application, under \$197.7, the policy board will use the separate budgets. In cases where a center is dependent on local funds, a separate budget for local funds will be required. In cases of joint applications, the grant amount will be prorated on the basis of the proportion of the costs of higher education to all recipients of the grant.

\$197.6 Preference for small or large grantees.

Comment. Several commenters wanted the grants to be small. They believed that modest funds would be more likely to result in the establishment of a center with locally-generated funds after the period of Federal support has ended. They argued that large Federal grants would make it more difficult and less likely that a center would continue with local financial support. In contrast, smaller grants suggested that it would be better to spread the funds to more places so that more centers and agencies could be helped. Some commenters called for “some guidance” regarding desirable size of grants. Some commenters were undecided in favor of large or small grants.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The Commissioner believes that in the first years of the program at least, there should be maximum flexibility with respect to grant size. An applicant is free to request relatively small sums.

\$197.5 Gradual decrease in amount of Federal assistance.

Comment. A commenter interested in trying to increase the likelihood that a teacher center will continue in operation after the period of Federal funding recommended that the amount of Federal funding be decreased during the second project year, and further decreased during the third year. (The Commissioner as interpreted for 36 months.) The commenter’s rationale was that in the program this is the impetus to leave open as many options as possible to a grantee and the policy board. The Commissioner does not know how many years of Federal financial support, and at what level, a given teacher center would need to demonstrate effectiveness and ensure its continued viability. Applications which propose to follow the strategy of this commenter and request less funding each succeeding year would be welcome, but the regulation does not refer to such an application.

\$197.6 Determination of good quality for approval of grants to institutions of higher education.

Comment. One commenter asked how the Commissioner proposes to determine whether there are sufficient applications “of good quality” from institutions of higher education to warrant using the ten percent set-aside. He noted that in the question was that “good quality” was a somewhat subjective and objective variable which could lead to abuse in the evaluation process to the disadvantage of institutions of higher education.

Response. Section 197.6(a) no longer includes the term “of good quality.” Instead, \$197.6(a) states that the maximum ten percent set-aside will be used “provided that there are sufficient applications from institutions of higher education which receive the minimum of 50 points to be eligible for funding under the evaluation criteria in \$197.11.”

\$197.7 Gradual increase in funding.

Comment. A commenter proposed that the Commissioner follow the model of a similar program established by the National Science Foundation to provide service education by which modest funds would be provided for the first year of a center’s activities, with increased funding in subsequent years, that is, a given center would receive increasing Federal support and institutional and community support to help assure the continued viability of the center.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. A modest project may request a small grant for the first project year with...
larger grants in subsequent years. However, this is only one possible approach. Furthermore, the difficulty of measuring "constituency support" for an ongoing project makes it extremely difficult to evaluate projects using the commenter's criteria.

§197.7 Assurances of Three-year funding.

Comment. A commenter wanted the regulation to clarify the "stability of funding" of an approved center for the second and third project years. One commenter on this subject wanted clarification of the role of theState educational agency in determining whether a funded center would be continued beyond the first year of Federal support.

Response. The language in §197.7 means that, where a project is initially funded on a multi-year basis, continuation grants for the second or third year of the project are made on a noncompetitive basis, contingent upon thepresentation of evidence of satisfactory performance of the work as proposed and the availability of Federal funds. However, no application (including applications for continued funding) will be approved by the Commissioner unless the State educational agency in the responsive jurisdictions and recommended the application, under 1197.10(a). This regulation applies equally to original applications and to modifications for assistance to continue a project for a second or third year. Therefore, it is possible that a project funded initially with a multi-year basis may be vetoed by the State educational agency in a subsequent year.

§197.8 Release of time to prepare the application.

Comment. A commenter recommended that the regulation allow payment of released time as needed for those teachers and other employed persons who participate in preparation of the teacher center project application.

Response. Section §197.8 is changed to clarify that the expenses of application development are not allowable costs. To allow these expenses would use up funds which should be used to support teacher center programs and, therefore, reimburse grantees for these preapplication expenses. Applicants must bear these costs from other resources.

§197.9 Determination of direct and indirect costs.

Comment. A commenter wanted to know whether an applicant that requests only one year of support is at a disadvantage with respect to initial funding or continued funding in comparison with applicants that request multi-year support.

Response. With respect to new applications for initial support, applications requesting multi-year support will be reviewed on the same basis. No preference will be given. It is possible that the length of a given project in relationship to the budget request of that project and its anticipated impact on the grantee's rating under §197.10(a). This regulation applies equally to original applications and to applications for assistance to continue a project for a second or third year. Therefore, it is possible that a project funded initially with a multi-year basis may be vetoed by the State educational agency in a subsequent year.

§197.6 Single-year and multi-year applications.

Comment. A commenter wanted to know whether an applicant that requests only one year of support is at a disadvantage with respect to initial funding or continued funding in comparison with applicants that request a multi-year support.

Response. With respect to new applications for initial support, applications requesting multi-year support will be reviewed on the same basis. No preference will be given. It is possible that the length of a given project in relationship to the budget request of that project and its anticipated impact on the grantee's rating under §197.10(a). This regulation applies equally to original applications and to applications for assistance to continue a project for a second or third year. Therefore, it is possible that a project funded initially with a multi-year basis may be vetoed by the State educational agency in a subsequent year.

§197.7 "Best interest of the Government."

Comment. A commenter recommended that the expression "best interest of the Government," as it applies to the continuation of funding during a second and third year, either be clarified or eliminated.

Response. The term "best interest of the Government," is not defined in the regulation.

§197.8 Prohibition of supplementation of regular expenditures.

Comment. A commenter requested that the regulation require the Federal funds used to support a teacher center will not be used to supplant State or local funds normally used by the grantees for support of in-service training for teachers and curriculum development. The commenter also recommended requiring an assurance that the proposed teacher center program is one which is not currently being supported by other public sources and that it is such that its program elements are not, or cannot be performed under existing agency, institutional or other agreements. The commenter further stated that the request might be justified to increase the exercise of the best interest of the Government. (....,

Response. A criterion addressing the commenter's concern is added in §197.11(i).

§197.9 Release of time to prepare the application.

Comment. A commenter requested that the regulation allow payment of released time as needed for those teachers and other employed persons who participate in preparation of the teacher center project application.

Response. Section §197.9 is changed to clarify that the expenses of application development are not allowable costs. To allow these expenses would use up funds which should be used to support teacher center programs and, therefore, reimburse grantees for these preapplication expenses. Applicants must bear these costs from other resources.

§197.10 Use of Federal funds for remodeling and maintenance.

Comment. A commenter believed that there might be places and conditions where the success of a teacher center would be affected by the availability of funds for minor remodeling of the quarters to be occupied by the center. The commenter wanted the expenditure of Federal funds for such remodeling to be an allowable cost. Another commenter proposed that "regular maintenance of facilities" be an allowable cost.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The initial determination would be made by the grantee in accordance with the grantee's official procedures and the applicable cost principles prescribed in 45 CFR Part 100a and appendices A, B, C, and D to 45 CFR Part 100a.

§197.11 Payment of released time for substitutes or other activities for large groups of teachers or at a series of sessions.

Comment. One commenter believed that the payment of released time by a teacher center in an area affected by court-ordered desegregation would have beneficial effects. One commenter noted that taxpayers often oppose the use of substitute teachers. This commenter recommended that if the payment of released time is made an allowable cost, the substitutes should be paid directly by the Federal Government through the accounting procedures. A few commenters strongly approved the regulation in its proposed form. Several commenters stated that the payment of released time "is a mistake" to pay for any released time.

Response. The proposed regulation was not worded to describe the release of teachers and use of substitutes to facilitate attendance at teacher center activities, but rather to limit the use of Federal funds for this purpose. One commenter believed that the payment of released time by a teacher center in an area affected by court-ordered desegregation would have beneficial effects. One commenter noted that taxpayers often oppose the use of substitute teachers. This commenter recommended that if the payment of released time is made an allowable cost, the substitutes should be paid directly by the Federal Government through the accounting procedures. A few commenters strongly approved the regulation in its proposed form. Several commenters stated that the payment of released time "is a mistake" to pay for any released time.

Response. The proposed regulation was not worded to describe the release of teachers and use of substitutes to facilitate attendance at teacher center activities, but rather to limit the use of Federal funds for this purpose. One commenter believed that the payment of released time by a teacher center in an area affected by court-ordered desegregation would have beneficial effects. One commenter noted that taxpayers often oppose the use of substitute teachers. This commenter recommended that if the payment of released time is made an allowable cost, the substitutes should be paid directly by the Federal Government through the accounting procedures. A few commenters strongly approved the regulation in its proposed form. Several commenters stated that the payment of released time "is a mistake" to pay for any released time.

Response. The proposed regulation was not worded to describe the release of teachers and use of substitutes to facilitate attendance at teacher center activities, but rather to limit the use of Federal funds for this purpose. One commenter believed that the payment of released time by a teacher center in an area affected by court-ordered desegregation would have beneficial effects. One commenter noted that taxpayers often oppose the use of substitute teachers. This commenter recommended that if the payment of released time is made an allowable cost, the substitutes should be paid directly by the Federal Government through the accounting procedures. A few commenters strongly approved the regulation in its proposed form. Several commenters stated that the payment of released time "is a mistake" to pay for any released time.
sary to allow teachers to participate in center activities. Provision is not made to allow as grant costs released time or substitute teachers for persons other than full time regular classroom teachers served by the teacher center.

2. The language of §197.9 is clarified to allow the Commissioner of the teacher center policy board (including the payment of released time or substitutes to allow teachers to participate in board activities) are allowable costs.

3. To address the Commissioner's concern that a substantial proportion of program funds will be consumed for released time or substitute payments, thereby reducing the number of awards which can be made with limited Federal funds, §197.13 is changed to provide that, in reviewing applications for the reasonableness of costs in relationship to anticipated results, the Commissioner considers the proportion of the budget represented by costs for released time or substitutes. Therefore, an application with substantial budgeted cost for released time or substitutes probably would not be well rated under §197.11(g) (which counts for 6 points).

The determination of accounting procedures and methods is a prerogative of the grantee.

§197.8 Purchase of instructional materials.

Comment. One commenter proposed that the purchase of instructional materials be an allowable cost.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The decision to allow as grant costs released time or substitutes probably would not be well rated under §197.11(g) (which counts for 6 points).

§197.9 Education of the handicapped.

Comment. One commenter requested that the regulation clarify the relationship between the teacher center project and educational efforts to improve the education of the handicapped.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The education of the handicapped merits high priority, and teacher centers are a potentially useful means of serving that education. However, the statute does not focus on particular substantive areas of education. Rather, the statute is designed to allow the teacher center policy board to determine the training and curriculum development needs of teachers at the local level. The decision to include activities related to the education of the handicapped is one for each teacher center policy board and applicant.

§197.9 Provision of technical assistance.

Comment. A commenter recommended that the state educational agencies be required to set forth in the application how it will use technical assistance and from which institutions of higher education it will use such assistance.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. While the statute is somewhat ambiguous on this point, the Commissioner interprets it as requiring that applications from institutions of higher education be submitted through the State educational agency. Section 532(f) of the Act provides that the Commissioner may make grant awards directly to institutions of higher education, in contrast to Section 533(e), which authorizes institutions to apply for grants to participate only by contracting with a State educational agency which receives a grant from the Commissioner.

The regulation does not expressly address whether an application from an institution of higher education must be submitted through a State educational agency. It provides that the authority to make grants to institutions of higher education is subject to the other provisions of this Section, which would include provisions for applications to be submitted through the State educational agency.

In requiring submission of applications by institutions of higher education through the State educational agencies, the regulation reinforces the important role of the State educational agencies for providing technical assistance to, and disseminating information from, funded centers.

§197.9 Sufficient time to prepare the application.

Comment. Several commenters, taking into account the statute's flexibility requirements for formation of the teacher center policy board, requested the maximum possible amount of time be allowed between the official announcement of the closing date for submission of applications and the date on which the decision is made to award grants.

Response. One commenter requested a six month preparation period. No change is made in the regulation. This is not one which the Commissioner will resolve by regulation. Instead, the length of time for preparing the application would be established in the Federal Register.

§197.9 Use of one Federal program to complement another.

Comment. A commenter asked whether it is possible to use other Federal programs of financial assistance to education to complement the teacher center program. As examples, he cited the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, of 1965, as amended, and Title IV-C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, of 1968, as amended.

Response. All procedures comply with the applicable statutes and regulations for each program and, in accordance with the application for these programs (and the expenditures can be properly accounted for), there is no reason why programs cannot complement each other.

§197.10 Review of applications.

Comment. A commenter asked whether there is any assurance that if a State agency recommends approval of one or more applications, at least one will be approved by the Commissioner.

Response. There is no assurance that at least one application will be approved from each State. All applications transmitted to the Commissioner will compete on equal terms on a nationwide basis for the available funds, against the published requirements and evaluation criteria. Unlike some other Federal programs, this statute does not provide for grants to each State, nor does it provide for any geographical distribution of the grants.
§ 197.10 Provision of technical assistance.

Comment. A commenter wanted the regulation to provide that the State educational agency, if requested by a grantee in its jurisdiction to furnish technical assistance to a teacher center, could do so to one or more of the State's public institutions of higher education. This is to say that instead of using its own staff to provide technical assistance, the State educational agency would be free to call upon a publicly-supported college or university to provide it. Another commenter urged that the specific activities which would include a State educational agency from arranging for technical assistance to come from an institution of higher education or any other qualified agency or individual. The specific nature of the technical assistance provided would depend upon the needs of particular teacher centers and upon the specific activities planned by State educational agencies to respond to those needs. Regional officials of the Office of Education have modified the role in the teacher centers program, but could, of course, be asked by the teacher center policy board for assistance.

§ 197.10 Use of teachers to review applications.

Comment. Several commenters recommended that the regulation require the State educational agencies to include full-time regular classroom teachers on any boards or panels set up to review applications under the teacher centers program. Some commenters wanted teachers to comprise the majority of any panel board or panel of reviewers. Other commenters wanted a requirement that classroom teachers comprise a majority of any panel used by the Commissioner either to select reviewers or to determine the review criteria to be used by the States. Another commenter wanted teachers who were paid on the basis of their applications to the State and Federal levels. Yet another commenter urged that both State and Federal review panels have the same composition used by the Commissioner.

Response. The Commissioner has no authority to determine who will review the project applications by the State educational agencies, and whether those persons are members of the agencies' own staffs, outsiders, or a combination of these. At the Federal level, the Commissioner, in deciding who will review the applications, will be sensitive to the comments and expects to use teachers as well as others for this purpose.

§ 197.10 Dissemination by State educational agencies.

Comment. A commenter interpreted § 197.10(b) to mean that the State educational agency would have the unreasonable burden of preparing, for submission with each application to the Commissioner, a separate plan for technical assistance and dissemination specifically related to each application. Of course, it would be sufficient for the State educational agency merely to "give assurance that application review, technical assistance and dissemination of information will, within available resources, be carried out and reported." No change is made in the regulation.

§ 197.10(a) does not require from the State educational agency, a separate plan for technical assistance and dissemination for each center. The request is met if the State educational agency, concurrently with or in advance of its submission of applications, submits to the Commissioner, (1) a single, general written assurance pertinent to all applications that the agency will make provision for furnishing technical assistance to approved centers within the State, and (b) will disseminate information derived from those centers; and (2) a single, general statement on how the technical assistance and dissemination will be performed, together with an estimate of their cost.

§ 197.10 Elimination of State educational agencies from the program.

Comment. Several commenters recommended that the State educational agencies' role in the teacher centers program be eliminated entirely.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The Commissioner recognizes that some States have State-wide plans for inservice training of teachers, and that it would be unrealistic to require the States to transmit to the Federal level to coordinate such programs. The Commissioner has no authority to require or pay for the development of State plans for professional development or to eliminate the criteria to be used in reviewing and recommending applications under the teacher centers program.

§ 197.10 Substitude for the role of the State educational agencies.

Comment. One commenter suggested that the responsibility for reviewing project applications by the State educational agency be given to a different State agency concerning with education, namely the State agency responsible for accreditation standards and the licensing of teachers. Another comment on the same subject wanted the regulation to be changed to require coordination between the State educational agency and the State agency responsible for certification, since teacher centers may well become involved in programs to certify or recertify teachers.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The State educational agency provides for review and approval of local educational agency applications by the State educational agency, and will not change the role of the State educational agency as used in the statute is defined in Section 1201(h) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, to mean the "State Board of Education or other agency or official specifically responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or if there is no such board, officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law, a State educational agency may wish to consult or coordinate with the State agency responsible for the certification of teachers, the matter is clearly a prerogative of the State educational agency and not to be regulated by the Commissioner.

§ 197.10 Combined local educational agency—State educational agency.

Comment. A commenter asked that attention be given to the special provision for the provision of technical assistance and dissemination of information in the regulation. Section 197.10(a) requires that the Commissioner receive a single, general written assurance of the State educational agency that it will disseminate information derived from the centers. The Commissioner recognizes that some States have State-wide plans for inservice training of teachers, and that the remaining criteria would be used by the Commissioner for review and evaluation of the applications.

Comment. A commenter suggested that it might be more appropriate and efficient, and would avoid duplication, if the criteria in § 197.10 were divided for use between the State educational agency and the Office of Education. Thus, certain criteria would be used by the State agency for its review and the remainder of the criteria would be used by the Commissioner for review and evaluation of the applications.

Comment. One commenter wanted the requirements to be made applicable to the State educational agency work with local educational agencies that wish to apply for assistance, prior to the development of applications by those local educational agencies, in order to avoid rejecting or requesting modifications in their applications as a result of the State educational agency's review.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. In the absence of a statutory provision on this matter, it would be inappropriate to require such involvement by State educational agencies. However, this involvement would be permissible, under the statute and regulations.

§ 197.10 Role of State educational agency in evaluation of applications.

Comment. A commenter suggested that it might be more appropriate and efficient, and would avoid duplication, if the criteria in § 197.10 were divided for use between the State educational agency and the Office of Education. Thus, certain criteria would be used by the State agency for its review and the remainder of the criteria would be used by the Commissioner for review and evaluation of the applications. The Commissioner thought that criteria in § 197.11(b),
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§197.11 Financial support from grantee.

Comment. Several commenters, including representatives of a State educational agency, urged that there be a criterion evaluating the extent of the applicant’s “commitment to participate in and support a teacher center,” either through “in-kind” or financial contributions. Some wanted the criterion to focus on “support from the applicant for the payment of released time to permit teachers to participate more easily in the teacher center,” either through “in-kind” or financial contributions. Some commenters wanted the regulation to clarify whether §197.11(b) means that, after a year of operation, the approved center’s teachers will be evaluated, or whether the centers “would have to prove whether the teacher center has in fact increased the effectiveness of teachers served.” One commenter said, “We don’t know how to evaluate teacher centers’ effectiveness—whether a teacher center has in fact increased the effectiveness of teachers served.” Another commenter said, “We don’t know how to do that without knowing how.” Another commenter on the same topic wanted to know how the individual teacher centers and the overall teacher center program will be evaluated.

Response. The comments appear to address evaluation, not on level with section 532(e), which

§197.11 Importance of cooperative arrangements.

Many commenters recommended that points be given in the evaluation of applications for funds under §197.11 so that
local educational agencies and one or more institutions of higher education could be encouraged to establish a teacher center. The rationale was that teacher training is the business of the local educational agencies and the colleges and universities working together. The goal was to establish a system of cooperative arrangements. Many commenters believed that the reference in section 532(a)(2) of the statute that teachers carry out activities of the teacher centers “with assistance of such consultants and experts as may be necessary” must be read in conjunction with section 532(e), which permits local educational agency grantees to contract for assistance from institutions of higher education. Several commenters recommended that the allowable cost rule stipulate that “the consultants authorized under Section 532(a)(2) of the Act and the financial contributions authorized under subsection 532(e) are the same and must be included together.”

Response. Section 197.8 is channeled to provide explicitly that service contracts with institutions of higher education are allowable project costs. The other recommendations are not accepted. Section 532(e) of the statute authorizes local educational agencies for the development and development of new curriculum developed by participating teachers. In the commenters’ judgment, evaluation should take into account “the teachers’ self-assessment” and “the effectiveness of the center’s program.” These commenters wanted any evaluation of teacher centers to be based on an analysis of the effectiveness of the centers’ impact on teachers rather than on the needs of students and the effect of the centers on students. One commenter recommended that centers be “continually evaluated to deter-
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and how the applicant must measure them. Needs and objectives will vary from place to place, and if regulation leaves flexibility to the States, this will be good. Section 197.7(c)(3) is related to review of previously funded project and is concerned with adequacy of information. The time the data is to be date (i.e., at the time its going activities are being evaluated) to determine whether it should be continued for a second or third year. The Commissioner will consider in principle many of the comments on evaluation and will consider them in formulating any Office of Education or Indian education program or evaluation of the overall program. Further regulation on this is not needed. The introductory paragraph of §197.11 is changed so that it no longer provides the exception for an gladly accepted. Aside from the program, the regulations which it attempts to influence.

Comment. A commentor noted in §197.11(d) the possible implication based on the word “sufficiency” that centers should be large. The commentor thought the program to develop the centers and other advantages to having small centers, and recommended that the word “sufficiency” be changed to “appropriateness.”

Response. The recommendation is accepted and the regulation is changed to read: “Appropriateness of size, scope, and duration of the project so as to be productive results.”

§197.11 Impact upon the grantee’s inservice program.

Comment. A commenter objected to the evaluation criterion in §197.11(h), which gives points for “the potential of the teacher center to improve the teacher center’s overall program of inservice training.” The rationale of the objection was that the criterion might be seen as “an attempt to build the teacher centers on an already-existing structure.” The commenter wanted the teacher center to be independent, not in competition with existing programs. The other Board, another commenter wanted a criterion included which favors applications which have arranged for close integration of the proposed teacher center with the existing training programs of the applicant and agency. The commenter stressed the importance of allowing flexibility so that the policy board can take into account the needs of the teachers, the needs of the center, and the needs of the school district.

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The potential of the teacher center to improve the teacher center’s overall program of inservice training is an appropriate criterion to weigh in judging competing applications. To the extent that the program is not of the kind of effect, the positive impact of limited Federal dollars is increased, and the project becomes more effective. However, the criterion is not an effort to impose a new structure on all existing training. An applicant could demonstrate potential for improvement with close reference to the structure of the center and not with reference to the structure of the center itself. However, if an applicant could demonstrate potential for improvement with reference to the structure of the center and not with reference to the structure of the center itself.

§197.11 Over-emphasis on formation of policy boards.

Comment. Many commenters felt that the assignment of responsibilities is too heavy on the authority and representativeness of the teacher center policy board was excessive, and that points should be reduced. A relatively high score was assigned to the quality of participation by the board in preparing the application. The criterion in §197.11(h)(1) has been reduced, reducing the points for §197.11(h)(1) from 20 to 10.

§197.11 Sufficiency or appropriateness of services.

Comment. A commenter noted in §197.11(b)(d) the possible implication, based on the word “sufficiency,” that centers should be large. The commenter thought the program to develop the centers and other advantages to having small centers, and recommended that the word “sufficiency” be changed to “appropriateness.”

Response. The recommendation is accepted and the regulation is changed to read: “Appropriateness of size, scope, and duration of the project so as to be productive results.”

§197.11 Weighting of the evaluation criteria.

Comment. Several commenters suggested changes in the number of points assigned to the criteria for evaluation of applications. The most common recommen-dation was to give more points to the evaluation of the proposed teacher center staff, to measure for increasing the effectiveness of the center. Another criterion recommended was a “needs assessment” in planning the work of the center, and to the objectives of the proposed center. Another commenter felt that the proposed criteria emphasized measurable outcomes and was concerned that such an approach would encourage narrow prescriptive center training rather than the kind of developmental programs needed to meet the diverse needs of individual teachers. One commenter wanted a criterion giving points for plans and activities which would improve the likelihood that the center would continue in operation after its period of Federal funding is over.

Response. Section 197.11 is changed to better reflect the purposes of the center. (1) Increase the points assigned to the potential of the center to improve the effectiveness of the teachers served in terms of the project, and, (2) increase the points assigned to the extent to which the project objectives are sharply defined, clearly stated, and capable of evaluation. Therefore, the points assigned are increased to 20 for an application which has a clearly defined program. Add a criterion on the extent to which Federal funds will support new or expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources. The proposed greater emphasis on the qualifications of the teacher center’s staff is not accepted. As is appropriate, many centers may rely heavily on teachers to staff the centers, and it may be difficult for application reviewers to draw clear distinctions among applications based on the quality of center staff. However, the points assigned are increased to 20 for an application which has a clearly defined program.

§197.11 Recognition of judgments made by State educational agencies.

Comment. A commenter asked that the regulations be changed to require that applications be reviewed by the State educational agency to which the application is submitted. The reasons for this change are as follows:

Response. No change is made in the regulation. The comments are noted and will be considered in formulating any Office of Education or Indian education program or evaluation of the overall program.
rules and regulations
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will be taken into account only as they bear upon the evaluation criteria established.

There is no reason to believe that the applications submitted to the State agency for the first time in 1973, and not previously transmitted, will be treated any differently than those subsequently transmitted. In view of the diverse nature of the titles proposed for the projects, and the data contained in the application, it is recommended that the Commissioner be permitted to appeal directly to the State educational agency for reconsideration of the application if it is not recommended for funding by the Federal agency. The Commissioner, or any other State educational agency, may petition the Commissioner to request further consideration of the application if it is not recommended for funding by the Federal agency.

The Commissioner believes that the provisions of the statute mandating the submission of the reports required by the Federal Register be made to the Commissioner for evaluation. The Commissioner believes that the reports required by the Federal Register be made to the Commissioner for evaluation.

Comment. A commenter reflected that the State agency is responsible for assuring that further consideration is given to the application by the State agency to the extent of the Commissioner's decision. The Commissioner believes that the provision of the statute mandating the submission of the reports required by the Federal Register be made to the Commissioner for evaluation.

The Commissioner believes that the provision of the statute mandating the submission of the reports required by the Federal Register be made to the Commissioner for evaluation.
RULES AND REGULATIONS

funds appropriated for the teacher centers program. This amount will be adequate to compensate the State educational agencies for their functions, and the remainder of the funds should go for the direct support of teacher centers. Section 197.12 is also changed (1) to delete any reference to "reimbursement" on the methods of paying State educational agencies for these services, thereby permitting other payment methods including advance payments and (2) to clarify the scope of technical assistance activities, indicating that the State educational agencies can take some initiative in organizing workshops and conferences to provide information needed by funded centers in their States.

§ 197.12 Reallocation of unspent funds.

Comment. A commenter suggested that, of the funds withheld by the Commissioner for technical assistance by State educational agencies, any portion not needed for that purpose by the teacher center would revert to the national treasury. The commenter recommended that grantee[s] be required to obtain the approval of ESSA to use any funds made available to them for this purpose so that the funds can be reallocated to other grantee[s] that would use them.

Response. Section 197.10(b) is changed so as not to provide that technical assistance must be specifically requested by each teacher center through the policy being issued. The State educational agency can only be compensated for technical assistance services to funded centers, and it is possible that those activities could be very limited if centers within a State neither need nor want them. However, the deleted provision in § 197.10(b) suggests a very passive State educational agency role in which the State agency could only act in responding to a request from a particular funded center in its State. There is nothing improper about this role, but it is also possible that particular State educational agencies may plan and carry out workshops and conferences to provide technical assistance to a number of funded centers in their State. These activities would have to be designed solely to provide technical assistance to funded centers, and it would still be true that, if the funded centers neither needed nor elected to participate in them, they would not be eligible for compensation under this program. Nevertheless, this change and the reduction in the set-aside reduces the risk that technical assistance funds will be reallocated. This is a problem that will be closely watched by the Commissioner, but no further action is warranted at this time.

[FN Doc. 78-655 Filed 1-10-78; 8:45 am]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL ASSISTANCE</th>
<th>2. APPLICANTS APPLICATION</th>
<th>3. STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER</th>
<th>4. LEGAL APPLICANT/RECIPIENT</th>
<th>5. FEDERAL EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TYPE OF ACTION</td>
<td>□ PREAPPLICATION</td>
<td>□ APPLICATION</td>
<td>□ NOTIFICATION OF INTENT (OPP)</td>
<td>□ REPORT OF FEDERAL ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ACTION TAKEN</td>
<td>☑ AWARDED</td>
<td>☑ REJECTED</td>
<td>☑ RETURNED FOR AMENDMENT</td>
<td>☑ DEFERRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEDERAL AGENCY IS ACTION</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LEGAL APPLICANT/RECIPIENT</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEDERAL AGENCY TO RECEIVE REQUEST</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TYPE OF APPLICANT/RECIPIENT</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TITLE AND DESCRIPTION OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS BENEFITING</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PROPOSED FUNDING</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. AREA OF PROJECT IMPACT</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ESTIMATED DATE TO BE SUBMITTED TO FEDERAL AGENCY</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TYPE OF APPLICATION</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TYPE OF CHANGE</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TYPE OF ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. PROJECT DURATION</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. DATE Year month day</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. PROJECT ENDING DATE Year month day</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. REMARKS ADDED</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

This form shall be used for applying for Federal Assistance for the following personnel training programs of the U.S. Office of Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Catalog of Federal Assistance Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Centers Program</td>
<td>13.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Personnel Training Program</td>
<td>13.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education Program</td>
<td>13.554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This form shall be used also to request supplemental assistance, to propose changes or amendments, and to request continuation or refunding, for approved grants originally submitted on this form. No grants may be awarded unless a completed application form has been received (20 USC 1119-1119c, 1851 -1865) submit the original and two copies of form Mos.

U. S. Office of Education Application Control Center Washington, D.C. 20202

Attention: 13.416

PART I

Part I of this application consists of the standard face page for Federal applications and the concomitant instructions.

The above programs are not presently included as programs under OMB Circular No. A-95; therefore, clearinghouse notification is not mandated. However, applicants should be aware that in various States, State law requires review of applications for Federal assistance under various programs not covered by Circular No. A-95. Implementation of such laws is enforced through State rules and regulations, and applicants are urged to ascertain the existence of such laws and to acquaint themselves with applicable State procedures. Clearinghouses are the proper source of information on additional review requirements. Applicants are encouraged to check with the appropriate Federal Regional Office to obtain the name(s) and address(es) of the clearinghouses.

Applicants for 13.416, see Instructions, Part 3, Item 8 for further requirements for State agency review.

The following supplemental instructions for the items given below are to be used in lieu of or, along with the standard instructions for Part I:

Item 5 - If the applicant organisation has been assigned a DHEW entity employer identification number prefixed by "1" and suffixed by a two-digit number, enter the full DHEW entity number in item 5.

If the payee will be other than the applicant, enter in the remarks section "Payee:" the payee's name, department or division, complete address and employer identification number or DHEW entity number. If an individual's name and/or title is desired on the payment instrument, the name and/or title of the designated individual must be specified.

Item 9 - Preprinted.

Item 20 - Preprinted

PART II

Negative answers will not require an explanation unless the Federal agency requests more information at a later date.

Provide supplementary data for all "Yes" answers in the space provided in accordance with the following instructions:

Item 1 - Provide the name of the governing body establishing the priority system and the priority rating assigned to this project. For 13.416 (Teacher Centers) the State educational agency reviewing applications may use this item to indicate this application's place in rank order or other numerical rating.

Item 2 - Provide the name of the agency or board which issued the clearances and attach the documentation of granting or approval. All applicants applying under 13.416 (Teacher Centers) are required to submit their application to the State educational agency for review. An application which does not contain an indication of State review (comments, rank order, or endorsements) cannot be accepted for review by the U.S. Office of Education. All applicants applying under 13.554 (Career Education Programs) are required to submit one copy of the application to the State Coordinator of Career Education concurrently with submission to the U.S. Office of Education. States may submit an additional comment on any application originating from within their States.
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Items 10 - Show the Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog number, the program name, the type of assistance, the status and the amount of each project where there is related previous, pending or anticipated assistance. Use additional sheets, if needed.

PART III
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS.
Sections A, B, and D should provide the budget for the first budget period (a year) and Section E should present the need for Federal assistance in the subsequent budget periods. All applications should contain a breakdown by the object class categories shown in Lines 1-4 of Section B.

Section A. Budget Summary
Lines 1-4, Columns (a) and (b).
For applications pertaining to a single grant program (Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number), enter on Line 1 under Column (a) the catalog program title and the catalog number in Column (b). For application pertaining to multiple programs, enter the catalog program title on each line in Column (a) and the respective catalog number on each line in Column (b).

Lines 1-4, Columns (c) through (g).
No non-Federal funds or resources should be shown.
For new applications leave Columns (c), (d), and (g) blank. For each line entry in Columns (a) and (b), enter in Column (a) the appropriate amount of funds needed to support the project for the first funding period (a year).

For continuing grant program applications, enter in Column (c) the estimated amounts of funds which will remain unobligated at the end of the grant funding period. Enter in Column (a) the amount of funds needed for the upcoming period. Leave Column (g) blank.

For supplemental grants and changes to existing grants, do not use Columns (c), (d), and (f). Enter in Column (e) the amount of the increase or decrease of Federal funds.
In Column (g) enter the new total budgeted amount (Federal) which includes the total previous authorized budgeted amounts plus or minus as appropriate, the amounts shown in Column (a). The amount(s) in Column (g) should NOT equal the amounts in Column (e).

LINE 5. Show the totals for all columns used.

Section B. Budget Categories
In the column headings (1) through (4), enter the titles of the same programs, shown on Lines 1-4, Column (a), Section A. When additional sheets were prepared for Section A, provide similar column headings on each sheet. For each program, fill in the total requirements for funds (Federal) by object class categories.

Lines 6a-h. Show the estimated amount for each direct cost budget (object class) category for each column with program heading.

Line 6a. "Personnel" must show salaries and wages only. Fees and expenses for consultants must be included on Line 6h.

Line 6b. Leave this line blank if fringe benefits applicable to direct salaries and wages are treated as part of the indirect cost rate.

Line 6c. Indicate travel of employees only. Travel of consultants, trainees, etc. should not go on this line. Nor should long transportation (i.e., where no out-of-town trip is involved).

Line 6d. Indicate the cost of nonexpendable personal property. Such property means tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $300 or more per unit. A grantee may use its own definition of nonexpendable personal property provided that such definition would at least include all personal property as defined above.
Section E. Summary Estimates

Line 6a. Show all tangible personal property except that which is on Line 6d.

Line 6d. Use for (1) procurement contracts (except those which belong on other lines such as equipment and supplies and (2) subgrants or other assistance-like payments to secondary recipient organizations such as affiliates, cooperating institutions, delegate agencies, political sub-divisions, etc. Line 6d must not include payments to individuals such as stipends. * allowances for travel, consulting fees, benefits, etc.

Line 6e. Elioall tangible personal property over the succeeding funding periods (ie transfers, equipment, inventories, etc.)

Line 6i. Enter the total of Line 6e, excluding any items listed on Line 6j, as required herein, or in other cost categories.

Line 6j. Enter the total for new construction or renovations.

Section F. Other Budget Information

Line 21. Use this space to explain amounts for individual direct object cost categories that may appear to be out of the ordinary and to explain the following details by program:

Personnel Salaries for Line 6a. Include a statement which shows the total commitment of time and the total salary to be charged to the project for each key member of the project staff cited in Part IV, 5a.

Travel from Line 6c. Foreign travel should be separately identified and justified. No foreign travel will be authorized under the grant unless prior approval is obtained.

Equipment from Line 6d. List items of equipment in the following format: Item, Number of Units, Cost per Unit, Total Cost.

Contractual from Line 6f. Indicate the number of contracts that will receive each proposed contract.

Other from Line 6h. (a) Give the total number of consultants that will work on the project and their costs (fees and travel). (b) For 13,416 (Teacher Centers) also give release time or substitute payment requested. (c) Give the total direct cost for any new or all new training activities not previously funded by the Office of Education if this is a continuation application.

Line 22. Enter the type of indirect rate (provisional, predetermined, final or fixed) that will be in effect during the funding period, the estimated amount of the base to which the rate is applied, and the total indirect expenses.

Line 23. Provide any other explanations required herein or any other comments deemed necessary.

PART IV

Program Narrative

Prepare the program narrative statement in accordance with the following instructions for all new grant programs. Requests for continuation or refunding and changes on an approved project should respond to item 5b only. Requests for supplemental assistance should respond to question 5c only.
1. OBJECTIVES AND NEED FOR THIS ASSISTANCE.

Describe the problem. Demonstrate the need for assistance and state the principal and subordinate objectives of the project. Supporting documentation or other testimonies from concerned interests other than the applicant may be used. Any relevant data based on planning studies should be included or footnoted.

2. RESULTS OR BENEFITS EXPECTED.

Identify results and benefits to be derived.

3. APPROACH.

a. Outline a plan of action pertaining to the scope and detail of how the proposed work will be accomplished for each grant program, function, or activity, provided in the budget. Cite factors which might accelerate or decelerate the work and your reason for taking this approach as opposed to others. Describe any unusual features of the project such as design or technological innovations, reductions in cost or time, or extraordinary social and community involvement.

b. Provide for each grant program, function, or activity, quantitative monthly or quarterly projections of the accomplishments to be achieved. When accomplishments cannot be quantified by activity or function, list them in chronological order to show the schedule of accomplishments and their target dates.

c. Identify the kinds of data to be collected and maintained and discuss the criteria to be used to evaluate the results and successes of the project. Explain the methodology that will be used to determine if the needs identified and discussed are being met and if the results and benefits identified in items 2 are being achieved.

d. List organizations, cooperators, consultants, or other key individuals or groups who will work on the project along with a short description of the nature of their effort or contribution.

4. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION.

Give a precise location of the project or area to be served by the proposed project. Maps or other graphic aids may be attached.

For 13.416 (Teacher Centers) the area to be served must be the same as the area represented by the policy board members.

B. IF APPLICABLE, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

a. Present a biographical sketch of the project director with the following information: name, address, phone number, background, and other qualifying experience for the project. Also, list the names, training, and background for other key personnel engaged in the project.

b. Discuss accomplishments to date and list in chronological order a schedule of accomplishments, program or milestones anticipated with the new funding request. If there have been significant changes in the project objectives, location approach, or time delays, explain and justify. For other requests for changes or amendments, explain the reason for the change(s). If the scope or objectives have changed or an extension of time is necessary, explain the circumstances and justify. If the total budget has been exceeded, or if individual budget items have changed more than the prescribed limits contained in Attachment X to FHEC 74-7, explain and justify the change and its effect on the project.

c. For supplemental assistance requests, explain the reason for the request and justify the need for additional funding.
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This is a multi-purpose standard form. First, it will be used by applicants as a required fakesheet for pre-applications and applications submitted in accordance with Federal Management Circular 74-7. Second, it will be used by Federal agencies to report to Clearinghouses on major actions taken on applications reviewed by clearinghouses in accordance with OMB Circular A-95. Third, it will be used by Federal agencies to notify States of grants-in-aid awarded in accordance with Treasury Circular 1082. Fourth, it may be used, on an optional basis, as a notification of intent from applicants to clearinghouses, as an early initial notice that Federal assistance is to be applied for (clearinghouse procedures will govern).

APPLICANT PROCEDURES FOR SECTION I

Applicant will complete all items in Section I. If an item is not applicable, write "NA". If additional space is needed, Insert an asterisk "*". If space is needed, use the remarks section on the back of the form. An explanation follows for each Item:

Item

1. Mark appropriate box. Pre-application and application guidance is in FMC 74-7 and Federal agency program instructions. Notification of intent guidance is in Circular A-95 and procedures from clearinghouse. Applicant will not use "Report of Federal Action" box.

2a. Applicant's own control number, If desired.

2b. Date Section I is prepared.

3a. Number assigned by State clearinghouse, or if delegated by State, by area-wide clearinghouse. All requests to Federal agencies must contain this identifier if the program is covered by Circular A-95 and required by applicable State/area-wide clearinghouse procedures. If in doubt, consult your clearinghouse.

3b. Date applicant notified of clearinghouse identifier.

4a-4h. Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of applicant, and name and telephone number of person who can provide further information about this request.

5. Employer identification number of applicant as assigned by Internal Revenue Service.

6a. Use Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number assigned to program under which assistance is requested. If more than one program (e.g., joint-funding) write "multiples" and explain in remarks. If unknown, cite Public Law or U.S. Code.

6b. Program title from Federal Catalog. Abbreviate if necessary.

7. Brief title and appropriate description of project. For notification of intent, continue in remarks section if necessary to convey proper description.

8. Mostly self-explanatory. "City" includes town, township, or other municipality.

9. Check the type(s) of assistance requested. The definitions of the terms are:

A. Basic Grant. An original request for Federal funds. This would not include any contributions provided under a supplemental grant.

B. Supplemental Grant. A request to increase a basic grant in certain cases where the eligible applicant cannot supply the required matching share of the basic Federal program (e.g., grants awarded by the Appalachian Regional Commission to provide the applicant a matching share).

C. Loan. Self explanatory.

D. Insurance. Self explanatory.

E. Other. Explain on remarks page.

10. Governmental unit where significant and meaningful impact could be observed. List only largest unit or units affected, such as State, county, or city. If entire unit affected, list it rather than subunits.

11. Estimated number of persons directly benefiting from project.

12. Use appropriate code letter. Definitions are:

A. New. A submittal for the first time for a new project.

B. Renewal. An extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project having no projected completion date, but for which Federal support must be renewed each year.

C. Revision. A modification to project nature or scope which may result in funding change (increase or decrease).

D. Continuation. An extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project the agency initially agreed to fund for a definite number of years.

E. Augmentation. A requirement for additional funds for a project previously awarded funds in the same funding/budget period. Project nature and scope unchanged.

Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions will be included. If the action is a change in dollar amount of an existing grant (a revision or augmentation), indicate only the amount of the change. For decreases enclose the amount in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, breakout in remarks. For multiple program funding, use totals and show program breakdowns in remarks. Item definitions: 13a, amount requested from Federal Government; 13b, amount applicant will contribute; 13c, amount from State, if applicant is not a State; 13d, amount from local government, if applicant is not a local government; 13e, amount from any other sources, explain in remarks.

Self explanatory.

The district(s) where most of actual work will be accomplished. If city-wide or State-wide, covering several districts, write "city-wide" or "State-wide."

15. Complete only for revisions (Item 12c), or augmentations (Item 12a).

STANDARD FORM 424 PAGE 3 (30-75)
APPLICANT PROCEDURES FOR SECTION II

Applicants will always complete items 23a, 23b, and 23c. If clearinghouse review is required, item 22b must be fully completed. An explanation follows for each item:

Item 23b. Self explanatory.

Item 23c. Self explanatory.

Note: Applicant completes only Sections I and II. Section III is completed by Federal agencies.

FEDERAL AGENCY PROCEDURES, FOR SECTION III

Executive department or independent agency having program administration responsibility.

Self explanatory.

Primary organizational unit below department level having direct program management responsibility.

Office directly monitoring the program.

Use to identify non-award actions where Federal grant identifier in item 30 is not applicable or will not suffice.

Complete address of administering office shown in item 26.

Use to identify award actions where different from Federal application identifier in item 28.

Self explanatory. Use remarks section to amplify where appropriate.

Amount to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions will be included. If the action is a change in dollar amount of an existing grant (a revision or augmentation), indicate only the amount of change. For decreases, enclose the amount in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, breakout in remarks. For multiple program funding, use totals and show program breakouts in remarks. Item definitions: 32a, amount awarded by Federal Government; 32b, amount applicant will contribute; 32c, amount from State, if applicant is not a State; 32d, amount from local government if applicant is not a local government; 32e, amount from any other sources, explain in remarks.

Date action was taken on this request.

Date funds will become available.

Federal Agency Procedures—special considerations

A. Treasury Circular 2082 compliance. Federal agency will assure proper completion of Sections I and III. If Section I is being completed by Federal agency, all applicable items must be filled in. Addresses of State Information Reception Agencies (SCIRA's) are provided by Treasury Department to each agency. This form replaces SF 240, which will no longer be used.

B. OMB Circular A-95 compliance. Federal agency will assure proper completion of Sections I, II, and III. This form is required for notifying all reviewing clearinghouses of major actions on all programs reviewed under A-95. Addresses of State and area-wide clearinghouses are provided by OMB to each agency. Substantive differences between applicant's request and/or clearinghouse recommendations, and the project as finally awarded will be explained in A-95 notifications to clearinghouses.

C. Special note. In most, but not all States, the A-95 State clearinghouse and the (TC 1082) SCIRA are the same office. In such cases, the A-95 award notice to the State clearinghouse will fulfill the TC 1082 award notice requirement to the State SCIRA. Duplicate notification should be avoided.
### PART II
**PROJECT APPROVAL INFORMATION**

#### ITEM 1
Does this assistance request require State, local, regional, or other priority rating?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Name of Governing Body**

**Priority Rating**

#### ITEM 2
Does this assistance request require State, or local advisory, educational or health clearances?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Name of Agency or Board**

(Attach Documentation)

#### ITEM 3
Does this assistance request require clearinghouse review in accordance with OMB Circular A-95?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

(Attach Comments)

#### ITEM 4
Does this assistance request require State, local, regional, or other planning approval?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Name of Approving Agency**

**Date**

#### ITEM 5
Is the proposed project covered by an approved comprehensive plan?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Location of Plan**

#### ITEM 6
Will the assistance requested serve a Federal installation?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Name of Federal Installation**

**Federal Population benefiting from Project**

#### ITEM 7
Will the assistance requested be on Federal land or installation?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Name of Federal Installation**

**Location of Federal Land or Percent of Project**

#### ITEM 8
Will the assistance requested have an impact or effect on the environment?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

See instructions for additional information to be provided.

#### ITEM 9
Will the assistance requested cause the displacement of individuals, families, businesses, or farms?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Number of:**
- Individuals
- Families
- Businesses
- Forms

#### ITEM 10
Is there other related assistance on this project previous, pending, or anticipated?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

See instructions for additional information to be provided.
### PART III - BUDGET INFORMATION

#### SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY (a)</th>
<th>FEDERAL CATALOG NO. (b)</th>
<th>ESTIMATED UNOBLIGATED FUNDS</th>
<th>NEW OR REVISED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL (c)</td>
<td>NON-FEDERAL (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT CLASS CATEGORIES (h)</th>
<th>GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TOTAL (j)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. PERSONNEL</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. FRINGE BENEFITS</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. TRAVEL</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. SUPPLIES</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. CONTRACTUAL</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. OTHER</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. TOTAL DIRECT CHARGES</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. INDIRECT CHARGES</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. TOTALS</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. PROGRAM INCOME</td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) GRANT PROGRAM</th>
<th>(b) APPLICANT</th>
<th>(c) STATE</th>
<th>(d) OTHER SOURCES</th>
<th>(e) TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (f) TOTALS        | $             | $         | $                | $         |

### SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL FOR 1ST YEAR</th>
<th>1ST QUARTER</th>
<th>2ND QUARTER</th>
<th>3RD QUARTER</th>
<th>4TH QUARTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. FEDERAL</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. NON-FEDERAL</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TOTALS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) GRANT PROGRAM</th>
<th>FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (years)</th>
<th>(b) FIRST</th>
<th>(c) SECOND</th>
<th>(d) THIRD</th>
<th>(e) FOURTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 16.               |                                |           |            |           |            |
| 17.               |                                |           |            |           |            |
| 18.               |                                |           |            |           |            |
| 19.               |                                |           |            |           |            |
| 20. TOTALS        |                                |           |            |           |            |

### SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION

(attach additional sheets if necessary)

21. DIRECT CHARGES:

22. INDIRECT CHARGES:

23. REMARKS:

### PART IV - PROGRAM NARRATIVE

(attach per instructions)
PART V
ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies that he will comply with the regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, including OMB Circulars No. A-95, A-102 and FHC 74-4, as they relate to the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies to the grant that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.

2. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) and in accordance with Title VI of that Act, no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant receives Federal financial assistance, and will immediately take any measures necessary to effectuate this agreement.

3. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000d) prohibiting employment discrimination where (1) the primary purpose of a grant is to provide employment or (2) discriminatory employment practices will result in unequal treatment of persons who are or should be benefiting from the grant-aided activity.

4. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs.

5. It will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activity of employees.

6. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, as they apply to hospital and educational institution employees of State and local governments.

7. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.

8. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General through any authorized representative the access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.

9. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.

10. It will ensure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.

11. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1972. Section 102(a) requires, on and after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.

12. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC 470), Executive Order 11993, and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 469a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.
NOTICE

1. No application for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare assistance is approved unless the applicant has on file with the Department an accepted assurance of compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352), on Form HEW 441. If a copy of Form HEW 441 is NOT already on file with the Department, it must be submitted with this application.

2. No application for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare financial assistance under any education program or activity is approved unless the applicant has on file with the Department an accepted assurance of compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-318), on Form HEW 639A (formerly Form HEW 639). If a copy of Form HEW 639 or Form HEW 639A is NOT already on file with the Department, it must be submitted with this application.

3. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare policy requires that if any phase of THIS project will involve subjecting individuals to the risk of physical, psychological, sociological, or other harm, certain safeguards must be instituted and an assurance must be filed on Form HEW 596. If there is any question about application of requirements for protection of human subjects to this project, further information should be requested from the Office of Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health, DHEW, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

4. No application for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare assistance is approved unless the applicant has on file with the Department an accepted assurance of compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 794), on Form HEW 641. If a copy of Form HEW 641 is NOT already on file with the Department, it must be submitted with this application.

5. If this is an application for continued support, include if you have not already done so (a) the report of inventions conceived or reduced to practice required by the terms and conditions of the grant, or (b) a list of inventions already reported, or (c) a negative certification.

NOTE: A copy of each of the four forms enumerated above (Forms HEW 441, 639A, 596, and 641) is attached hereto for your convenience in the event that you may be required to file one or more of them in accordance with the ABOVE instructions. If, however, 1, 2, and/or 4 of the above assurances have been submitted to either the Office of Education (OE) or the Department, another original or copy need not be submitted nor will any OE program insist upon such a duplicate submission as a consideration of any application.
HEW FORM NO. 441, ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE REGULATION UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Section 80.4 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Regulation effectuating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that every application to the Department for Federal financial assistance shall contain or be accompanied by an Assurance that the program or facility to be assisted will be conducted or operated in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the Department's Regulation.

Section 80.4 further provides that "the form of the foregoing Assurance and the extent to which like Assurances will be required of subgrantees, contractors, transferees, successors in interest and other participants," shall be specified by the responsible Department official. Under this authority, HEW Form No. 441 has been specified as the form of Assurance which shall apply to all applications for Federal financial assistance (except for continuing state programs which must meet the requirements of Section 80.4(b) and school districts availing themselves of Section 80.4(c) of the Regulation) submitted to the Department after January 3, 1965; also the circumstances have been specified under which an Applicant shall obtain comparable written Assurances of compliance from its subgrantees, contractors, and transferees. (See answers to Questions 11 and 12 below in this regard.)

HEW Form No. 441 constitutes a legally enforceable agreement to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the Regulation issued thereunder. Applicants are urged to read the Department's Regulation before executing the Assurance.

The following explanation of the requirements of the Department's Regulation and the examples of the kinds of discriminatory practices prohibited by them are for the guidance of the Applicants.

1. By executing the Assurance (HEW Form No. 441), what does an Applicant agree to do?

A. The Applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in providing to individuals any service, financial aid, or other benefit under any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the Applicant by the Department.

2. What is meant by "distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin"?

A. "Distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin" includes (1) any type of segregation, separate or different treatment, or other discrimination on that ground; (2) the imposition of any admission, enrollment quota, eligibility, or other requirement or condition which individuals must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit under a program or to be afforded an opportunity to participate in a program, if the race, color, or national origin of individuals is considered in determining whether they meet any such requirement or condition; (3) the use of membership in a group as a basis for the selection of individuals for any purpose, if in selecting members of the group there is discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin; and (4) the assignment of personnel to provide services, or the assignment of times or places for the provision of services, on the basis of the race, color, or national origin of the individuals to be served. It does not, however, include distinctions on the ground of race, color, or national origin determined by the responsible Department official to be necessary to the conduct of research or experimental programs having as their primary objective the discovery of new knowledge concerning special characteristics of particular racial or other ethnic groups.
3. What is meant by "service, financial aid, or other benefit"?

A. "Service, financial aid, or other benefit" under a program receiving Federal financial assistance includes—

- any education or training,
- any evaluation, guidance, counseling, or placement service,
- any health, welfare, rehabilitation, housing, or recreational service,
- any referral of individuals for any of the foregoing services,
- any scholarship, fellowship or traineeship stipend or allowance,
- any loan or other financial assistance or benefit (whether in cash or in kind), which is made available to individuals
- with the aid of Federal financial assistance,
- with the aid of the Applicant's or of other non-Federal funds required to be made available for the program as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance,
- in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance or the non-Federal matching funds referred to in (2).

4. What requirements are placed on the use of facilities?

A. The Applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in making available to individuals the use of any land, building, equipment, or other facility leased, acquired, constructed, improved, or equipped with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the Applicant by the Department, including—

- the use of any room, dormitory, ward, or other space in the facility;
- the use of any equipment in the facility;
- the use of any office, waiting room, restroom, eating, recreational, concession, or other accommodation or convenience provided in the facility;
- the use of any facility not provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance if the availability of such facility is required as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance for the Federally-assisted facility.

5. What requirements are placed on the opportunities to participate in a program receiving Federal assistance?

A. The Applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in affording opportunities to individuals to participate (other than as employees) in any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended by the Department to the Applicant, including opportunities to participate—

- as providers of any service, financial aid, or other benefit to individuals under the program (e.g., as physicians, surgeons, dentists, or other professional practitioners seeking the privilege of practicing in a Federally-aided hospital or other facility),
- as conferees, observers, consultants, or advisers, or as members of advisory or planning groups, or
- as volunteers (e.g., as voluntary workers, or as patients or other subjects of study or experimentation in research, survey, demonstration, or like programs).

6. Does that mean that an Applicant who signs the Department's Assurance may nevertheless make distinctions among his employees on the basis of race, color, or national origin?

A. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act does not concern itself with employment practices except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment. Thus, where a basic objective of the program is to provide employment, the Applicant's employment practices are subject to the Department's Regulation. However, even where this is not the case an Applicant may be precluded from engaging in any discriminatory employment practices under the provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Executive Orders 10925 and 11114, and the Merit System Regulations.

7. When an Applicant's employment practices are covered by the Department's Regulation, what requirements must be met?

A. The Applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in its employment practices (including recruitment or recruitment advertising, hiring, layoff or termination, upgrading, demotion, or transfer, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and use of facilities) with respect to individuals seeking employment or employed under any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the Applicant by the Department, in those programs where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment to such individuals. This includes programs under which the employment is provided—

- as a means of extending financial assistance to students or to needy persons,
- to students, fellows, interns, residents, or others in training for related employment (including research associates or assistants in training for research work), or
- to reduce unemployment or to provide remunerative activity to individuals who because of severe handicaps cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market.
8. What effect will the Regulation have on a college or university's admission practices or other practices related to the treatment of students?

A. An institution of higher education which applies for any Federal financial assistance of any kind must agree that it will make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in the admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students.

(a) "Student" includes any undergraduate, graduate, professional, or postgraduate student, fellow, intern, student, or other trainee receiving education or training from the institution.

(b) "Admission practices" include recruiting and promotional activities, application requirements, eligibility conditions, qualifications, preferences, or quotas used in selecting individuals for admission to the institution, or any program of the institution, as students.

(c) "Other practices relating to the treatment of students" include the affording to students of opportunities to participate in any educational, research, cultural, athletic, recreational, social, or other program or activity; the performance evaluation, discipline, counseling of students; making available to students any housing, eating, health, or recreational service; affording work opportunities, or scholarship, loan, or other financial assistance to students; and making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment, or other facility or property.

9. Does the Assurance of nondiscrimination apply to the entire operation of an institution?

A. Insofar as the Assurance given by the Applicant relates to the admission or other treatment of individuals as students, patients, or clients of an institution of higher education, a school, hospital, nursing home, center, or other institution owned or operated by the Applicant, or to the opportunity to participate in the provision of services, financial aid, or other benefits to such individuals, the Assurance applies to the entire institution. In the case of a public school system the Assurance would be applicable to all of the elementary or secondary schools operated by the Applicant.

10. What about a university which operates several campuses?

A. Section 80.4(d)(2) of the Regulation provides for a more limited Assurance only where an institution can demonstrate that the practices in part of its operation in no way affect its practice in the program for which it seeks Federal funds. This would be a rare case.

11. If an Applicant intends to make use of other individuals to help carry out the Federally-assisted program, does the requirement not to discriminate apply to such a subgrantee or contractor?

A. It does. The Applicant must require any individual, organization, or other entity which it utilizes, to which it subgrants, or with which it contracts or otherwise arranges to provide services, financial aid, or other benefits under, or to assist it in the conduct of, any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the Applicant by the Department, or with which it contracts or otherwise arranges for the use of any facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance was extended, to comply fully with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Regulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued thereunder.

12. Must this Assurance of nondiscrimination by the subgrantee, etc., be in writing?

A. In the case (1) of any contractual or other arrangement with another such individual or entity which will continue for an indefinite period or for a period of more than three months, (2) of any subgrant, or (3) of any conveyance, lease, or other transfer of any real property or structures thereon provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the Applicant by the Department, the Applicant shall obtain from such other person, subgrantee, or transferee, an agreement, in writing, enforceable by the Applicant and by the United States, that such other individual or entity, subgrantee, or transferee will carry out its functions under such subgrant, or contractual or other arrangement, or will use the transferred property, as the case may be, in accordance with Title VI of the Act and the Regulation will otherwise comply herewith.

13. What obligations does the Applicant have to inform beneficiaries, participants, and others of the provisions of the Regulation?

A. The Applicant must make available to beneficiaries, participants, and other interested persons information regarding the provisions of the Regulation and protections against discrimination provided under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The Department will issue shortly more detailed instructions on carrying out this phase of the Regulation.
14. What obligations does the Applicant have to keep records and to make them available to the Department?

A. From time to time, Applicants may be required to submit reports to the Department, and the Regulation provides that the facilities of the Applicant and all records, books, accounts, and other sources of information pertinent to the Applicant's compliance with the Regulation be made available for inspection during normal business hours on request of an officer or employee of the Department specifically authorized to make such inspections. More detailed instructions in this regard will also be forthcoming from the Department in the near future.

15. Must separate Assurance forms be filed with each application?

A. As a general rule once a valid Assurance is given it will apply to any further application as long as there is no indication of a failure to comply.
ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE REGULATION UNDER
TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

(Name of Applicant)

(hereinafter called the "Applicant")

HEREBY AGREES THAT it will comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
(P.L. 88-352) and all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the Regulation of the Department
of Health, Education, and Welfare (45 CFR Part 80) issued pursuant to that title, to the end that,
in accordance with title VI of that Act and the Regulation, no person in the United States shall,
on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the
benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for
which the Applicant receives Federal financial assistance from the Department; and HEREBY GIVES
ASSURANCE THAT it will immediately take any measures necessary to effectuate this agree-
ment.

If any real property or structure thereon is provided or improved with the aid of Federal financial
assistance extended to the Applicant by the Department, this assurance shall obligate the
Applicant, or in the case of any transfer of such property, any transferee, for the period during
which the real property or structure is used for a purpose for which the Federal financial as-
stance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits.
If any personal property is so provided, this assurance shall obligate the Applicant for the
period during which it retains ownership or possession of the property. In all other cases, this
assurance shall obligate the Applicant for the period during which the Federal financial assis-
tance is extended to it by the Department.

THIS ASSURANCE is given in consideration of and for the purpose of obtaining any and all
Federal grants, loans, contracts, property, discounts or other Federal financial assistance
extended after the date hereof to the Applicant by the Department, including installment pay-
ments after such date on account of applications for Federal financial assistance which were
approved before such date. The Applicant recognizes and agrees that such Federal financial
assistance will be extended in reliance on the representations and agreements made in this
assurance, and that the United States shall have the right to seek judicial enforcement of this
assurance. This assurance is binding on the Applicant, its successors, transferees, and assign-
ees, and the person or persons whose signatures appear below are authorized to sign this assurance on behalf of the Applicant.

Dated ____________________________

(Applicant)

By ________________________________

(President, Chairman of Board, or comparable
authorized official)

(Applicant’s mailing address)
Section 901 of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 provides that no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. Section 902 of Title IX authorizes and directs the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter the "Department") to effectuate the nondiscrimination requirements of section 901 by issuing rules, regulations, and orders of general applicability. Pursuant to section 902, the Department has issued 45 C.F.R. Part 86 (hereinafter "Part 86") which became effective on July 21, 1975.

Section 86.4 of Part 86 requires that every application for Federal financial assistance for any education program or activity shall, as a condition of its approval, contain or be accompanied by an assurance from the applicant satisfactory to the Director of the Office for Civil Rights (hereinafter the "Director") that each education program or activity operated by the applicant and to which Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Part 86 apply will be operated in compliance with Part 86.

Section 86.4 also provides that the Director will specify the form of the assurance required and the extent to which such assurance will be required of the applicant's subgrantees, contractors, subcontractors, transferees, or successors in interest. Under this authority, HEW Form 639 A (3/77) has been specified as the form of assurance which shall apply to all recipients of and applicants for Federal financial assistance subject to the provisions of Title IX and awarded by the Department.

HEW Form 639 A (3/77) constitutes a legally enforceable agreement to comply with Title IX and all of the requirements of Part 86. Applicants are urged to read Part 86 and the accompanying preamble. The obligation imposed by Title IX and Part 86 are independent of, and do not alter, the obligation not to discriminate on the basis of sex imposed by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); Executive Order 11246, as amended; sections 799A and 855 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295h-9 and 298b-2); and the Equal Pay Act (29 U.S.C. 206 and 206 (d)).
PERIOD OF ASSURANCE

HEW Form 639 A, (3/77) is binding on a recipient for a period during which Federal financial assistance is extended to it by the Department. With respect to Federal financial assistance used to aid in the purchase or improvement of real or personal property, such period shall include the time during which the real or personal property is used for the purpose of providing an education program or activity. A recipient may transfer or otherwise convey title to real and personal property purchased or improved with Federal financial assistance so long as such transfer or conveyance is consistent with the laws and regulations under which the recipient obtained the property and it has obtained a properly executed HEW Form 639 A, (3/77) from the party to whom it wishes to transfer or convey the title, unless the property in question is no longer to be used for an education program or activity or the Federal share of the fair market value of such property has been refunded or otherwise properly accounted for to the Federal government.

An applicant or recipient which has submitted an HEW Form 639 A, (3/77) to the Director need not submit a separate form with each grant application, but may, if the information contained therein remains accurate, simply incorporate by reference, HEW Form 639 A, (3/77), giving the date it was submitted. On the other hand, a revised HEW Form 639 A, (3/77) must be submitted within 30 days after information contained in the submitted form becomes inaccurate, even if no additional financial assistance is being sought.

OBLIGATION OF RECIPIENT TO OBTAIN ASSURANCES FROM OTHERS

As indicated in Article III, paragraph 2, of the Assurance, if a recipient subgrants to, or contracts, subcontracts, or otherwise arranges with an individual, organization, or group to assist in the conduct of an education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department or to provide services in connection with such a program or activity, the recipient continues to have an obligation to ensure that the education program or activity is being administered in a nondiscriminatory manner. (See 45 C.F.R. 86.31.) Accordingly, the recipient must take reasonable steps to ensure that the individual, organization, or group in question is complying with Title IX and Part 86. These steps may include, but do not necessarily require, obtaining assurances of compliance from such subgrantees, contractors, and subcontractors in the form of, or modeled on, the HEW Form 639A, (3/77). These steps to require, however, such activities as may be reasonably necessary to monitor the compliance of these subgrantees, contractors, or subcontractors, regardless of whether they have submitted assurances to the recipient. If a recipient is unable to assure itself that any contractor, subcontractor, subgrantee, or other individual or group with whom it arranges to provide services or benefits to its students and employees does not discriminate on the basis of sex as described in Part 86, the recipient may not initiate or continue contracts, subcontracts, or other arrangements with that individual or group or make subgrants to it.

D8
ADMINISTRATIVELY SEPARATE UNITS

If an educational institution is composed of more than one administratively separate unit, a separate HEW Form 639 A, (3/77) may be submitted for each unit or one may be submitted for the entire institution. If separate forms are submitted, the administratively separate unit for which the form is submitted should be clearly identified in the first line of HEW Form 639 A, (3/77). An "administratively separate unit" is defined as a school, department or college of an educational institution (other than a local educational agency) admission to which is independent of admission to any other component of such institution. See 45 C.F.R. 86.2(o).

STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

State education agencies are generally not responsible for running pre-school, kindergarten, elementary or secondary programs. Such responsibility is generally left to local education agencies although some supervisory authority may be vested with the state education agency. Consequently, most state agencies should not check the boxes for "Pre-school," "Kindergarten," or "Elementary or Secondary" in Article I of HEW Form 639 A, (3/77). If the state agency runs special programs for the handicapped, including those on the pre-school, kindergarten, elementary, or secondary level, the box marked "Other" should be checked and the appropriate description inserted in the space provided.

Under Article III, paragraph 5, of HEW Form 639A, (3/77) a state education agency may be called upon from time to time to submit reports necessary to determine Title IX compliance by local education agencies within its jurisdiction. The form and content of such reports will be specified by the Director at the time the request is made.

RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION

Applicants or recipients which are educational institutions controlled by a religious organization are not covered by Part 86 to the extent that application of Part 86 would be inconsistent with the religious tenets of the controlling religious organization.

Section 86.12 of Part 86 requires an institution seeking an exemption to submit a written statement to the Director identifying the provisions of Part 86 which conflict with a specific tenet of the controlling religious organization. Such a statement must be signed by the highest ranking official of the educational institution claiming the exemption. An applicant or recipient claiming an exemption is not relieved of its obligations to comply with that portion of Part 86 not specified in its statement to the Director as being inconsistent with the tenets of the controlling religious organization.
Although 86.12 imposes no time restrictions when a recipient or applicant may claim an exemption, applicants or recipients are urged to make such claims when they initially submit HEW Form 639 A, (3/77) by checking the appropriate box in Article I of HEW Form 639 A, (3/77) and attaching thereto the statement required by 86.12(b). Such an approach will avoid misunderstandings on the part of both the Department and the applicant or recipient as to what, if any, action is required under Part 86.

An applicant or recipient will normally be considered to be controlled by a religious organization if one or more of the following conditions prevail:

1. It is a school or department of divinity;

2. It requires its faculty, students or employees to be members of, or otherwise espouse a personal belief in, the religion of the organization by which it claims to be controlled;

3. Its charter and catalog, or other official publication, contains explicit statement that it is controlled by a religious organization or an organ thereof or is committed to the doctrines of a particular religion, and the members of its governing body are appointed by the controlling religious organization or an organ thereof, and it receives a significant amount of financial support from the controlling religious organization or an organ thereof.

The term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects. (This definition is adopted from section 1201(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329.)
ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972 AND THE REGULATION ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE IN IMPLEMENTATION THEREOF

(PLEASE READ EXPLANATION OF HEW FORM 639 A (3/77)* BEFORE COMPLETING THIS DOCUMENT)

Pursuant to 45 C.F.R. 86.4:

| (Name of Applicant or recipient) |
| (address) |
| (city, state, zip code) |
| (Identifying code-FICE, OE, or IRS) |

(hereinafter the "Applicant") gives this assurance in consideration of and for purpose of obtaining Federal education grants, loans, contracts (except contracts of insurance or guaranty), property, discounts, or other Federal financial assistance to education programs or activities from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter the "Department"), including payments or other assistance hereafter received pursuant to applications approved prior to the date of this assurance.

ARTICLE I - TYPE OF INSTITUTION SUBMITTING ASSURANCE.

A. The Applicant is (check the following boxes where applicable):

1. [ ] A state education agency.
2. [ ] A local education agency.
3. [ ] A publicly controlled educational institution or organization.
4. [ ] A privately controlled educational institution or organization.
5. [ ] A person, organization, group or other entity not primarily engaged in education. If this box is checked, insert primary purpose or activity of Applicant in the space provided below:

*HEW Form 639 A (3/77) This form supersedes HEW Form 639 (7/76). HEW Form 639 (7/76) submitted prior to this revision are valid and recipients need not submit a new assurance.

D11
B. ( ) Claiming a religious exemption under 45 C.F.R. 86.12(b).
(If religious exemption is claimed, attach statement by
highest ranking official of Applicant identifying the
specific provisions of 45 C.F.R. Part 86 which conflict with
a specific religious tenet of the controlling religious organization.)

C. The Applicant offers one or more of the following programs or
activities (check where applicable):

1. ( ) Pre-school
2. ( ) Kindergarten
3. ( ) Elementary or Secondary
4. ( ) Graduate
5. ( ) Other (such as special programs
     for the handicapped even if
     provided on the pre-school, elementary
     or secondary level). If this box is
     checked, give brief description below:

6. ( ) Undergraduate (including
     junior and community colleges)
7. ( ) Vocational or Technical
8. ( ) Professional

ARTICLE II-PERIOD OF ASSURANCE. This assurance shall obligate the
Applicant for the period during which Federal financial assistance is
extended to it by the Department.

ARTICLE III-TERMS AND CONDITIONS. The Applicant hereby agrees that it will:

1. Comply, to the extent applicable to it, with Title IX of the Education
   Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318), as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1681, 1682, 1683,
   and 1685 (hereinafter, "Title IX"), and all applicable requirements imposed
   by or pursuant to the Department's regulation issued pursuant to Title IX,
   45 C.F.R. Part 86 (hereinafter, "Part 86"), to the end that, in accordance
   with Title IX and Part 86, no person in the United States shall, on the
   basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits
   of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any education
   program or activity for which the Applicant receives or benefits from
   federal financial assistance from the Department. (This assurance does
   not apply to sections 904 (proscribing denial of admission to course of
   study on the basis of blindness) and 906 (amending other laws) of Title IX,
   20, U.S.C. 1684 and 1686.)

2. Assure itself that all contractors, subcontractors, subgrantees
   or others with whom it arranges to provide services or benefits to its
   students or employees in connection with its education program or
   activity are not discriminating on the basis of sex against these
   students or employees.
3. Make no transfer or other conveyance of title to any real or personal property which was purchased or improved with the aid of Federal financial assistance covered by this assurance, and which is to continue to be used for an education program or activity and where the Federal share of the fair market value of such property has not been refunded or otherwise properly accounted for to the Federal government, without securing from the transferee an assurance of compliance with Title IX and Part 86 satisfactory to the Director and submitting such assurance to the Department.

4. Submit a revised assurance within 30 days after any information contained in this assurance becomes inaccurate.

5. If the Applicant is a state education agency, submit reports in a manner prescribed by the Director under 45 C.F.R. 80.6(b) as to the compliance with Title IX and Part 86 of local education agencies or other education programs or activities within its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IV-DESIGNATION OF RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE AND ADOPTION OF GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES. (Check the appropriate box.)

A. 1. ( ) Pursuant to 45 C.F.R. 86.8, the Applicant has adopted grievance procedures and designated the following employee to coordinate its efforts to comply with Part 86 and has notified all of its students and employees of these grievance procedures and the following name, address and telephone number of the designated employee:

2. ____________________________
   (name of employee)

3. ____________________________
   (office address)

4. ____________________________
   (telephone number)

B. 1. ( ) The Applicant is not presently receiving Federal financial assistance subject to Part 86 and, consequently, has not designated a responsible employee or adopted grievance procedures pursuant to 45 C.F.R. 86.8 but will do so immediately upon award of such assistance and will immediately notify the Director, its students and employees of the name, office address, and telephone number of the employee so designated.
ARTICLE V - SELF-EVALUATION. (Check the appropriate box.)

A. ( ) The Applicant has completed a self-evaluation as required by 45 C.F.R. 86.3(c) and has not found it necessary to modify any of its policies and practices or to take any remedial steps to come into compliance with Part 86.

B. ( ) The Applicant has completed a self-evaluation as required by 45 C.F.R. 86.3(c) and has ceased to carry out any policies and practices which do not or may not meet the requirements of Part 86 and is taking any necessary remedial steps to eliminate the effects of any discrimination which resulted or may have resulted from adherence to such policies and practices.

C. ( ) The Applicant has not completed the self-evaluation required by 45 C.F.R. 86.3(c) but expects to have it completed by __________ insert date ________

D. ( ) The Applicant is not required to conduct a self-evaluation under 45 C.F.R. 86.3 since it did not receive any Federal financial assistance to which Part 86 applies prior to July 21, 1976.

Date: __________________________

(Insert name of Applicant)

By

(Insert title of authorized official.)

(This document must be signed by an official legally authorized to contractually bind the Applicant.)
STATEMENT OF POLICY: Safeguarding the rights and welfare of subjects at risk in activities supported under grants and contracts from DHEW is primarily the responsibility of the institution which receives or is accountable to DHEW for the funds awarded for the support of the activity. In order to provide for the adequate discharge of this institutional responsibility, it is the policy of DHEW that no activity involving human subjects to be supported by DHEW grants or contracts shall be undertaken unless the Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved such activity, and the institution has submitted to DHEW a certification of such review and approval, in accordance with the requirements of Public Law 93-348, as implemented by Part 46 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as amended. (45 CFR 46). Administration of the DHEW policy and regulation is the responsibility of the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md 20014.

1. TITLE OF PROPOSAL OR ACTIVITY

2. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/ACTIVITY DIRECTOR/FELLOW

3. DECLARATION THAT HUMAN SUBJECTS EITHER WOULD OR WOULD NOT BE INVOLVED

A. NO INDIVIDUALS WHO MIGHT BE CONSIDERED HUMAN SUBJECTS, INCLUDING THOSE FROM WHOM ORGANS, TISSUES, FLUIDS, OR OTHER MATERIALS WOULD BE DERIVED, OR WHO COULD BE IDENTIFIED BY PERSONAL DATA, WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY. (IF NO HUMAN SUBJECTS WOULD BE INVOLVED, CHECK THIS BOX AND PROCEED TO ITEM 7. PROPOSALS DETERMINED BY THE AGENCY TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS WILL BE RETURNED.)

B. HUMAN SUBJECTS WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY AS EITHER: NONE OF THE FOLLOWING, OR INCLUDING: MINORS, FETUSES, ABORTUSES, PRISONERS, MENTALLY RETARDED, MENTALLY DISABLED, UNDER SECTION 6. COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS, ON REVERSE OF THIS FORM, GIVE NAME OF INSTITUTION AND NAME AND ADDRESS OF OFFICIAL(S) AUTHORIZING ACCESS TO ANY SUBJECTS IN FACILITIES NOT UNDER DIRECT CONTROL OF THE APPLICANT OR OFFERING INSTITUTION.

4. DECLARATION OF ASSURANCE STATUS/CERTIFICATION OF REVIEW

A. THIS INSTITUTION HAS NOT PREVIOUSLY FILED AN ASSURANCE AND ASSURANCE IMPLEMENTING PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS WITH THE DHEW THAT APPLIES TO THIS APPLICATION OR ACTIVITY. ASSURANCE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THIS INSTITUTION WILL COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS OF DHEW REGULATION 45 CFR 46, THAT IT HAS ESTABLISHED AN INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS AND, WHEN REQUESTED, WILL SUBMIT TO DHEW DOCUMENTATION AND CERTIFICATION OF SUCH REVIEWS AND PROCEDURES AS MAY BE REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ASSURANCE FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT OR ACTIVITY.

B. THIS INSTITUTION HAS AN APPROVED GENERAL ASSURANCE (DHEW ASSURANCE NUMBER ) OR AN ACTIVE SPECIAL ASSURANCE FOR THIS ONGOING ACTIVITY, ON FILE WITH DHEW. THE SIGNER CERTIFIES THAT ALL ACTIVITIES IN THIS APPLICATION PROPOSING TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THIS INSTITUTION'S INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD IN A CONVENED MEETING ON THE DATE OF IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS ON PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (45 CFR 46). THIS CERTIFICATION INCLUDES, WHEN APPLICABLE, REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFYING FDA STATUS FOR EACH INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG TO BE USED (SEE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM). THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD HAS DETERMINED, AND THE INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL SIGNING BELOW CONCURS THAT:

EITHER ■ HUMAN SUBJECTS WILL NOT BE AT RISK; OR ■ HUMAN SUBJECTS WILL BE AT RISK.

5. AND 6. SEE REVERSE SIDE

7. NAME AND ADDRESS OF INSTITUTION

8. TITLE OF INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL TELEPHONE NUMBER

SIGNATURE OF INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL DATE

ENCLOSE THIS FORM WITH THE PROPOSAL OR RETURN IT TO REQUESTING AGENCY.
5. INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUGS - ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT

SECTION 46.17 OF TITLE 43 OF THE Code of Federal Regulations states, "Where an organization is required to prepare or to submit a certification ... and the proposal involves an investigational new drug within the meaning of The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the drug shall be identified in the certification together with a statement that the 30-day delay required by 21 CFR 130.3(e)(2) has expired and the Food and Drug Administration has not, prior to expiration of such 30-day interval, requested that the sponsor continue to withhold or to restrict use of the drug in human subjects; or that the Food and Drug Administration has waived the 30-day delay requirement; provided, however, that in those cases in which the 30-day delay interval has neither expired nor been waived, a statement shall be forwarded to DHEW upon such expiration or upon receipt of a waiver. No certification shall be considered acceptable until such statement has been received."

INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG CERTIFICATION

TO CERTIFY COMPLIANCE WITH F.D.A REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSED USE OF INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUGS IN ADDITION TO CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL, THE FOLLOWING REPORT FORMAT SHOULD BE USED FOR EACH IND: (ATTACH ADDITIONAL IND CERTIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY).

- IND FORMS FILED:  
  - FDA 1571,  
  - FDA 1572,  
  - FDA 1573

- NAME OF INO AND SPONSOR

- DATE OF 30-DAY EXPIRATION OR F.D.A WAIVER
  (FUTURE DATE REQUIRES FOLLOWUP REPORT TO AGENCY)

- FDA RESTRICTION

- SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

6. COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS - ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT

SECTION 46.16 OF TITLE 43 OF THE Code of Federal Regulations IMPOSES SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS ON THE CONDUCT OF STUDIES OR ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE GRANTEE OR PRIME CONTRACTOR OBTAINS ACCESS TO ALL OR SOME OF THE SUBJECTS THROUGH COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS NOT UNDER ITS CONTROL. IN ORDER THAT THE DHEW BE FULLY INFORMED, THE FOLLOWING REPORT IS REQUESTED WHEN APPLICABLE.

USE FOLLOWING REPORT FORMAT FOR EACH INSTITUTION OTHER THAN GRANTEE OR CONTRACTING INSTITUTION WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS PARTICIPATING IN THIS ACTIVITY: (ATTACH ADDITIONAL REPORT SHEETS AS NECESSARY).

INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCESS TO SUBJECTS

- SUBJECTS: STATUS (WARDS, RESIDENTS, EMPLOYEES, PATIENTS, ETC.)

  NUMBER
  NAME OF OFFICIAL (PLEASE PRINT)
  TITLE

  NAME AND ADDRESS OF COOPERATING INSTITUTION

  OFFICIAL SIGNATURE

NOTES: (e.g., report of modification in proposal as submitted to agency affecting human subjects involvement)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 504 OF THE
REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973, AS AMENDED

The undersigned (hereinafter called the "recipient") HEREBY AGREES THAT it will comply with section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 794), all requirements imposed by the applicable HEW regulation (45 C.F.R. Part 84), and all guidelines and interpretations issued pursuant thereto.

Pursuant to § 84.5(a) of the regulation [45 C.F.R. 84.5(a)], the recipient gives this Assurance in consideration of and for the purpose of obtaining any and all federal grants, loans, contracts (except procurement contracts and contracts of insurance or guaranty), property, discounts, or other federal financial assistance extended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare after the date of this Assurance, including payments of other assistance made after such date on applications for federal financial assistance that were approved before such date. The recipient recognizes and agrees that such federal financial assistance will be extended in reliance on the representations and agreements made in this Assurance and that the United States will have the right to enforce this Assurance through lawful means. This Assurance is binding on the recipient, its successors, transferees, and assignees, and the person or persons whose signatures appear below are authorized to sign this Assurance on behalf of the recipient.

This Assurance obligates the recipient for the period during which federal financial assistance is extended to it by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or, where the assistance is in the form of real or personal property, for the period provided for in § 84.5(b) of the regulation [45 C.F.R. 84.5(b)].

The recipient: [Check (a) or (b)]
- a. ( ) employs fewer than fifteen persons;
- b. ( ) employs fifteen or more persons and, pursuant to § 84.7(a) of the regulation [45 C.F.R. 84.7(a)], has designated the following person(s) to coordinate its efforts to comply with the HEW regulation:

Name of Designee(s) — Type or Print
Name of Recipient — Type or Print
(IRS) Employer Identification Number
A12
A11
C1

Street Address or P. O. Box
A42
A41
A1
A11
C1

City
B12
B11
B41

State
B42
B71
Zip

I certify that the above information is complete and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date
Signature and Title of Authorized Official
B72
B77
B78

If there has been a change in name or ownership within the last year, please PRINT the former name below:

NOTE: The 'A', 'B', and 'C' followed by numbers are for computer use. Please disregard.
PLEASE RETURN ORIGINAL TO: Office for Civil Rights, HEW, P. O. Box 8222, Washington, D.C. 20024.
IMPORTANT NOTICE
TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS IN USOE CONTRACT AND GRANT PROGRAMS

GRANTS

Applicants for grants from the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) have to compete for limited funds.

Deadlines assure all applicants that they will be treated fairly and equally, without last minute haste.

For these two reasons, USOE must set strict deadlines for grant applications. Prospective applicants can avoid disappointment if they understand that

Failure to meet a deadline will mean that an application will be rejected without any consideration whatever.

The rules, including the deadline, for applying for each grant are published, individually, in the Federal Register. A one-year subscription to the Register may be obtained by sending $50.00 to: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (Send check or money order only, no cash or stamps.)

The instructions in the Federal Register must be followed exactly. Do not accept any other advice you may receive. No USOE employee is authorized to extend any deadline published in the Register.

Questions regarding submission of applications may be addressed to:

U.S. Office of Education
Application Control Center
Washington, D.C. 20202

CONTRACTS

Competitive procurement actions undertaken by the USOE are governed by the Federal Procurement Regulations and implementing HEW Procurement Regulations.

Generally, prospective competitive procurement actions are synopsized in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD). Prospective offerors are therein advised of the nature of the procurement and where to apply for copies of the Request for Proposals.

Offerors are advised to be guided solely by the contents of the CBD synopsis and the instructions contained in the Request for Proposals (RFP). Questions regarding the submission of offers should be addressed to the Contracting Officer identified on the face page of the RFP.

Offers are judged in competition with others, and failure to conform with any substantive requirements of the RFP will result in rejection of the offer without any consideration whatever.

Do not accept any advice you receive that is contrary to instructions contained in either the CBD synopsis or the RFP. No USOE employee is authorized to consider a proposal which is non-responsive to the RFP.

A subscription to the CBD is available for $80.00 per year via second class mail or $105.00 per year via first class mail. Information included in the Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) and the Health, Education and Welfare Procurement Regulations (HEWPR) are contained respectively in Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, Chapters 1 to 2 ($5.70) and Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, Chapters 3 to 6 ($5.90). The foregoing publications may be obtained by sending your check or money order only, no cash or stamps, to:

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

In an effort to be certain this important information is widely disseminated, this notice is being included in all USOE mail to the public. You may, therefore, receive more than one notice. If you do, we apologize for any annoyance it may cause you.

OE FORM 5348, 7/77
REPLACES OE FORM 5348, 7/76, WHICH IS OBSOLETE