

TLC - outreach

---

**PHOTOCOPY  
PRESERVATION**

---

*National Coordinating Committee on  
Technology in Education & Training (NCC-TET)*

**Brenda Kempster**  
Chair

1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 383-6437  
Fax (202) 347-4683  
California (916) 399-0638  
Fax (916) 399-1275  
bkempster@aol.com

---

## **Technology and Learning Challenge (TLC) Task Force Outreach Subcommittee**

### **OUTREACH GOALS**

The goals of Outreach are to:

- communicate the TLC vision and elements of the proposed Program;
- seek input and feedback from broad-based stakeholder communities;
- develop a network of stakeholder leaders to sustain the development of the Program.

### **FOUR PHASES of OUTREACH**

Four distinct phases of the Outreach task have been identified.

**Phase I. Program Definition** is the period of Program design in which ideas are generated, circulated for comment, and incorporated into the conceptual design of the project.

**Phase II. Detail Planning** is the period of Program development, after the public announcement, in which specific project details are developed as appropriate to facilitate public awareness and proposal to governing bodies.

**Phase III. Approval Process** is that period when appropriate government bodies, review, refine, and approve the Program.

**Phase IV. Implementation** comprises the period and the process whereby Program activities are conducted.

### **PHASE I - PROGRAM DEFINITION**

With respect to the goals and activities of Outreach, this phase consists of five parts:

Part A. Establish the Outreach Subcommittee.

Part B. Provide input on overall TLC Program design.

Part C. Identify Stakeholder communities.

Part D. Provide "Proprietary" briefings for leaders in each stakeholder community, and conduct workshops to collect input and generate support.

Part E. Conduct follow-up sessions among stakeholder communities in coordination with identified leaders from each community.

Technology and Learning Challenge (TLC) Task Force  
Outreach Subcommittee

---

Stakeholder communities have been identified. In Table 1 below, each community is listed adjacent to the Outreach Subcommittee member who is responsible for outreach to that particular group.

Being responsible for outreach to a particular stakeholder community includes but might not be limited to the following:

- identifying opinion leaders in the stakeholder community;
- compiling a target list of stakeholders to involve in the outreach process;
- identifying an appropriate forum (using existing forums where possible, e.g., planned conferences) in which to deliver a Proprietary Briefing about the Program to an invited cadre from that stakeholder community;
- developing a plan for the Proprietary Briefing meeting/workshop, including structure, agenda, assumptions to be presented to the community, and questions to be posed for discussion and feedback (Attachment A provides an example of such a plan for the stakeholder community of CEOs/Businesses);
- developing briefing materials tailored to that particular community;
- eliciting questions and feedback about the program from the stakeholder community and relaying these back to the TLC Task Force;
- capturing on videotape all relevant speeches and meeting activities, especially Q&A sessions. (These video clips can be edited and compiled into a presentation video for the Vetting session(s) and ultimately into a promotional video for widespread distribution to share the TLC vision and seed stakeholder communities.)

A tentative schedule of Proprietary Briefing/Workshops is given in Table 2 below. Several potential opportunities for follow-up sessions are listed as well.

Technology and Learning Challenge (TLC) Task Force  
Outreach Subcommittee

---

**Table 1. Outreach Subcommittee Members and their Stakeholder Community Assignments.**

| Outreach ...<br>Member       | Association   | ...assigned to Stakeholder<br>Community <sup>1</sup>    |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Jim Kohlenberger             | Office of VP  | White House   |
| Frank Biden                  | Government Printing Office  | Agencies,<br>Policy makers,<br>Gurus                    |
| John Cradler                 | Council for Educational<br>Development & Research                           | Educators   |
| Brenda Kempster              | National Coordinating<br>Committee on Technology<br>in Education & Training | CEOs,<br>Businesses                                     |
| Dennis Bybee                 | Int'l Society for<br>Technology in Education<br>Association                 | Professional<br>Education<br>& Training<br>Associations |
| Cheryl Williams              | National School Boards<br>Association                                       | Model<br>Technology<br>Programs                         |
| Drew Allbritten              | American Association of<br>Adult & Continuing Education                     | Learners  |
| John Yrchik                  | National Education Association  | Educators   |
| Janet Weisenford             | Naval Air Warfare Center<br>Training Systems Div.                           | Technology<br>Transfer                                  |
| Ed Schroer<br>Mark Gittleman | American Society for<br>Training & Development                              | Trainers  |
| G. A. Redding                | Institute for Defense Analysis  |   |
| Paul Evans                   | MITRE Corporation   | Support for<br>Outreach Subcommittee                    |

---

<sup>1</sup> Other major stakeholder communities, such as Non-Profit Community-Based Organizations (contact Columbus Hartwell of IBM Foundation), might be added to the list.

Technology and Learning Challenge (TLC) Task Force  
Outreach Subcommittee

---

**Table 2. Tentative Schedule of \*Proprietary Briefings and Follow-up Sessions.**

| Date       | Forum   | Stakeholder<br>Community  | Responsible<br>Outreach Member |
|------------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <u>Sep</u> |   |                           |                                |
| 15         | <b>*National Coordinating Committee on Technology in Education &amp; Training</b><br>NEA, Washington DC | Associations              | D.Bybee                        |
| 22-23      | <b>*State Network Project</b><br>Austin, TX   | Educators                 | J.Cradler<br>(C.Stout)         |
| 27/28      | <b>*CEO Briefing</b><br>White House   | CEOs/Business             | B.Kempster                     |
| <u>Oct</u> |   |                           |                                |
| 7          | Coalition of Adult Education Organizations<br>Arlington, VA   | Learners                  | D.Albritten                    |
| 25-26      | NSBA Technology & Learning Conference<br>Dallas, TX   | Model Technology Programs | C.Williams                     |
| <u>Nov</u> |   |                           |                                |
| 1-4        | <b>*American Asso of Adult &amp; Continuing Education</b><br>Nashville, TN                              | Learners<br>Educators     | D.Allbritten                   |
| 10         | CCCSO/ISTE<br>New Mexico  | Associations              | D.Bybee                        |
| 15-16      | <b>*Star Schools Meeting</b><br>Washington, DC  | Model Technology Programs | C.Williams<br>(C.Garnette)     |
| <u>Dec</u> |   |                           |                                |
| 1          | <b>*National Issues Committee Meeting</b><br>Washington, DC   | Trainers                  | M.Gittleman                    |
| 12-14      | IBM Foundation<br>Life Long Learning Summit   | Learners                  | D.Allbritten                   |
| mid        | <b>*Policy makers/Gurus Proprietary Briefing</b>  | Policy makers<br>/Gurus   | F.Biden                        |

### **Possible Areas/Questions for Data Collection**

- How should the Program be managed and funded?
- How much private cost-sharing could be expected from the various partners?
- What can we do to drive creative financing formulas at the state and local levels?
- How can challenge grants most effectively stimulate market development?
- What kinds of intellectual property rights would developers expect?
- What can CEOs do to reach American public in mass media to help create new mindset and national enthusiasm for technology in learning? (post announcement media/advocacy campaign)
- What is the optimum grant size?
- How do we ensure replicability?
- How do we help overcome various existing barriers, including teacher training, teacher time, infrastructure support (internal and external), content/software development, connectivity, equipment cost/obsolescence, preconceived attitudes (technophobia), etc.
- What is the scope of the need?

### **PHASE II - DETAILED PLANNING**

#### **Vetting**

When a reasonably solid proposal has been developed, Outreach will conduct one or two Vetting workshop(s) with a group of identified leaders ("sparkplugs"), including at least one representative selected from each stakeholder community. These groups should be small (10) in order to facilitate discussion.

### **PHASE IV - APPROVAL PROCESS and IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **Seeding Communities**

Throughout the Program Definition phase and the Vetting workshop(s), emphasis will have been given to developing a longer term network of opinion leaders that can eventually be the seeds for community involvement. Outreach would subsequently involve a series of regional meetings, like the empowerment meetings, to engage and involve communities. The agencies hosting the Program would probably take the lead in this activity.

## **OUTREACH DELIVERABLES**

Deliverables from the Outreach Subcommittee include:

- feedback for Task Force efforts;
- a human network created to:
  - enlist support for approval by Congress;
  - obtain cost sharing from the private sector;
  - get state and local governments to address funding and other barriers;
  - seed communities to rise to the challenge (magic feather);
  - identify existing resources in Federal labs to support community efforts.

## **OUTREACH TIMELINE and PRODUCTS**

The following is a suggested timeline for the Outreach tasks and deliverables:

|                    |                           |   |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|
| July-Sep           | <u>Program Definition</u> | -Prepare and schedule<br>Proprietary Briefings,<br>leveraging existing<br>forums.<br><br>-Identify Briefers<br><br>-Invite Stakeholder Leaders  |
| Sep-Nov 4          |                           | -Conduct Proprietary<br>Briefings/Workshops,  |
| Nov-Jan            | <u>Detailed Planning</u>  | -Conduct Follow-on Sessions<br>with stakeholder groups<br>as appropriate<br><br>-Conduct Vetting workshops<br>with small group of reps<br>selected from all<br>stakeholder groups<br><br>-Provide feedback from<br>stakeholders to Task Force |
| Jan-Sep<br>'95     | <u>Approval Process</u>   | -Enlist support from<br>stakeholders for<br>TLC Program approval  |
| Sep-Jun<br>'95-'96 | <u>Implementation</u>     | -Share Program information<br><br>-Seed communities<br><br>-Identify existing resources   |

**INPUT FROM OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE ON TLC PROGRAM DESIGN**

The Outreach Subcommittee offers the following suggestions to the TLC Task Force.

1. The Grant Program should include replication of existing successful models.
2. Selection Criteria should include: "*Will* the learning tools produced be transferred, marketed, or made available to schools throughout the United States?" rather than "Can...."
3. "Cost Sharing" criteria should be changed to "Does the proposal offer creative new funding scenarios?" and "What are the resource commitments from the non-profit entities?"

**Attachment A - SAMPLE PLAN**

**White House Task Force on Technology and Learning  
Outreach**

**Draft Plan for Proprietary Briefing/Workshop  
Stakeholder Community: CEO/Business  
Responsible Outreach Member: Brenda Kempster**

**Structure:**

One meeting will be held in the late September/early October time frame with approximately 30 CEOs (more than likely we will have to accommodate key staff person for education technology as well -- so meeting could be as many as 50). Meeting will be followed by a hosted (by business) reception for the purpose of networking and informal information gathering.

This stakeholder group meeting should be held at the White House, suggest Indian Treaty Room, in order to position the importance of initiative and appeal to CEOs to personally attend.

**Agenda:**

- 90 minutes -
1. Welcome
  2. Overview of objectives/vision by White House representative;
  3. Detail of initiative by agency person from TLC Task Force (probably Commerce or Labor with support person from DoEd);
  4. Introduce CEO team leader(s) (1-3 who have been identified in advance);
  5. Pose questions for business involvement/outreach
- 60 minutes -
- Break into groups of 10 (can be same room w/chair re-arrangement).  
Each group lead by TLC Task Force member to record input.
6. Provide feedback on initiative and business suggestions.
- 30 minutes -
7. Read-out by each group on comments/upgrades.
  8. White House representative discusses next milestones, and closes.

Adjourn to hosted reception - venue to be determined; others may be invited to attend.

**Assumptions to be posed to CEO/Business stakeholders.**

- Barriers exist that impede expansion of learning technology market development.
- Key barriers are:
  - Content/software development
  - Connectivity
  - Equipment - cost/obsolescence
  - Training
  - Infrastructure support - internal and external
  - Preconceived attitudes (technophobia)

**Questions to be posed to CEO/Business stakeholders**

- How do we help overcome various existing barriers?
- How much private cost-sharing could be expected from the various partners?
- What can we do to drive creative financing formulas at the state and local levels?
- How can challenge grants most effectively stimulate market development?
- What kinds of intellectual property rights would developers expect?
- What can CEOs do to reach American public in mass media to help create new mindset and national enthusiasm for technology in learning? (post announcement media/advocacy campaign)

**SAMPLE Invitation Letter**  
**for CEO/Business Proprietary Briefing**

(White House Letterhead)

Date

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

You are cordially invited to attend a White House briefing session regarding an important national learning and technology initiative. The Administration is seeking the advice of key business leaders in the development of this program. You have been selected to attend the meeting because of your company's focus on education and training, and your personal interest in incorporating technology into the learning process.

The purpose of the session is to gather input from a representative group of business leaders to help shape a national effort targeted at learning and technology. If America's learners are to meet the challenges of tomorrow, they must have access today to the technology tools that will prepare them for work place responsibilities. The business perspective will be critical to the overall success of the initiative.

The meeting will be held in the Indian Treaty Room of the White House Old Executive Office Building on (date tbd) from 2:00-5:00 p.m. It will be followed by a reception at (location tbd) 5:30-7:00 p.m.

The White House Task Force on Learning and Technology will give a detailed briefing of the proposed initiative. You will be asked for feedback and suggestions for maximizing business and industry involvement. Your views will be highly valued.

Please respond to Brenda Kempster, team leader for Task Force business outreach component, by \_\_\_\_\_ to confirm your participation. She can be reached on \_\_\_\_\_.

Sincerely,

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: Sept. 9, 1994  
TO: Paul Diamond  
FROM: Martha Matzke, American Federation of Teachers  
RE: Challenge grant program

Paul--

These notes are very sketchy and random. As I attempt to respond to your concept for a grant program to stimulate the development of "learning communities," I realize that I am missing too many dots (infobits) to be able to make the connections even a mechanistic portrait requires. So here are simply some minimalist reactions to what you proposed:

Your goal is ambitious: To model an effort that will get telcos to do more wiring than they think will pay off; school-system leaders to budget for a concept about which most understand little and are at best skeptical; and "providers" to develop software/content that will advance learning, not just profits.

You also will be dealing with everyone's calculations about the fate of the Administration and its initiatives.

And you face real tensions among the various purposes you aim to encompass in one program. One of the most significant unknowns for institutionalized education in the NII concept is whether schools serving low-income populations will be bypassed. The telecommunications industry (in all of its components) clearly views the connection to the residence as the most cost-effective investment -- for hardware, content, and tariffing. The opportunity costs in developing this marketplace alone are so great that, absent continuing pressure and encouragement, companies will not shell out their cash for resource-poor schools, rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding.

Henry Kelly  
Mike Schmidt  
het's discuss,  
Some interesting  
ideas here  
Paul

Your school-to-work and worker-training/lifelong learning goals CAN be encompassed in a "home-as-learning/entertainment/consumption-center" vision. The only piece of a learning community that can't be created in the home is schools as we know them. So it seems to me that one issue for you is how to underscore in this effort the seriousness of the Administration's intent to have the NII include all schools and libraries. (A related issue may be how to ensure that your grant resources do not end up, as is the case with so many school-improvement schemes, in venues that don't really need the boost and won't help solve the haves-have nots problem in technology.)

Your memo describes at length the potential you see in the creations of the content developers. I agree about the possibilities. But I also concur with the emphasis you placed in our conversation on the problem of how to get the wiring infrastructure in place. My reaction to the memo is that the potential goodies will not be developed unless the infrastructure is built out. I thought you were suggesting when we talked that the grant program would be focused on infrastructure rather than content.

In the context of these thoughts, the following considerations seem to me to be important to your grant initiative. It should:

#### 1) **Maintain the focus**

The Administration got off to a great start with the NII initiative. The message was both focused and evocative; it captured the public's imagination and framed a great national discussion in terms that had not existed before. The moment reminded me of the Kennedy space challenge -- when leadership seemed to harness national energies to a bold vision of the future that then drew everyone forward.

I would think you would want to wrap your initiative tightly to the overall program that has been launched. I start with this point because educators in particular are used to total balkanization -- in funding, regulation, interest-group politics, and definition of purposes. There have been myriad grant programs in the last decade -- out of the foundation world as well as every nook and cranny of the Education Department -- with the words "learning communities" in their programmatic rhetoric. Educators are used to little, inconsequential ideas in meagerly financed projects that are dressed up in very inflated rhetoric. So (I am hazarding the worst

case scenario here) your use of that language will immediately call up this complicated collection of negative associations.

To counter that, would it be possible to make your initiative a top priority of the NII's second year? Could it somehow be a component of the overall NII grant program, and thus associated, not with the bits-and-pieces history of education projects, but with the domestic-policy prestige of the NII itself?

If I were setting up such an attempt to leverage change, I would make sure that people know they were buying into a high level, high stakes national effort — not just another wee sideshow. To do that, I would weave this initiative into the overall NII grants effort. For one thing, wouldn't it be much more synergistic to get the telcos to participate ONCE? They step up to the Gore initiative and say yes, we want to participate in the second round of infrastructure grants, and yes, we would like to put our efforts into the "learning communities" part of the program. Couldn't your projects then get funded for testbed hardware (I mean, the big stuff)? And wouldn't that be an incentive for the corporations?

I would also try to increase the leverage of your effort by having it departmentally supported by Secretaries Riley and Reich. I don't know what grant programs Labor has. But I know Riley made educational networks a FY 1995 priority for the Secretary's Discretionary Grants Program, and he certainly has a lot of interest in pumping Goals 2000. Maybe the two Secretaries could each provide some funding for activities related to "learning communities" ventures.

I am mindful that I didn't even ask you how much dough you've got to bake with. If it's not all that much, the grandeurs I'm imagining would be pretty far-fetched. But even on a modest scale, you will gain by associating your initiative with the broad national purposes of the NII rather than simply with education.

## **2) Get the people who make the decisions involved, not just representative constituency groups**

What you want to demonstrate, it seems to me, are prototypes of the policy/financial partnerships and shifts in thinking that will be required to build out the education infrastructure. So you want proposals that require education decisionmakers to grapple with the

substance of telecommunications issues and to commit some resources to changing the current paradigm.

One approach to the grant program would be to gear the project leadership to the state level. Get states to make the proposals, including some or all of the following requirements: 1) Must involve corporate telecommunications and/or higher education partners and state/local financial commitment; 2) Must attack technology equity issues; 3) Must involve wiring to classroom (or -- if not a school -- user level) and plan for wide- and local-area network/interactivity of one or more kinds; 4) Must include home school linkages and linkages among teachers and between teachers and online data; 5) Must involve classroom teachers in computer training and planning for use of interactive materials in their classroom program; 6) Must involve a financial plan at the school/or district/or state level showing how the entity will incorporate telecommunications costs into regular operating budgets.

I started with states because some are already, as you know, pretty far along in developing their statewide links. And I would like to see state leaders, who after all have the fiscal and constitutional responsibility for schools, become much more vigorous in pushing -- through rhetoric, incentives, and example -- local districts to move forward. It is the state leaders who should be demanding that their schools be equipped to train information-age workers. These folk also are better able than school people to put pressure on the telcos to step up to the challenge of making learning networks financially feasible for schools and libraries.

--- They are also in a position to "encourage" school district leaders to make institutional commitments, rather than simply take the money and run.

Or you could model the program after the first round of NII grants last year. As I recall, there were two types of grant -- planning and operational -- and project sponsorship was left fairly open. If you don't have enough grant money to make hefty awards, then the idea of encouraging a wide variety of types of partnership and seeing what you get has a lot of appeal.

**3) This is an addendum to #2. Get people in policymaking positions to raise their political involvement in this issue.**

I am not sure exactly how to do this, or what the potential for outside cheerleaders is. But I am imagining some kind of ongoing support by folks that I think of as usually hanging back when they should be exerting leadership: the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Education Commission of the States, the National School Boards Association, American Association of School Administrators, etc. I mean the education people who in their professional lives have some kind of responsibility for shaping policy and/or spending decisions. As I said when we talked, Shanker and Geiger can grace your announcement, but what you need is the equally enthusiastic backing of governance types.

What about the National Governors Association? Could you get them to make learning infrastructure an NGA priority? Can any of these other groups be persuaded to provide rhetorical or symbolic support by carrying forward the learning communities theme in their own activities? Year of the Learning Community?

Another angle: Symbolic corporate interest in your program. The Council on Competitiveness, which I staff for AI, has a major initiative on the NII and just held a quite impressive two-day applications conference that included some education demonstrations. As a nice non-Administration-favoring collection of corporate giants, they might lend an effective bipartisan air to your efforts. You may already know that the Council's applications conference last week was co-sponsored by NIST.

Well, I've rambled on far too long. And I fear this is not at all what you had in mind. If there is any redeeming social value in ~~these~~ notions, however, don't hesitate to call on me again. If not, you know where the circular file is!!!

Good luck with the planning, Paul.