

FROM COLLEGE TO FIRST-YEAR TEACHING

How the United States Compares to Several Other Countries

Up to one-third of new U.S. teachers leave the profession within the first few years, according to the recent report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. One reason for this "wastage" of teaching resources, according to the Commission, is our typical "sink-or-swim" attitude toward teacher induction.

In contrast, new teachers in some other countries are provided with resources and guidance that help them to make a successful transition from being students themselves to becoming self-confident, skilled professional teachers. The United States can learn from their experience. **The U.S. Department of Education** recently worked with the **Education Forum of APEC** (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) and with Pelavin Research Institute to carry out a cross-national study of teacher "induction" -- practices designed to support and guide new teachers. The report from this study, *From Students of Teaching to Teachers of Students*, includes case studies of how school systems in three other countries (Japan, New Zealand, and the Northern Territory of Australia) help first-year teachers make the transition from college to the classroom.

These case studies show us that **teaching isn't any easier in other parts of the world. New teachers everywhere feel overwhelmed** by the challenge of their first year in charge of a class. One teacher in Australia's Northern Territory said: "It was like jumping in at the deep end. It is a very steep learning curve moving from the university to the real world." A teacher in Japan agreed, saying "This first year has been very difficult. I am much busier than I had expected to be. It is entirely different from my student teaching experience. Every day brings a new surprise."

Recognizing the challenge, these education systems have developed and put into practice strategies that help teachers through that very tough first year. **Some of the weakest aspects of typical induction practice in the United States have been addressed relatively successfully by these other systems. This report shows that "successful" teacher induction programs, while rooted in the unique cultures of the country where they are found, have the following characteristics in common:**

1. ***New teachers are viewed as professionals on a continuum, with increasing levels of experience and responsibility; novice teachers are not expected to do the same job as "veteran" teachers without significant support.***
 - In Japan and New Zealand, **new teachers are assigned to classes perceived as less difficult** or less critical to educational development, and they carry lighter teaching loads in order to participate in induction activities.
 - In New Zealand, one principal stated "I assign new teachers to classes where I expect fewer discipline problems and parents who are easier to deal with." Assignment to more difficult classes is phased in over a three-year period.

- In Japan, new teachers have reduced classroom hours and administrative duties.
- In all three of the programs studied, the authors concluded that **new teachers are viewed as professionals** -- albeit ones who are at a different point on a continuum of development from experienced teachers -- whose contributions will grow over time, given appropriate support. The difference in skill levels between new and experienced teachers are acknowledged and built in to the school program.

How different from the typical situation in the United States, where new teachers all too frequently get the most difficult class assignments, the most educationally needy children, and extra duties.

2. *New teachers are nurtured and not left to “flounder on their own;” interaction with other teachers is maximized.*

- In the three sites in the APEC study, **schools and classrooms are set up to maximize interaction among teachers**--between new and experienced teachers, and among new teachers. In New Zealand, for instance, the location of a new teacher’s class is viewed as important; when possible, it is next door to a “buddy teacher” or among other teachers of the same grade-level.
- **New and experienced teachers move frequently between one another’s classrooms** for visitations, observations, assessments, and advice. Both the students and the teachers are accustomed to this interaction, so it is not disruptive to the class nor confusing to the students. It’s a natural part of the day. The study calls this “**modeling good practice.**”
- In addition to observing and being observed, in these school systems interaction is facilitated by other structural components of induction programs. The school day or week includes **dedicated time for group planning, grade-level and curriculum-development meetings, and team teaching.** These interactions help new teachers in planning, learning about and gaining access to resources, and building new relationships; they also let the beginner contribute to the group.
- In Japan, **new teachers are provided with at least two periods per week to be observed or to observe other teachers’ classes and at least three periods for consultations with guidance teachers.**

In the United States, by contrast, teachers are left to sink or swim. “Isolated behind classroom doors with little feedback or help, as many as 30 percent leave in the first few years, while others learn merely to cope rather than to teach well” (National Commission Report). The APEC study found that **attrition rates among new U.S. teachers are often five times higher than those of more experienced teachers.**

3. *Teacher induction is a purposive and valued activity.*

- **The induction programs provide “just in time” activities.** New teachers receive information and support when they need it, rather than in lengthy pre-term orientations. For example, in Chiba City, Japan, time is set aside throughout the year for first-year teachers to come together, learn, and reflect on topics that are likely to become important to them at about that time in the academic cycle. Teachers attend a workshop on preparing for teacher-parent consultations at a time just before the first consultations occur.
- In Japan, by law, new teachers must be provided with no less than **60 days** per year of in-school training (including observation and advice), under the leadership of the guidance teacher, and at least **30 days** of out-of school training per year.
- In New Zealand, the Advice and Guidance program provides for release time equal to one day per week to spend on induction activities. For this purpose, schools with a new teacher are provided with 20 percent more than the cost of that teacher’s slot; most of that funding goes for release time so that the new teacher and/or guidance teacher can participate in observation, consultation, and in-service training; the new teacher has a strong say in how the time is used.
- In Australia’s Northern Territory, the induction program promotes teacher retention in a difficult and remote environment. “Orientation” actually includes three components: (1) four days of **initial orientation** before the term begins; (2) **“recall orientation,”** when new teachers come back together for three days about four to six weeks into the term; and (3) **on-going school-level support**. So, again, attention is given when and where it is really needed.

In much of the United States, on the other hand, to the extent that they get special training, new teachers tend to get pre-term orientations or other induction activities at moments chosen more for their convenience to organizers than to inductees’ needs.

4. *Schools possess a culture of shared responsibility and support, in which all or most of the school’s staff contributes to the development and nurturing of the new teacher.*

- In Japan, for instance, one of the principal’s duties is to ensure that all teachers in the school cooperate with the guidance teacher to help the first-year teacher.
- The frequent interaction between new and experienced teachers referred to earlier fosters a naturally close and supportive relationship that is extremely helpful to the first-year teacher.

- Most mentors in these three systems do not receive additional compensation, but having served as a mentor may be a criterion used for promotion to senior teacher or school-level administrator
- Sharing with mentors and other experienced teachers helps new teachers in all three countries cope with their initial, unrealistic expectations of themselves.

This support goes beyond the formal one-on-one mentoring relationship that is designed into teacher induction programs in many U.S. school systems.

5. ***Finally, the study found that in all three countries, assessment of new teachers is down-played.*** This does not mean that there is no attempt to “weed out” incompetent teachers. But the emphasis clearly is on helping new teachers to become better.

- In Australia/Northern Territory, for example, the administration asks schools to **focus less on administering assessments of teacher competency and more on helping teachers prepare for assessment.** A teacher’s failure is seen as a failure on the part of the administration.
- The study researchers noted that the absence of serious concern by all participants in the induction program about meeting certification and registration requirements enhances the provision of assistance and support. Teachers do not seem to feel threatened or even uncomfortable about being observed, or about asking questions they fear will reveal professional inadequacies. **The frequent observation by fellow teachers is non-threatening assessment** that can help them improve.

This study found, however, that “teacher induction in the United States traditionally has focused most heavily on assessment; and assistance where it exists is strongly linked to aiding new teachers to achieve the assessment criteria.”

6. ***Policy makers almost everywhere want to improve their teacher induction.***

Teacher induction is not perfect in any of these sites; in fact, all interviewed policy makers thought it could be improved. In all three sites, administrators at both **teacher-training institutions and in the schools say they want closer links with each other.** Formative and summative **program evaluation is virtually lacking,** so there is little hard evidence that the induction programs are working. And there is **some concern about equity:** teacher induction is seen to be more universally provided and more strongly supported in schools and communities with higher income levels. We also know there are some districts in the United States that are doing good things with their new teachers. ***Still, American schools could learn a lot about how they could better support their first-year teachers by taking a good look at what teacher induction means in Australia’s Northern Territory, Japan, and New Zealand.***



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE SECRETARY

April 17, 1997

Dear Colleague:

A central part of the President's school improvement agenda in elementary and secondary education is vigorous support for community and state efforts to set very high standards. Indeed, there is nothing more important in American education than setting and achieving the highest standards for our students, schools, and teachers.

For this reason, the President and I were extremely interested in a report on the quality of teaching in this country released last fall by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, a bipartisan panel of elected officials, business leaders, and educators. This study, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*, reports that two million teachers will be needed in the next ten years to accommodate growing student enrollments and to replace an aging teaching force, and that the nation is neither setting high enough standards for current or future teachers nor providing adequate help for teachers to meet high standards. The Commission challenged the nation to ensure that every child in the country has access to competent, qualified, and caring teachers by the year 2006.

While I joined Commission members in releasing their report at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., the President was visiting an elementary school in Fresno, California, where he called on the nation to invest in quality teaching and help America's teachers meet the highest standards. In the President's *A Call to Action for American Education In the 21st Century*, outlined in his most recent State of the Union address, he described strategies to help ensure that there is a talented and dedicated teacher in every classroom in the nation. The President also asked the U.S. Department of Education to notify state and local officials of Department resources available to help address the following challenges to promote excellence and accountability in teaching:

- ▶ recruiting talented people into teaching;
- ▶ setting high standards for teachers, including tough licensing and certification standards, and increasing dramatically the number of teachers who meet the demanding standards for accomplished teaching set by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards;
- ▶ investing in high-quality teacher preparation and career-long professional development strategies to help teachers meet high standards; and
- ▶ rewarding and retaining good teachers, restoring enthusiasm and providing intensive assistance for teachers who need it, and counseling out of the profession or removing -- fairly, quickly, and cost-effectively -- teachers who are incompetent or burnt-out.

I am pleased to share with you the enclosed *Excellence & Accountability in Teaching: A Guide to U.S. Department of Education Programs and Resources* on how this Department's resources can accelerate state and local efforts to support high-quality teaching. I hope that you will find it useful in highlighting U.S. Department of Education resources available to help schools, communities, universities, and states address these challenges. If used thoughtfully, in ways that are consistent with state and local school improvement strategies and with the underlying purposes of the relevant programs, these resources can make significant contributions to the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms throughout the nation. Where program requirements impede the use of effective strategies to improve teaching and learning, my staff can help explore the possible use of waivers, schoolwide projects, and other strategies for tailoring the use of U.S. Department of Education program funds to your needs.

Specific questions about the programs and resources included in the *User's Guide* can be directed to the contacts identified in the program descriptions. More general questions or comments can be addressed to our new Teacher Excellence Desk by telephone (202-260-4794) or by Internet (teacher_excellence@ed.gov).

In addition, with help from teachers, principals, colleges, and others around the country, this Department has also developed a number of other documents related to excellence in teaching that you may find helpful. I encourage your office to call 1-800-USA-LEARN to request any of these documents, including a brochure outlining the mission and principles of high-quality professional development, brief profiles of schools recently honored by the Department for their outstanding work in teacher professional development, and a guidebook on programs offered by agencies throughout the federal government that support teacher education and professional development. The Department also will soon release a document identifying promising practices in each of the areas of challenge discussed in the enclosed materials.

Quality teachers and quality teaching are cornerstones of all our school improvement efforts. The President and I look forward to working with you to ensure that all students have access to the well-prepared, high-quality teachers they need and deserve.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dick Riley", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Richard W. Riley

Enclosure

Excellence & Accountability in Teaching

A GUIDE TO
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES

General questions or comments about this *Guide*, or suggestions about how it or future material of this kind can be improved, may be directed to:

Teacher Excellence Desk
U.S. Department of Education
600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202-0170
Telephone: (202) 260-4794
E-mail: [teacher_excellence @ed.gov](mailto:teacher_excellence@ed.gov)

Questions about specific programs or resources identified in the *Guide* should be directed to the named contact.

This material is available in alternative formats.
Please contact the U.S. Department of Education to request this information.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS THAT CAN
SUPPORT EXCELLENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN TEACHING**

A GUIDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Improving Schools: The Critical Role of Good Teachers and Good Teaching	1
II. Using Department Programs to Support Excellence and Accountability In Teaching	11
Chart of the Department's Programs	17
III. U.S. Department of Education Programs and Resources	21
Index	21
Part A - Formula Grant Programs	23
Introduction	23
Program Descriptions	23
Part B - Competitive Grant Programs	31
Introduction	31
Current or Upcoming Department of Education Grant Competitions	32
Learning More About New Competitions	40
Part C - Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	42

PART I: IMPROVING SCHOOLS: THE CRITICAL ROLE OF GOOD TEACHERS AND GOOD TEACHING

The enclosed materials identify major U.S. Department of Education programs and resources that are available to support school, community, university, and state efforts to invest in good teachers and good teaching. This introduction places the issue of teacher quality -- and how these programs and resources can most effectively be used to promote it -- in the context of broad trends in public education and presents some of the key challenges identified by the President and by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Elementary and Secondary Education in America: Promising Trends, But Progress is Not Fast Enough

New demands are facing our young people, our teachers, and our schools. Jobs in today's economy demand substantially higher levels of education, skills, and knowledge than ever before. The gap in lifetime earnings and opportunity between the well-educated and poorly educated is growing. And with an unprecedented 51.7 million students enrolled in K-12 education this year, many schools face the challenge of educating record numbers of students. Preparation for productive employment, good citizenship, and a high quality of life depends on strong schools.

To respond to these growing needs, parents, educators, businesses, communities, colleges, states, and the U.S. Department of Education are taking steps to improve teaching and learning in our schools. Many schools and communities are working together to raise expectations for children, make schools safe and drug free, and provide students with access to computers, the Internet, and other technologies that open new doors to learning.

But these promising efforts are still not enough to keep pace with the rising demands being placed on our schools. Despite positive trends, including steadily improving math scores, increased attendance in college, and tougher academic classes, a number of recent studies suggest that U.S. schools and students need to make even more progress. While there are high-performing schools setting and achieving the highest standards for students and teachers even in the most challenging circumstances, too many schools are not keeping pace.

High-quality public education remains the cornerstone of our democracy and economy and the key to realizing the American dream for those who are willing to work for it. Efforts must be redoubled to ensure high-quality teaching and learning in schools throughout the nation, helping all our students and teachers to reach the highest standards.

Quality Teaching: A Critical Element in All Efforts to Improve Schools

Without quality teachers and teaching, not even the most promising school improvement effort will succeed. Setting high standards for students, involving parents more in education, infusing the effective use of computers and technology into our schools, and turning schools into havens of safety, discipline, and learning all depend in large part on providing students with access to talented, knowledgeable, dedicated, and caring teachers.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future's recent report *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* describes this challenge, as well as important efforts to raise the quality of teaching in America.

The Commission found that half the nation's aging teaching force will be replaced within 10 years and that there is inadequate preparation and support to ensure good teachers and good teaching for all of America's classrooms. The Commission also called on the nation to elevate the teaching profession and

Did you know that Eisenhower and Goals 2000 funding can be used -- as part of broad state education plans to help all students master the basics and reach high academic standards -- to support the strengthening of state licensure standards for beginning teachers?

institute comprehensive strategies for helping teachers meet high standards. President Clinton joined the call for quality teaching, challenging the nation to ensure that every child has "dedicated outstanding teachers who know their subject matter, are effectively trained, and know how to teach to high standards and to make learning come alive for students."

To this end, the President challenged communities and states to recruit talented, diverse people into teaching, set challenging teacher licensure and certification standards, provide teachers with the training and support they need to meet these standards, reward good teachers, and identify low-performing or burnt-out teachers who need to receive intensive assistance or, if necessary, to be counseled out of the profession or removed.

Strategies in each of these areas will affect student learning and teacher effectiveness most significantly if they are integrated with local school improvement efforts aimed at raising the quality of teaching and learning. Moreover, they should be considered in light of the question: what strategies, partnerships, or allocation of resources will have the most powerful and enduring effect on the quality of teaching and learning immediately and in the long term?

Meeting these challenges will also require a commitment across America to supporting quality teaching. To help communities and states address these challenges, the President asked the Secretary of Education to make clear what U.S. Department of Education resources are available to address these challenges and support high-quality teaching throughout the nation.

Setting Rigorous Standards for Students and Teachers

At the heart of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and new educational technology initiatives is support for the development of rigorous academic standards and comprehensive efforts by communities and states to help all students reach those standards. Because student learning depends on quality teaching, enabling teachers to meet high standards is also essential. To improve the practice of teaching, we need:

- ▶ Tougher standards for licensing new teachers and more rigorous requirements in hiring teachers set by school districts. States vary widely in the processes and standards used to license classroom teachers. For this reason, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), through leadership from the Council of Chief State School Officers, is working with more than 30 states to develop high-quality performance assessments of knowledge and skills for beginning teachers. These teacher standards are related directly to academic standards for students. Requiring tougher licensing and certification standards for teachers is drawing significant support from the nation's teachers, with 86 percent supporting competency requirements before obtaining certification.

Meanwhile, some states have moved ahead with tougher licensing requirements for new teachers, requiring entering teachers to meet rigorous standards within their first few years of teaching and undergo performance assessment conducted by state-trained observers. Experienced mentors and special clinics help prepare teachers for these assessments. School districts can also set rigorous requirements for newly-hired teachers and work with local schools of education and universities to ensure graduates meet these requirements.

- ▶ Standards for advanced teaching skills and knowledge, especially standards developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Board members, the majority of whom are classroom teachers, oversee a process for granting advanced teaching certification to experienced, accomplished teachers. The certification process is performance-based and extremely rigorous, asking teachers to demonstrate their skills through classroom teaching, videotapes of their teaching, lesson plans, and samples of their own and students' work.

Many school districts, teacher associations and unions, schools of education, and states have begun to help teachers gain national board certification and to reward board-

Did you know that the Clinton Administration has proposed \$105 million over five years to help the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards complete assessments in most fields and to help school districts and states defray the costs of teachers going through the Board's intensive review?

certified teachers with incentives, bonuses, and salary increases. North Carolina, for example, will pay the fee for teachers to complete the National Board certification assessments, provide three days of substitute time for teachers to undergo the review needed for certification, and provide a four percent annual bonus to board-certified teachers; just this year, North Carolina Governor Jim Hunt has proposed providing a 12 percent pay increase for board-certified teachers. These master teachers also serve as coaches and trainers for other teachers in their schools.

In St. Paul, the school district is collaborating with the teachers' union and the University of Minnesota to support teachers through the board certification process. The district pays the application fees, and the university and other partners develop and conduct professional support programs for the candidates.

- ▶ New standards for schools of education that prepare future teachers. In 1995, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) completed its latest revision of higher standards for schools of education. These standards are closely aligned with core academic and skill standards for student learning, and 40 percent of our nation's teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities have received this accreditation. Partly because of the new standards, and partly through their own initiative, a number of universities have begun to overhaul their undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs.
- ▶ Standards for rewarding teachers and for identifying teachers that need intensive assistance and review. School districts can work with teachers and others to set clear, high standards for rewarding knowledge, skill, and performance as well as for identifying teachers needing intensive assistance or, if necessary, removal from the classroom. In Cincinnati, low-performing teachers can be assigned to an intervention program where they gain assistance from colleagues and administrators, and if unable to improve, are counseled out of the profession or removed. The Rochester, New York, school district has used similar strategies, along with annual salary advancement for teachers that is linked to performance. Experienced, expert teachers in Rochester can also apply to become more highly paid "lead teachers" who consult with beginning teachers and develop curricula while they continue their own teaching.

Teacher recruitment

With nearly half of the nation's teaching force retiring over the next ten years, a critical factor affecting the quality of teaching will be how well schools, communities, and universities recruit talented people into the teaching profession.

Did you know that funds from the School-to-Work Opportunities Act can be used to support the development of middle school and high school academies for future teachers?

A number of promising recruiting strategies are being tried around the nation:

- ▶ Starting early. School districts and universities are working together to create middle and high school programs that expose young people to the teaching profession. For example, the South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment has reached thousands of academically talented high school juniors and seniors through its Teacher Cadet Program, offered in more than 140 high schools statewide. Teacher Cadets study education and have the opportunity to teach younger students under the tutelage of both school and university faculty. The Center also targets minority middle-school students, encouraging them to take rigorous courses in school and aspire to a career in teaching.
- ▶ Aggressive outreach to non-traditional sources of teachers and creating high-quality pathways to teaching. This includes outreach to the fields of business and engineering, to the military, and to recent college graduates who did not major in education. For example, large California businesses and a local university created the California Mathematics and Science Teacher Corps program, recruiting retiring engineers and scientists and providing them with intensive preparation for teaching in the classroom.

Programs to prepare teachers' aides and other paraprofessionals to become teachers are also growing rapidly around the nation. Moreover, the organization Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. has conducted several national studies of teacher recruitment efforts and has several publications with practical information on how to improve such strategies.

- ▶ Streamlining hiring procedures and making it easier for teaching candidates to find out about available positions and for schools to hire qualified teachers. Too often, inaccessible and belated information about job openings can make it difficult for schools to hire quality prospective teaching candidates. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future has suggested that school districts create a central electronic "hiring hall" that provides relevant information on all qualified candidates and delegate more hiring and selection decisions to schools.
- ▶ Honoring good teachers and building public respect for the teaching profession. One of the most powerful strategies for recruiting talented, diverse people into teaching is to honor good teachers and encourage the public to value the teaching profession. While respect for the teaching profession must rest fundamentally on seeing good teaching in local schools, other steps include publicly recognizing good teachers and providing opportunities for exemplary teachers to talk and work with education, business, student, and community groups.

Helping Teachers Reach High Standards: Preparing Future Teachers and Providing Ongoing Training and Professional Development for Current Teachers

Setting high standards for teachers will affect teaching and learning only if teachers receive the preparation, support, and ongoing training they need to improve classroom practice. In every field, demands are being placed on the workforce for higher levels of knowledge, skill, and performance than ever before. Teaching is no exception.

This support includes rigorous, comprehensive, and clinically-based preparation for future teachers, ongoing opportunities for current teachers to learn and acquire new skills, such as the use of technology in the classroom, ensuring that school principals support good teaching, and organizing schools in ways that promote student and teacher learning.

- Teacher education: preparing the teachers of tomorrow. A number of universities have been working to upgrade the quality of their schools of education and are often working in close partnership with local schools and school districts. In San Antonio, for example, Trinity University has been working with several local schools to upgrade preparation for college students hoping to become teachers.

Did you know that Goals 2000 subgrants are being awarded across the nation to partnerships of school districts, universities, and others to improve the preparation of future and current teachers?

Trinity replaced its traditional four-year education major with five years of tough course work in core academic areas integrated with courses in education. In the fifth year, Trinity students become student teachers, working with expert teachers and university faculty to hone their skills.

- Ongoing training and professional development for current teachers. Learning new skills cannot stop on entering the teaching profession. High-quality, sustained professional development for all teachers is essential, and it involves a commitment to providing teachers the time to work together and acquire the skills needed to accomplish a well-defined school mission and to help all students reach challenging academic standards. But teachers do not always receive good professional development; the recently released Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), for example, reports that U.S. teachers are provided with less time and training than teachers in other nations to learn and hone the skills needed to

Did you know that states and school districts can use the consolidated planning process under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to develop strategies for how an array of federal funds will support high-quality professional development?

teach math and science. More attention is needed to provide teachers with the opportunity and time for acquiring the skills, knowledge, and professional development they need.

Fortunately, some schools and school districts are doing just that. For example, the Woodrow Wilson Elementary School in Manhattan, Kansas, was established as a “professional development school” where current and future teachers can go for assistance in upgrading their skills in math, science, and technology. The school, which helps teachers understand and use the widely acclaimed math standards developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, was recently named as one of five schools to win an award from the U.S. Department of Education for efforts to give teachers the skills they need to succeed. Please call 1-800-USA-LEARN to ask for brief profiles of these award-winning schools and school districts.

Rewarding Good Teachers, and Dealing with Low-Performing or Burnt-Out Teachers

While these are local and state decisions, federal funds can be used to support the development of systems and standards for rewarding good teachers and thoughtful and careful strategies for identifying -- and improving the skills of or removing -- incompetent teachers. Indeed, these strategies are drawing broad support from the nation’s teachers, with 90 percent agreeing that making it easier to remove incompetent teachers would have a positive effect on the quality of teaching.

- ▶ Rewarding good teachers for knowledge, skill, and performance. Good teachers and good teaching should be rewarded, and many schools and school districts have begun to do so. For example, a number of states and school districts (including North Carolina, Ohio, and New Mexico, and the St. Paul school district) provide financial rewards and greater responsibilities to teachers who gain certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Did you know that Title I funds can be used to provide bonuses to high-performing teachers to compensate them for coaching other teachers in need of assistance?
- ▶ Identifying teachers in need of intensive assistance and, when necessary, counseling them out of the profession or removing them. The Cincinnati school district has been pioneering the use of a peer review of low-performing teachers. Teachers in these programs receive intensive assistance and support, with most improving their performance in the classroom. When performance does not improve, however, some teachers are counseled to leave the profession or are removed.

Using U.S. Department of Education Resources to Address Critical Challenges Affecting the Quality of Teaching

Since only a small percentage of funding for K-12 education comes from the federal government, communities and schools should first examine how well they use their own resources to recruit, prepare, and reward good teachers while holding teachers accountable to high standards.

Once a local community or state has conducted this analysis and has begun to develop strategies for helping teachers reach high standards, it can explore what federal resources are available to help. Some U.S. Department of Education programs can be used either directly or indirectly by teachers and other educators, colleges, communities, and states to help bring excellence and accountability to the teaching profession.

Using federal funds to complement state and local resources to improve the quality of teaching should be done thoughtfully, ensuring that funds are used in a way that is consistent both with local and state school improvement strategies and with the underlying purposes of the relevant federal programs. For example, funds from the bilingual education program might be used to help recruit and prepare teachers who can help students with limited English proficiency to reach high academic standards that a district or state has set for all students. Staff knowledgeable about federal programs at the school district, state, or U.S. Department of Education can help explore in greater depth how to tailor these programs to your needs.

Did you know that schools, school districts, and states may apply to the Secretary of Education for waivers of statutory and regulatory provisions in many federal programs where these provisions impede the ability of a school to help all students meet high academic standards?

Have you thought about how federal funds can be used to invest in teacher quality? A school district might apply for a Goals 2000 grant to work with local universities to prepare future teachers to meet tougher state licensing requirements and to identify and support two accomplished teachers in every school to become certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. A district might also use a portion of its Eisenhower professional development funds to train outstanding teachers to mentor new teachers and to review the performance of and provide intensive assistance to low-performing teachers. And the district might use a portion of a bilingual education grant to prepare teachers for certification in teaching students with limited English proficiency.

Have you thought about the use of Title I schoolwide programs to invest in professional development and improving teaching quality throughout the school? Many high-poverty schools receiving Title I funding are eligible to become "schoolwide programs," where they can -- if they develop a plan for helping all of their students meet high academic standards -- further combine funds to provide sustained professional development so their teachers are fully equipped to help students meet high standards.

Thinking About Comprehensive Strategies to Invest in Quality Teaching and the Use of Federal Funds to Support These Strategies

Investing in quality teaching depends on public recognition of the extraordinary demands placed on our teachers today, a willingness to accord respect and honor to teachers across America, and leadership from teachers, schools, and communities to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure our students have access to the talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teachers they need and deserve.

Efforts to support good teaching can be bolstered by critical steps identified by the President and discussed in this document: recruiting new teachers, setting the highest standards for teachers and helping them reach those standards, rewarding good teachers, and identifying low-performing teachers in need of assistance or other forms of intervention. However, these steps should not be considered in isolation from one another or from broader local and state efforts to improve schools and boost student achievement. Moreover, the design and implementation of strategies to improve teaching, learning, and schooling should rely heavily on the leadership of classroom teachers and principals that work every day to motivate and educate their students.

Communities and states have an opportunity to draw on an array of U.S. Department of Education resources to support a comprehensive strategy to ensure that students have access to good teachers and teaching.

Explanation of Following Materials and Conclusion

The materials that follow have been prepared to help the public understand how the many U.S. Department of Education programs and resources can support strategies to invest in quality teaching.

- ▶ Part II of this Guide presents important, general information about these programs and how they can be used most effectively to promote state and local efforts to support teacher excellence and accountability. It also contains charts of the Department's principal grant programs that can help meet each of the key challenges to improving the quality of the nation's teachers.
- ▶ Part III provides brief descriptions and contacts for the programs identified in those charts as well as for the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers. These centers can further help schools, school districts, universities, and states in their work to use the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs to improve the quality of teaching. Each program and resource description also provides the name, phone number, and Internet address of a contact who can provide further information or assistance. In addition, the section of Part III on "Competitive Grant Programs" identifies those programs for which the Department has scheduled or

planned new competitions in the near future as well as how the Internet may be used to obtain copies of program application notices and program priorities published in the *Federal Register* directly from the Department's home page.

The Appendix to this *Guide* contains descriptions and contacts for other resources that can support efforts to improve teaching. Many of these research programs, technical assistance centers, and information clearinghouses focus on particular subject areas or promoting increased achievement among students with special needs.

In addition, the Department has established a new Teacher Excellence desk to assist anyone with more general questions or comments about these materials or how federal programs and resources can help them to meet the key challenges for improving teaching. Please call or write:

Teacher Excellence
U.S. Department of Education
600 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-0170
Phone: (202) 260-4794
E-mail: teacher_excellence@ed.gov

Working together, our nation can provide all of our students with the talented, caring, diverse, and well-prepared teachers our children need and deserve. As part of broad efforts to improve schools, meeting this challenge can help all students reach high academic standards and be prepared for the 21st century.

April 1997

PART II: USING DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS TO SUPPORT EXCELLENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN TEACHING

The following charts identify U.S. Department of Education programs that can contribute to efforts to meet each of five key challenges for promoting excellence and accountability in teaching. These challenges (and their abbreviations used on the charts) are --

- **Recruit the most talented people into teaching** ("Recruit Talent");
- **Prepare future teachers to meet high licensing and certification standards** ("Prepare for Cert");
- **Help support tougher licensing and certification requirements for teachers** ("Stronger Stnds");
- **Provide ongoing training to help teachers meet high standards, including support for—and restoring the enthusiasm of—teachers who are most in need of assistance** ("Ongoing Training"); and
- **Help create accountability systems to identify and reward good teachers—and remove incompetent teachers quickly, fairly, and less expensively, or counsel them out of teaching** ("Accountability").

The Department's programs generally fall into two categories. "Formula grant" programs make funding available to all eligible recipients; "competitive grant" programs provide funding only to those winning a grant competition. The charts separately identify those programs in each category that, depending upon a state or community's own goals and strategies, can most readily be used in efforts to meet these challenges.

As states and communities are developing goals and strategies for promoting a high-quality teaching force, some may be unsure where to begin looking among the Department's programs for help. For those in this situation, we suggest starting with the following programs.

WHERE TO START -- SOME SUGGESTIONS FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS:

- **Goals 2000: High Standards and Education Reform**
- **Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards (Title I, ESEA)**
- **Eisenhower Professional Development (Title II, ESEA)**
- **Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (Title III, ESEA)**
- **Innovative Educational Program Strategies (Title VI, ESEA)**
- **Individuals With Disabilities Education Act -- Assistance to States (Part C, IDEA)**

OTHER PROGRAMS:

- **School-to-Work Opportunities Grants**
- **Star Schools Program**
- **Training Personnel for Education of Individuals With Disabilities**
- **Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education**

Putting the Pieces Together

The programs and resources identified in the following materials can support efforts to create a truly high quality and diverse teaching force. But **how** can one actually use these programs? And, more important, **how** can they be used most effectively?

The U.S. Department of Education is committed to helping educators find answers to these questions. Given the Department's mission to promote excellence and equity in education, many of its programs focus on needs of particular populations or aspects of the school environment that are crucial to teaching and learning. Therefore, understanding how each Department program can contribute to improving teacher quality requires knowledge of: (1) the program's requirements; and (2) the particular role that the program can play, notwithstanding its particular focus, in helping all prospective and current teachers acquire the knowledge and skills they need to enable all children to succeed.

States and school districts will find some of the programs identified in the charts easier than others to use in their efforts to address the five challenges. Given program funding levels, the Department does not conduct competitions each year for all of its competitive grant programs. Moreover, in some cases, such as a school district's use of funds provided under Title I, Part A of the ESEA to help establish tougher local certification requirements, only those local-level recipients that want to establish their own special requirements for teachers of certain students (or who will teach in certain schools) will be able to exercise the flexibility and creativity needed to use a particular program's funds. Still, the charts confirm the breadth of Department programs that recipients can consider using as they endeavor to address the five challenges in ways that will most improve the quality of teaching and the achievement of all students.

However, **effective** use of these programs requires much more. Classroom teachers do not have students with a single set of needs or learning styles. Indeed, any given classroom -- indeed, any given student -- may need a teacher highly skilled not only in teaching content that reflects the school district's and state's standards, but teaching it in ways that address challenges resulting from lack of English proficiency, disabilities, migrancy, and a school environment marred by drugs and violence. Helping that teacher or prospective teacher to acquire the knowledge and skills he or she needs requires knowing how to coordinate the various federal programs that would be used to promote teacher excellence and accountability and how to integrate them into the professional development strategies and activities carried out with state and local funds.

Recent changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) along with provisions of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act offer creative and powerful tools for accomplishing these objectives. These tools include:

- ▶ **Availability of Waivers.** While ESEA and other programs are very flexible, there may be situations in which a program's requirements seem to impede a school's, school district's, or state's ability to develop an integrated plan for promoting excellence and accountability in teaching. The ESEA now authorizes the Secretary to waive most program statutes and regulations (including general administrative regulation) that a school, district, or state demonstrates are hampering its efforts to improve teaching and learning, including funding for and implementation of high-quality professional development activities. This waiver authority extends to all ESEA formula and competitive programs identified in the charts. In addition, both the Goals 2000 and School-to-Work statutes extend the Secretary's waiver authority to most provisions of the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act. Under Ed-Flex (the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program), the Secretary of Education has granted nine states their own authority to waive provisions of certain ESEA programs and the Perkins formula grant program. These states are Colorado, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Vermont.
- ▶ **Consolidated State and Local Plans.** The ESEA also invites districts and states to revamp the very ways in which they plan the use of federal program funds. Districts and states are no longer required, as a condition of receiving federal formula grant funds, to develop and submit separate and detailed plans or applications for each federal program in which it wants to participate. Instead, for most formula grant programs, the ESEA now permits the use of a single consolidated plan that focuses specifically on what the district will do to promote cross-program coordination, integration of service provided under those programs with state and local-sponsored activities, and improved service delivery. Use of a consolidated plan does not eliminate federal program requirements and does not authorize commingling of program funds. Consolidated planning does, however, encourage thinking about how all of the individual federal programs included in the plan, notwithstanding their distinct purposes and different beneficiaries, can fit together and support the district's own program to improve teaching and learning.
- ▶ **Schoolwide Programs.** The ESEA authorizes schools in high poverty areas to use Title I, Part A funds along with funds provided by most other federal programs, to upgrade the entire education program of a school. As a schoolwide program, a school can use the funds it receives under nearly all federal programs (except the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)) as a common pool of resources. Federal funds used in the schoolwide program are required to supplement resources that the school otherwise would have available from non-federal funds. But instead of tracking all the funds, the school has to ensure only that where a particular federal program contributes to the

schoolwide program, the school's activities meet the intent and purposes of that program (rather than the individual requirements of the program).

- **Consolidated Administrative Funds.** The ESEA also authorizes states and school districts to consolidate administrative funds provided under the ESEA state formula grant programs and Goals 2000 into a common pool, thereby eliminating the need for tracking how a particular program's administrative funds are spent. The ESEA also authorizes this pool of funds to be used for a broad range of activities, including coordination of the federal programs with other federal and non-federal programs.

A Few Reminders

Many of the Department's programs are intended to provide additional support with which to address needs of a particular population of students (*e.g.*, students with disabilities or limited-English proficiency), or improvements in particular aspects of the learning environment (*e.g.*, safe-and drug-free schools, and enhanced use of technology). These programs can help fill important gaps in an overall plan for promoting excellence and accountability in teaching. For example, a school district that has decided to strengthen its efforts to recruit, train, or retain high-quality teachers of limited-English proficient students may want also to examine how Titles I and II of the ESEA and the bilingual education competitive grant programs can help it do so.

Each Department program has its own set of requirements and purposes, which need to be considered in order to use the programs properly to promote excellence and accountability of all teachers. Except for funds of those programs that a school uses in a schoolwide program established under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), program funds can help to support these challenges only if the use of those funds (a) supports activities that meet the program's statutory purposes, (b) benefits those students (or teachers of those students) whom the program serves, and (c) otherwise complies with all applicable program requirements and any approved or amended program plans or applications. For certain programs, these requirements include the need for program funds to "supplement, and not supplant" funds that, in the absence of program funds, would be available from state and local sources to support activities. Using program funds to support tougher licensing and certification requirements for teachers where those programs benefit particular populations or focus on particular subject areas (*e.g.*, technology and violence-free and drug-free schools) will make sense where those populations or subject areas are one focus of licensing and certification requirements.

The charts contain a number of notes that are intended to remind the reader of these important considerations.

Keys to Understanding the Charts

1. A filled circle (●) indicates not only that program funds can be used to address this challenge, but also that this use of funds is a primary focus of the program. A circle (○) in a column indicates that program funds can be used to address this challenge, but that addressing the challenge, or improved professional development in general, is not at the heart of the program's purpose.
2. Superscript notes highlight the existence of a supplement, not supplant requirement, or basic program requirements that affect how recipients may use funds to support a particular challenge.
3. The charts use the following abbreviations:

ESEA	:	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
IDEA	:	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
HEA	:	Higher Education Act
STWOA	:	School-to-Work Opportunities Act

For simplicity, the charts use the term "States" to identify grantees that are state departments of education (more formally known as "state educational agencies" and, in the case of the Title II, ESEA, Eisenhower Professional Development Program, "state agencies for higher education").

4. *Italics* are used in the charts to designate those subgrantees for which funds are available only on a competitive, rather than on a formula, grant basis. In addition, those "grantees" designated as "direct" are Department grantees (e.g., state departments of education), while those designated as "indirect" receive subgrants from Department grantees (e.g., school districts that receive ESEA Title I, Part A funds from their respective state department of education).
5. Section III of this Guide contains brief descriptions of each of the identified formula grant programs (Part A) and information about competitive grant programs for which the public can now apply (including application due dates) or for which the Department plans to hold competitions in the near future (Part B). This information also includes information on how those with Internet access can access further information about these competitions from the Department's Home Page. Section III also includes information about the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers, which are designed to assist states, school districts, and schools to use resources provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act -- including resources that are available to promote excellence and accountability in teaching -- in the most effective ways possible.
6. In addition to the Comprehensive Centers, the Department funds a number of more specialized centers, information clearinghouses, and other service providers that may be able to provide technical assistance, although not funds, to help other entities address the five

challenges. These service providers are identified and described in the Appendix to this *Guide*. In addition, the Department is conducting new competitions for service providers identified at the beginning of this section. While all other resources identified in this section are selected competitively, the Department does not anticipate new competitions for them in the near future.

**U.S. Department of Education Programs
That Promote Excellence and Accountability in Teaching**

Program	Recruit Talent	Prepare for Cert	Stronger Stnds.	Ongoing Training	Accountability
FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS					
Goals 2000: High Standards and Education Reform (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Title III) Grantees: States (direct); <i>School districts</i> (indirect)	○	●	●	●	●
Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Dev. Program -- State & Local Grants (ESEA, Title II, Part B) Grantees: States, (direct); School districts, <i>Higher ed institutions, Non-profit orgs.</i> (indirect)	○	●	●	●	●
Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards: Improving Basic Programs Operated by School Districts ¹ (ESEA, Title I, Part A) Grantees: States (direct); School districts (indirect)	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	● ²	○ ²
Even Start (Family Literacy) (ESEA, Title I, Part B) Grantees: States (direct); <i>School districts (with Public agencies, Higher ed institutions, or Private non-profit orgs.)</i> (indirect)	○ ²	○ ²		○ ²	
Migrant Education ¹ (ESEA, Title I, Part C) Grantees: States (direct); <i>School districts</i> and other local operating agencies (indirect)	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund ¹ (ESEA, Title III, Part A, subpart 2) Grantees: States (direct); <i>School districts</i> (indirect)				● ²	
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (ESEA, Title IV) Grantees: States, Governors (direct); School districts, <i>Community agencies</i> (indirect)				○ ²	

CHART KEY

CIRCLES: ● Primary focus of the program. ○ Not a primary focus of the program.
 ITALICS: Funds for subgrantees are awarded on a competitive basis only.
 NOTES: Special program requirements apply -- see notes on page 19..

U.S. Department of Education Programs That Promote Excellence and Accountability in Teaching					
Program	Recruit Talent	Prepare for Cert	Stronger Stnds.	Ongoing Training	Account- ability
Innovative Education Program Strategies ¹ (ESEA, Title VI) Grantees: States, (direct); School districts, <i>Higher ed institutions, Libraries, Museums, Non-profit orgs.</i> (at the State's or School district's discretion) (indirect)	○	○	○	○	○
Impact Aid (ESEA, Title VIII) Grantees: School districts	○	○	○	○	○
Indian Education -- Formula Grants to School Districts (ESEA, Title IX, Part A, subpart 1) Grantees: School districts, and Schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under certain conditions				○ ²	
SPECIAL EDUCATION					
Individuals With Disabilities Education Act -- Assistance to States ¹ (IDEA, Part B) Grantees: States (direct); School districts (indirect)	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²
Training Personnel for Education of Individuals with Disabilities ¹ (IDEA, Part D) Grantees: States	● ²	● ²	● ²	● ²	○ ²
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities (IDEA, Part H) ¹ Grantees: State Part H lead agencies (State educational agencies or other state agencies)	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²

CHART KEY

CIRCLES: ● Primary focus of the program. ○ Not a primary focus of the program.
ITALICS: Funds for subgrantees are awarded on a competitive basis only.
NOTES: Special program requirements apply -- see notes on page 19..

U.S. Department of Education Programs That Promote Excellence and Accountability in Teaching					
Program	Recruit Talent	Prepare for Cert	Stronger Stnds.	Ongoing Training	Accountability
ADULT AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION					
Adult Education Special Demonstration and Teacher Training ¹ (Adult Ed Act, sec. 353) Grantees: States (direct); School districts, Higher ed institutions and other Non-profit orgs. (indirect)	○ ²	○ ²		○ ²	
Vocational Educational – Basic Grants State Programs/State Leadership ¹ (Carl D. Perkins Voc and Applied Tech Ed Act, Title II, Part A) Grantees: State boards of vocational ed	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	● ²	○ ²
Local Activities ¹ (Carl D Perkins Voc and Applied Tech Ed Act, Title II, Part C) Grantees: State boards of vocational ed (direct); School districts, Area voc ed schools, Other interm. ed agencies, Higher ed institutions (indirect)	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²	○ ²
Tech-Prep Education (Carl D. Perkins Voc and Applied Tech Ed Act, Title III, Part E) Grantees: State boards of vocational ed (direct); Consortia of secondary entities (e.g., School districts and Higher ed institutions) (indirect) (formula or competitive grant at the State board's discretion)				○ ²	
SCHOOL-TO-WORK OPPORTUNITIES					
State Implementation Grants -- State and Local Partnerships (STWOA, Titles II and III) Grantees: State and local partnerships	○	○	○	○	

CHART KEY

CIRCLES: ● Primary focus of the program. ○ Not a primary focus of the program.
 ITALICS: Funds for subgrantees are awarded on a competitive basis only.
 NOTES: Special program requirements apply -- see notes on page 19..

NOTES

1. As the program has a supplement, not supplant requirement, program funds can help to support efforts to meet the challenges only if they supplement the level of state and local funds that otherwise would be spent doing so.
2. Consistent with the program's purpose, activities that promote teacher excellence and accountability must focus on particular subject areas or particular populations that the program may serve.

PART III: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
PART A - FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS	
INTRODUCTION	23
PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS	
Goals 2000: High Standards and Education Reform	23
Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Title III	
Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program- State & Local Grants	24
(ESEA, Title II, Part B)	
Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies	24
(ESEA, Title I, Part A)	
Even Start Family Literacy Program	25
(ESEA, Title I, Part B)	
Migrant Education Program	25
(ESEA, Title I, Part C)	
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund	25
(ESEA, Title III, Part A, subpart 2)	
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities	26
(ESEA, Title IV, Part A., subpart 1)	
Innovative Education Program Strategies	26
(ESEA, Title VI)	
Impact Aid	26
(ESEA, Title VIII)	
Indian Education - Grants to Local Educational Agencies	27
(ESEA, Title IX, Part A, subpart 1)	
SPECIAL EDUCATION	
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - Grants to States and Preschool Grant Programs	27
(IDEA, Part B)	
Training Personnel for Education of Individuals with Disabilities	28
- Grants to State Educational Agencies	
(IDEA Part D, sec. 632)	
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities	28
(IDEA, Part H)	

	<u>Page</u>
ADULT EDUCATION	
Adult Education Special Demonstration and Teacher Training Projects (Adult Education Act, sec. 353)	28
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	
Vocational Education - State Programs/State Leadership (Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title II, Part A)	29
Vocational Education - Local Activities (Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title II, Part C)	29
Vocational Education - Tech-Prep Education (Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title III, Part E)	29
SCHOOL-TO-WORK GRANT PROGRAMS	
School-to-Work Opportunities: Preparing Transitions for College and Career State Development and Implementation Grants; Local Partnerships (School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (Title II, Subtitles A and B)	30
PART B - COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAMS	
INTRODUCTION	31
CURRENT OR UPCOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GRANT COMPETITIONS	32
LEARNING MORE ABOUT NEW COMPETITIONS	40
PART C - COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS	42

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES

Formula Grant Programs	pages 23-30
Competitive Grant Programs	pages 31-41
Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	pages 42-45

PART A - FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Education's various formula grant programs provide funds to states, school districts and other local entities throughout the nation, either to provide additional support for underserved groups of children and adults or to help those entities address areas of particular educational need. Generally, each program requires prior submission of a plan or application, and has its own requirements that govern how and for whom funds may be spent. Within these limitations, formula grant programs may provide states, school districts, individual schools and other recipients with promising and immediate sources of financial support that can address -- along with the general need of teachers for high-quality professional development -- the challenges for promoting excellence and accountability in teaching.

Funding formulas and eligibility rules determine the amount of program funds available to recipients (and in the case of entities receiving funds from the state, whether they do so on a formula or competitive basis). **For those programs administered by states rather than by the Department of Education, more information on the programs and any special requirements they may have on how funds may be used may be obtained from the state educational agency or, in the case of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act programs, from the state board for vocational education.**

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Goals 2000: High Standards and Education Reform (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Title III)

Funds awarded to state education agencies and, through subgrants, to school districts are available to help develop and implement comprehensive state and local improvement plans that include strategies for promoting quality professional development. Subgrants from the state education agency to school districts support, among other things, continuing and sustained

professional development programs that can increase student learning, and improved teacher education programs, that are consistent with the Goals 2000 state improvement plan. Each state educational agency funds these activities on a competitive, peer-review, basis out of a portion of the Goals 2000 grant that it receives from the Department.

For more information, contact the state educational agency. School districts located in a state that does not participate in the Goals 2000 program may contact:

Thomas Fagan
Goals 2000 Program
600 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20202-6100
Phone: (202) 401-0039
e-mail: thomas_fagan@ed.gov

**Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program - State & Local Grants
(ESEA, Title II, Part B)**

The Eisenhower Program is the federal government's largest program devoted specifically to supporting state and local efforts to stimulate and provide sustained and intensive high-quality professional development in all of the core academic subjects (but with a priority in mathematics and science). School districts receive funding from states to carry out activities that are consistent with local priorities, and have very wide discretion in determining the activities that will best enable all teachers to obtain the skills and knowledge they need to help all students achieve to high standards. Districts must contribute at least one-third of the cost of their Eisenhower-supported activities from state and local sources, other federal funds (such as Title I), cash, or in-kind contributions. In addition, the state educational agency receives program funds to support special initiatives designed to upgrade the quality of the state's teachers, while the state agency for higher education receives funds for competitive subgrants to institutions of higher education and nonprofit private organizations to improve the quality of teacher education and professional development programs. (While the scope of activities that the state agency for higher education may sponsor are quite broad, they do not extend to supporting efforts to recruit talented individuals into teaching.)

For more information, contact the state educational agency or the state agency for higher education.

Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (ESEA, Title I, Part A)

Title I, the largest federal education program for pre-K through 12 education, has one overriding goal: to improve teaching and learning for low-achieving children in high-poverty schools, to enable them to meet challenging academic content and performance standards. Under Part A of Title I, funds are provided to districts and schools, based on their number of poor children, to help low-achieving children acquire the knowledge and skills expected of all children. To receive Part A funds, districts must have a plan that includes a strategy the district will use, among other things, to provide professional development for teachers to improve the teaching of

academic subjects to enable all children to meet the state's student performance standards. Districts and schools have considerable flexibility in deciding how to use their Title I Part A funds, including the amount of Title I funds they devote to professional development of teachers and other staff who work with disadvantaged students. Moreover, schools with not less than 50 percent of children from low-income families are eligible to operate as schoolwide programs. Doing so permits schools to combine their federal, state and local resources to support comprehensive, schoolwide reform efforts that include professional development for all of the school's teachers.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

**Even Start Family Literacy Program
(ESEA, Title I, Part B)**

Even Start provides financial assistance through subgrants from the state educational agency to support programs that integrate early child education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education into a unified family literacy program. Each program is to include special training of staff to develop the skills necessary to work with parents and young children in the full range of instructional services that the Even Start project would provide. Eligible applicants include school districts in partnership with a public or private nonprofit organization, another public agency, or an institution of higher education.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

**Migrant Education Program
(ESEA, Title I, Part C)**

The Migrant Education Program (MEP) provides supplemental assistance for high-quality programs for students who migrate to enable themselves or a family member to obtain temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing work. The MEP reduces educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves, helping these children overcome problems that inhibit their ability to meet challenging content and performance standards. Grants are awarded to state educational agencies who in turn make subgrants to school districts and other agencies to provide educational and support services for migrant students during periods in which they reside in the area. Local districts and other operating agencies are responsible for integrating MEP services with services provided by other ESEA and federal programs to meet the needs of migrant students and, subject to State approval, have flexibility in how they do so. To the extent feasible, local MEP projects include appropriate professional development including mentoring for teachers and other school personnel who work with migrant students.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

**Technology Literacy Challenge Fund
(ESEA, Title III, Part A, subpart 2)**

The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund provides funds to states, on a formula basis, to help their local districts use technology to strengthen their educational programs. The goals of the

Challenge Fund are to provide all teachers with the training and support they need to help students learn by using technology; to provide all schools with modern computers; to connect all classrooms to the information superhighway; and to make effective software and on-line learning resources an integral part of the curriculum in schools. Ninety five percent of the funds a state receives must be awarded to school systems on a competitive basis. For Fiscal Year 1997, the first year of the program, Congress has appropriated \$200 million, and the Administration has requested \$425 million for Fiscal Year 1998.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

**Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
(ESEA, Title IV, Part A, subpart 1)**

This program supports comprehensive school- and community-based drug education and prevention activities, as well as activities designed to prevent violence. Funds are available to all districts on the basis of school enrollment, with additional funds being made available for districts that the state finds to be "high-need." Districts that use Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities money must assess needs and measure program outcomes, but may implement a broad range of age-appropriate prevention activities, including professional development of school personnel in prevention strategies and curriculum.

For more information, contact the state educational agency or Governor's office.

**Innovative Education Program Strategies
(ESEA, Title VI)**

Title VI provides funds to permit districts to support activities that encourage school reform and educational innovation. It makes funds available to all districts, through the states, on the basis of school enrollment, with some weighting to districts with particularly high costs. Under this program, districts have the flexibility to use funds for any of the following primary areas: (1) technology related to implementing reform; (2) acquisition and use of instructional and educational material; (3) promising educational reform projects such as magnet schools; (4) programs for at-risk children; (5) literacy programs for students and their parents; (6) programs for gifted and talented students; (7) reform efforts consistent with Goals 2000; and (8) school improvement programs or activities authorized under the Title I program. Title VI funds may be used to support high-quality professional development that is related to any of these areas.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

**Impact Aid
(ESEA, Title VIII)**

The Impact Aid program makes formula grants to school districts that serve federally connected students (e.g. military dependents and children living on Indian lands) and to certain school districts containing a significant amount of federal property. In particular, payments made to school districts under sections 8002 and 8003 become part of the school district's general funds,

and may be used for any purpose, including professional development and efforts to promote excellence and accountability in teaching.

For more information, contact:

Catherine Schagh
Impact Aid Programs
600 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20202-6244
Phone (202) 260-3858
e-mail: catherine_schagh@ed.gov

**Indian Education - Grants to Local Educational Agencies
(ESEA, Title IX, Part A, subpart 1)**

The program provides grants to support school districts in their efforts to reform elementary and secondary education programs that serve Indian students in order to ensure that these programs are based on challenging state content standards and student performance standards, and are designed to assist Indian students to meet these standards. Funds are provided to school districts based on their enrollment of Indian children, and may be used to provide professional development for teachers and other school professionals who are new in the Indian community, and all teachers involved in this program who work with Indian children.

For more information, contact:

David Beaulieu
Office of Indian Education Programs
600 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20202-6335
Phone: (202) 260-3774
e-mail: david_beaulieu@ed.gov

SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - Grants to States and Preschool Grant Programs
(IDEA, Part B)**

The IDEA, Part, B provides funds to states and school districts to help pay for the additional costs of services that are needed to enable all children ages three through twenty-one with disabilities, regardless of the level of severity of the disability, to receive a free and appropriate public education and to improve education opportunities. The program makes funds available through state educational agencies to all districts in a state on the basis of their relative number of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services. IDEA, Part B requires districts that receive funds to provide certain basic procedural safeguards for children with disabilities and their parents. It also requires the state to develop, as part of its statewide system, and includes in its application a comprehensive system of personnel development

(CSPD) for ensuring an adequate supply of qualified personnel to carry out the purposes of the IDEA, which may include support of this challenge. School district subgrantees must include in their applications to the state procedures for using and implementing the state CSPD, as well as comprehensive plans for how the district will address the needs of its disabled students. These plans may include provision for the use of IDEA, Part B funds for professional development activities that will give teachers and other staff the skills that they need to enable their students with disabilities to have increased levels of academic achievement.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

Training Personnel for Education of Individuals with Disabilities - Grants to State Educational Agencies (IDEA Part D, sec. 632)

The IDEA, Part D, provides assistance to states in establishing and maintaining programs to prepare special and regular education, related service, and early intervention personnel to meet the needs of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. State educational agencies are eligible to apply. Funds are provided to support the development and maintenance of the comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD), as summarized above in the description of the IDEA, Grants to States and Preschool Grant Programs (IDEA, Part B).

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities (IDEA, Part H)

The IDEA, Part H, provides financial assistance to states to develop and implement a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multi disciplinary, interagency program of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. Through this program, Part H funds are available to states to assist with preparation of teachers, and other service providers to meet high standards, certification and licensing requirements, if the state chooses to use the money that way. Under the program the state grantee develops, as part of its statewide system, and includes in its application a comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD) for ensuring an adequate supply of qualified personnel to carry out the purposes of the IDEA, which may include this activity. The CSPD must be consistent with the CSPD of the state prepared under part B of IDEA.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

ADULT EDUCATION

Adult Education Special Demonstration and Teacher Training Projects (Adult Education Act, sec. 353)

States administer two categories of local-level projects: experimental demonstration projects that involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs that may have national significance or will be of special value in promoting effective adult education programs; and

projects that train professional teachers, volunteers, and administrators, with a particular emphasis on full-time professional adult educators, minority adult educators, and teachers of adults with limited English proficiency, learning disabilities, or serious reading deficiencies. Eligible applicants include school districts, community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit agencies and institutions of higher education.

For more information, contact the state educational agency.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Basic Grant

State Programs/State Leadership

(Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title II, Part A)

Under Title II, Part A of the Perkins Act, states may use up to 8.5 percent of their basic state grant for state leadership activities. These activities must include professional development, curriculum development and dissemination, and assessment of programs receiving federal assistance. Professional development may involve vocational teachers and academic teachers working with vocational students, corrections and community based educators and counselors, and in-service and preservice training of teachers in state-of-the-art programs and techniques with particular emphasis on minorities.

For more information, contact the state board of vocational education.

Local Activities

(Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title II, Part C)

States subgrant funds to school districts and other entities to help support secondary vocational education programs that the districts implement either by themselves or in conjunction with an area vocational education school or an intermediate education agency. The amount of Perkins funds that a district is eligible to receive depends on the relative size of its ESEA, Title I, Part A allocations, the number of students with individualized education programs, and the number of students enrolled in schools and adults enrolled in training programs. School districts must submit an application to the state board for vocational education that describes their plans for using program funds in ways that give priority to special populations. Uses of funds may include professional development of vocational instructors and academic instructors working with vocational education students that focuses on integrating vocational and academic instruction.

For more information, contact the state board of vocational education.

Tech-Prep Education

(Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title III, Part E)

Title III, Part E, supports ongoing training to help teachers. Each Tech-Prep Education program must include in-service training for teachers that (1) is designed to train teachers to effectively

implement Tech-Prep Education curricula; (2) provides for joint training for teachers from all participants in a Tech-Prep consortium; and (3) may provide such training in weekend, evening, and summer sessions, institutes or workshops.

For more information, contact the state board of vocational education.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK OPPORTUNITIES

State Implementation Grants (School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (Title II and III))

All states have received School-to-Work Opportunities Development Grants to assist them in planning and developing statewide school-to-work systems. State Implementation Grants are awarded competitively to states to establish comprehensive, statewide school-to-work systems that offer young Americans access to education and training programs designed to prepare them for a first job in a high-skill, high-wage career, and to increase their opportunities for further education. A state receiving a first-year implementation grant passes 70 percent of its School-to-Work Opportunities grant to local partnerships. In the second year, it will pass 80 percent of its grant to local partnerships and in the third year and beyond it will pass 90 percent to local partnerships. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are eligible to apply for state grants.

The School-to-Work program also provides special grants for local partnership, for urban and rural partnerships, grants to territories, and development and implementation grants for Indian youth

National School-to-Work Office
400 Virginia Avenue, SW
Room 210
Washington, D.C. 20024
Phone: (202) 401-6222
e-mail: stw@ed.gov

PART B - COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

The forgoing charts also identify the Department's competitive grant programs that also can contribute financial support to the efforts of states, school districts, schools and other entities as they work to address both professional development needs generally and the five challenges for promoting excellence and accountability in teaching, in particular. (Many of these competitive grant programs may fund activities in areas that extend beyond professional development or the improvement of teaching. Unless the Department limits application under these programs to those that support high-quality teaching, the programs will support this objective only if an application that addresses improvements in teaching is selected for funding over applications that address other areas.)

Unlike formula grant programs that are broad in scope and provide funding to all entities that meet basic eligibility requirements, with some exceptions competitive grant programs tend to be more narrowly focused. The Department of Education focuses competitive grant programs on the most outstanding applicants, and funds activities that reflect best practice or are most likely to yield significant results. Thus, the Department tends to make awards under competitive grant programs to those institutions, schools, teachers and other eligible applicants whose applications reflect clearest and most promising ideas about how additional funds can be used to improve teaching and learning.

A program's announcement inviting applications for new awards will identify the maximum length of time that the Department will fund a competitive grant awards under that program. Depending upon the requirements of a particular program, the Department generally is allowed to make awards or up to five years. After the initial year for which an award is made, a recipient's entitlement to future year awards depends upon factors such as the availability of appropriations and the degree to which the recipient has been able to demonstrate performance of the plans and activities contained in its approved application.

Awards under competitive grant programs are made only to those relatively few applicants whose applications, including proposed budgets, are found most likely to be successful (although a program's criteria for awards also might include other factors such as the need for geographical distribution of awards). Therefore, while appropriation levels for competitive grant programs generally are much smaller than for formula grant programs, the amount of available program funds distributed to a recipient under a competitive grant program may be much larger than the recipient receives under many formula grant programs.

**CURRENT OR UPCOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
GRANT COMPETITIONS**
(as of April 18, 1997)

Of those competitive grant programs identified on the charts, the Department has either announced or plans to announce grant competitions and/or application due dates under the following competitive grant programs:

- Public Charter Schools Program (ESEA, Title X, Part C)
- Star Schools Program (ESEA, Title III, Part B)
- Centers and Services to Meet the Special Needs of Individuals with Disabilities; and Innovation and Development (Research) (IDEA, Parts C and E, combined)
- Training Personnel for Education of Individuals with Disabilities (IDEA Part D)
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) (HEA, Title X, Part A)
- Fulbright-Hays Seminars Abroad Program (Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act)
- Field Initiated Studies (Research) (ERDDIA, Part C)

The Department will announce in the future in the *Federal Register* and on its Web Site when new grant competitions will be scheduled for awards under other programs that can help to promote excellence and accountability in teaching.

Public Charter Schools Program
(ESEA, Title X, Part C)

This program provides financial assistance for the design and initial implementation of charter schools. Grants are awarded to state educational agencies in states with charter school laws. State educational agencies receiving funds conduct subgrant competitions for eligible applicants that are partnerships between chartering agencies and developers, which may include teachers, administrators and other school staff, parents, and other members of the community in which a charter school will be carried out. If an eligible state educational agency chooses not to participate, or applies and is not successful, the local eligible applicant may apply directly to the Department. Funds may be used for planning and design of the educational program, including efforts needed to ensure the high-quality of teachers and other staff, and for initial implementation of the charter school.

Competition:

Application deadline:	June
Estimated number of awards:	20-25 to states; hundreds more through state subgrants
Estimated range of awards:	\$250,000 to \$4,000,000 (states) \$25,000 to \$250,000 (other applicants)

John Fiegel
Public Charter Schools Program
School Improvement Programs
600 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20202-6140
Phone: (202) 260-2671
e-mail: john_fiegel@ed.gov

Star Schools Program
(ESEA, Title III, Part B)

The Star Schools Program supports telecommunications partnerships to provide telecommunications equipment and programming to underserved students, including those living in rural and urban areas. Through support from the Star Schools Program, more than 50,000 teachers along with a host of administrators, parents, and policy makers have participated in staff development and community awareness activities produced via satellite, compressed video technology, fiber optics, videodisc, and microcomputer-based networks. Eligible partnerships may take the form of either: (1) A public agency or corporation established for the purpose of developing and operating telecommunications networks to enhance educational opportunities; or (2) a partnership that includes three or more of the following, at least one of which must be an agency as described in (a) or (b): (a) a local educational agency with a significant number of elementary and secondary schools that are eligible for assistance under ESEA Title I funds, or elementary and secondary schools operated or funded for Indian children by the Department of the Interior; (b) a state educational agency; (c) an adult or family education program; (d) an institution of higher education or state higher education agency; (e) a teacher training center or academy; (f) a public or private agency with experience or expertise in the planning and operation of telecommunications networks or a public broadcasting entity; or (g) a public or private elementary or secondary school.

Competition:

Application deadline::	May 9, 1977
Estimated number of awards:	7 general projects and 1 dissemination project
Estimated range of awards:	\$2,000,000 General Projects; \$500,000 Dissemination Project

Jean Tolliver
Star Schools
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20208-5645
Phone: (202) 219-2116
e-mail: jtollive@inet.ed.gov

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Centers and Services to Meet the Special Needs of Individuals with Disabilities; and Innovation and Development (Research)

IDEA, Parts C and E, combined

The Centers and Services program (IDEA, Part C) includes a number of grant competitions that, together, support activities in a variety of areas. Depending on the competition, awards are made to support demonstration, research, training, dissemination and other activities (including, depending upon the application, professional development for teachers and other staff) designed to support persons with disabilities across the educational spectrum. Different competitions support activities that focus on, among other things: early intervention, special education, and related services for children who are deaf or blind; infants, toddlers and other preschool children; children with severe disabilities, including deaf-blindness, children and youth with severe emotional disturbances; model programs of postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, or adult education (with a minimum of funding for projects that serve the deaf); and education and transitional services for persons in transition from secondary school to postsecondary environments. The statute identifies the entities that are eligible to apply for each competition.

This Innovation and Development (Research) program (IDEA, Part E) supports projects to advance and improve the knowledge base and to improve the practice of professionals, parents and others providing early intervention, special education, and related services, including professionals in regular education environments, to provide children with disabilities effective instruction and enable them to learn successfully. Funds also support research and related activities, surveys, or demonstrations relating to physical education or recreation, including therapeutic recreation, for children with disabilities.

Competition:

An Urban Center on Implementing Inclusive Education for Children with Severe Disabilities as part of Systemic Education Reform Efforts (proposed priority) A requirement of this priority will be to provide training and technical assistance in the adoption, use and maintenance of inclusive education practices involving access to the general education curriculum in urban settings via direct technical assistance as well as distance learning and other innovative methods.

Application deadline:

To be announced

Estimated number of awards:

To be announced

For the IDEA, Part C program:

Jane M. Williams

Research to Practice Division

Office of Special Education Programs

Room 4616, Switzer Building

330 C Street, SW

Washington, DC 20202

Phone: (202) 205-8294

e-mail: jane_williams@ed.gov

For the IDEA, Part E program

Scott Brown

Research to Practice Division

Office of Special Education Programs

Room 3522, Switzer Building

330 C Street, SW

Washington, DC 20202

Phone: (202) 205-8117

e-mail: scott_brown@ed.gov

Training Personnel for Education of Individuals with Disabilities
(IDEA Part D)

The program supports grants for personnel training to increase the quality and quantity of personnel available to serve infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities, and their families. State education agencies, institutions of higher education, and other appropriate nonprofit agencies and organizations are eligible to apply.

Competitions:

Center to Promote the Access to and Participation by Minority Institutions in Discretionary Programs Authorized Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (proposed priority)

The purpose of this priority is to support a national center to promote the participation of minority institutions in personnel preparation competitions authorized by IDEA and to promote the professional development capacity of minority entities.

Application deadline:	To be announced
Estimated number of awards:	To be announced

An Academy: Linking Teacher Education to Advances in Research (proposed priority) Under this priority, applicants are required to design an approach, consistent with principles of effective professional development, for linking teacher education programs to recent advances in research on teaching reading to children with learning disabilities, using technology to enhance educational results for children with disabilities, and using positive behavioral supports to teach children with disabilities who exhibit challenging behaviors.

Application deadline:	To be announced
Estimated number of awards:	To be announced

Developing a National Plan for Training Personnel to Teach Blind and Low-Vision Children (Proposed Priority) Under this priority, the applicant is required to conduct a systemic and systematic needs assessment of the personnel shortage in this area and design a comprehensive approach for preparing capable and qualified personnel to education blind and low vision students.

Application deadline:	To be announced
Estimated number of awards:	To be announced

Ray Miner
Research to Practice Division
Office of Special Education Programs
Room 4611, Switzer Building
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202
Phone: (202) 205-9805
e-mail: ray_miner@ed.gov

HIGHER EDUCATION

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) (HEA, Title X, Part A)

The Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) provides financial support for nationally significant activities that are designed to enhance the quality of education in the nation's institutions of higher education. The scope of activities that the Department may support is quite broad. It includes: encouragement of reform, innovation, and improvement in postsecondary (including graduate) education programs; creation of institutions and programs that promote new paths to career and professional training; promotion of use of technology; design and implementation of cost-effective methods of instruction and operation. In particular, FIPSE has funded a number of activities that focus on improving the quality of K-12 teaching, including: projects to (1) train teachers to assume ever-expanding educational and social responsibilities; (2) strengthen the skills of elementary school teachers in math and science, and of teachers at all levels to incorporate math and science into an interdisciplinary curriculum; (3) develop School-College partnerships that encourage colleges to share resources with schools in order to strengthen the training of both prospective and current K-12 teachers; and (4) explore new pathways into the teaching profession.

Competition:

FIPSE's current Comprehensive Program priorities are: 1. Access, Retention and Completion; 2. Improving Campus Climate for Learning; 3. Making More Productive Use of Resources to Improve Teaching and Learning; 4. Improving School-College Collaboration; 5. Curricular and Pedagogical Reform; 6. Faculty Development; and 8. Dissemination of Successful Innovations. However, the public is invited to submit proposals for other activities they believe also are important to the improvement of Postsecondary education.

Application deadline:	October, 1997
Estimated number of awards:	70

NOTE: Guidance for the next round of applications (FY 1998) for the Comprehensive Program are expected to be available in approximately August, 1997. Preliminary proposals will be due in October, 1997, and full proposals will be due in mid-March, 1998. Awards will be made by June 30, 1998.

Brian Lekander
Office of Postsecondary Education
600 Independence Ave., SW
Room 3100, ROB-3
Washington, DC 20202-5175
Phone: (202) 708-5750
e-mail: brian_lekander@ed.gov

OTHER PROGRAMS

Fulbright-Hays Seminars Abroad Program (Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act)

The program is intended to increase mutual understanding between people of the United States and other countries by offering qualified American educators opportunities to participate in short-term seminars abroad during the summer. The program provides opportunities for K-12 social studies teachers, administrators and state and school district curriculum specialists with responsibility for curriculum development in social studies, and for undergraduate faculty members from postsecondary institutions whose professional activities primarily include teaching undergraduate courses in the humanities, social sciences, or international affairs. Upon their return, participants are expected to share their broadened knowledge and experiences with students, colleagues, members of civic and professional organizations and the public in their home communities.

Competition:

A new competition is planned, but not yet announced, for awards to individual elementary and secondary school teachers and colleges and university faculty. No awards would be made to states or schools. The program does not intend to establish priorities.

Application deadline:	Late October, 1997 (projected)
Estimated number of awards:	130

Linda Byrd-Johnson
Center for International Education
Office of Postsecondary Education
600 Independence Ave., SW
Room 600 Portals Building
Washington, DC 20202
Phone: (202) 401-9775
e mail: linda_byrdjohnson@ed.gov

Field Initiated Studies (Research) (ERDDIA, Part C)

Field-initiated studies grants support educational research projects where the topics and methods of study are generated by the investigators. There are five national research institutes within the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI): (1) the National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment; (2) the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students; (3) the National Institute on Education Governance, Finance, Policy-Making, and Management; (4) the National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education; and (5) the National Institute on Postsecondary Education, Libraries, and Lifelong Education support field-initiated studies. Each Institute conducts its own field-initiated studies competition.

Competition:

The Department particularly invites educational research and development projects that focus on one or more priorities in its published Research Priorities Plan. Those priorities include: Ensuring effective teaching through activities that focus on prospective and current teachers; improving curriculum, instruction, assessment and student learning; strengthening schools; supporting schools to affectively prepare diverse populations to meet high standards; promoting learning and formal and informal settings; improved early childhood learning; and understanding changing requirements for adult competence.

Application deadline:	June 9, 1997
Estimated number of awards:	7 per institute
Estimated Range of awards	\$100,000 to \$225,000

For information on the program or any of its individual competitions, contact:

Jackie Jenkins
National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Room 510g
Phone: (202) 219-2232
FAX: (202) 219-2135
e-mail: Jackie_Jenkins@ed.gov

Beth Fine
National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20208-5521
Phone: (202) 219-1323
FAX: (202) 219-2030
e-mail: Beth_Fine@ed.gov

Veda Bright
National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208
Phone: (202) 219-1935
FAX: (202) 219-4768
e-mail: veda_bright@ed.gov

Barbara Lieb

National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking, and Management.

U.S. Department of Education

555 New Jersey Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20208-5510

Phone: (202) 219-219/2032

FAX: (202) 219-2159

e-mail: barbara_lieb@ed.gov

Norman Brandt

National Institute on Postsecondary Education, Libraries and Lifelong Learning

U.S. Department of Education

555 New Jersey Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20208-5531

Phone: (202) 219-1662

FAX: (202) 501-3005

e-mail: norman_brandt@ed.gov

LEARNING MORE ABOUT NEW COMPETITIONS

Those interested in learning more about these competitions, and obtaining application packages may call or write the program Department of Education program contacts who are identified in the following program descriptions. In addition, the Department publishes notices in the *Federal Register* that announce each of the program competitions, and provide specific information about the competition such as how to obtain an application package, the estimated number and size of awards, and the date when completed application must be received. The *Federal Register* also contains notices of any program rules that apply to the competitions.

Those having access to the Internet may obtain copies of recent *Federal Register* grant announcements through the Department of Education's Home Page. To find program announcements:

1. Find the Department's Home Page at "<http://www.ed.gov/>"
2. Key into "Money Matters" ("<http://www.ed.gov/money.html>")
3. Key into "*Federal Register* Documents" ("<http://www.ed.gov/money.html#fr>")
4. Key into "Announcements" ("<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/announcements/index.html>")

For some competitive grant programs, the Department also establishes "absolute priorities." While program statutes may allow the use of funds for activities in a broad range of areas, the Department sometimes establishes absolute priorities, after giving the public an opportunity to comment on the "proposed" priority, to limit the applications it will review to those that address particular activities. The program application notice identifies whether the Department has established a funding priority for the competition, and in what part of the *Federal Register* the public can find the priority if it is not published in the application notice. *Federal Register* documents that contain recent priority notices also may be accessed through the Department's Home Page. To do so, after finding the page, "*Federal Register* Documents" (step 3 above) --

5. Key into "Federal Register Regulations, Priorities and Other Rules" ("<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrules/index.html>")

In addition, those wanting more information on any of these competitive grant programs, when competitions plan to be scheduled, application due dates, and any special requirements of these programs, may contact the individual identified in the following program descriptions.

NOTE: Those having access to the Internet can obtain this information -- and other information available through the Department of Education's Home Page -- through different access methods:

World Wide Web	http://www.ed.gov/
Gopher	gopher.ed.gov or select North America-->USA-->General-->U.S. Department of Education from the All/Other Gophers menu on your system
FTP	ftp.ed.gov (log on anonymous)
E-Mail	Send e-mail to almanac@inet.ed.gov to get instructions on usage of our mail server In the body of the message type send catalog (avoid use of signature blocks)
Telnet	No public telnet access is available. You must either have an appropriate WWW, Gopher, or FTP client at your site or be able to telnet to a public access client elsewhere.

PART C - COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS

In addition to its formula and competitive grant programs, the U.S. Department of Education funds important sources of technical assistance that can help to provide or locate special help to those working to meet the challenges for promoting excellence and accountability in teaching. A key source of technical assistance are the 15 Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers, which the Department created to help states, school districts, schools, tribes, community-based organizations, and other grant recipients with the administration, integration and implementation of programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) so that all students can increase the levels of their achievement. These Regional Assistance Centers are designed to be able to provide high-quality comprehensive training and technical assistance to improve teaching and learning and to meet the needs of children served by ESEA programs. Hence, the Centers can play a key role in promoting state, school district and school efforts to secure excellence and accountability in teaching.

Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers

Region I: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire,
Rhode Island, Vermont

Education Development Center, Inc.
Newton, MA
Phone: (617) 969-7100 ext 2533
FAX: (617) 965-6325
e-mail: WendeA@edc.org

Region II: New York State

New York Technical Assistance Center
New York University
New York, NY
Phone: (212) 998-5110
FAX: (212) 995-4199
995-4041
e-mail: millrla@is2.nyu.edu

Region III: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey,
Ohio, Pennsylvania

George Washington University
Arlington, VA
Phone: (703) 528-3588
FAX: (703) 528-5973
e-mail: crivera@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu

Region IV: Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia,
West Virginia

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Charleston, WV
Phone: (304) 347-0441
FAX: (304) 347-0489
e-mail: buckleyp@ael.org

Region V: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi

Southeast Comprehensive Assistance Center
Metairie, LA
Phone: (504) 838-6861
FAX: (504) 831-5242
e-mail: htran@sedl.org

Region VI: Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota,
Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI
Phone: (608) 263-4326
FAX: (608) 263-3733
e-mail: mcoyne@macc.wisc.edu

Region VII: Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma

University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK
Phone: (405) 325-1711
FAX: (405) 325-1824
e-mail: steffens@uoknor.edu

Region VIII: Texas

Intercultural Development Research Association
San Antonio, TX
Phone: (210) 684-8180
FAX: (210) 684-5389

e-mail: cmontecl@txdirect.net
acortez@txdirect.net

Region IX: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah

New Mexico Highlands University
Albuquerque, NM
Phone: (505) 242-7447
FAX: (505) 242-7558
e-mail: martinez@cesdp.nmhu.edu

Region X: Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Portland, OR
Phone: (503) 275-9479
FAX: (503) 275-9625
e-mail: simone@nwrel.org
sundermc@nwrel.org

Region XI: Northern California

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research
San Francisco, CA
Phone: (415) 565-3009
FAX: (415) 565-3012
565-2024
e-mail: bfarr@wested.org

Region XII: Southern California (Counties: Imperial, Inyo, Los Angeles, Mono, Orange, San Bernardino, San Diego)

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Downey, CA
Phone: (310) 922-6343
FAX: (310) 940-1798
e-mail: mothner_henry@laoe.edu

Region XIII: Alaska

South East Regional Resource Center
Juneau, AK
Phone: (907) 586-6806
FAX: (907) 463-3811
e-mail: billb@akrac.k12.ak.us

Region XIV: Florida, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands

Educational Testing Service
Tucker, GA
Phone: (770) 723-7443
FAX: (770) 723-7436
e-mail: thensley@ets.org

Region XV: American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,
Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Hawaii, Republic of the
Marshall Islands, the Republic of Palau

Pacific Region Educational Laboratory
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Phone: (808) 533-6000
FAX: (808) 533-7599
e-mail: heineh@prel.hawaii.edu

For more information on the comprehensive technical assistance centers, contact:

Steven L. Brockhouse
School Improvement Programs
Room 4500, Portals Building
1250 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202-6140
Phone: (202) 260-2476
e-mail: steve_brockhouse@ed.gov

Secretary Riley will release two teaching-related reports today. One, conducted by APEC, shows the approaches used by other countries which do a better job than the U.S. in providing support to beginning teachers. The second prepared in response to a directive you issued last September in connection with the release of the report from Governor Hunt's commission on excellence in teaching, shows how federal resources can be used by states and school districts to promote excellence and accountability in teaching.

Prior to the White House event, the teachers will participate in a forum entitled **Attracting and Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century.** The Department of Education has organized this forum for the teachers to meet with presidents and deans of major teacher preparatory colleges and universities. During this meeting, they will discuss what can be done to improve teacher education. This group will also attend today's event. (List attached)

This year's National Teacher of the Year is Sharon Draper, a literature and composition teacher at Walnut Hills High School in Cincinnati, Ohio. In her classroom, students read literature, discuss ideas from books and world events and write. Writing is a passion for Draper who has published five books for young people along with numerous short stories and poems. She has been honored by the American Library Association with its Coretta Scott King Genesis Award and the ALA award for Best Book for Young Adults. Each year her students don the class-designed **I survived the Draper Paper** T-Shirt, commemorating the legendary research project that all her seniors must complete to graduate.

In 1995, Draper was among the first group of teachers to be certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In that same year she was elected to the Board of Directors of that organization.

Fifty-one State Teachers of the Year including DOD schools, Guam, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia will be represented at today's ceremony. The Teachers of the Year from Arkansas, the Mariana Islands, Pennsylvania and West Virginia were not able to attend.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Pre-briefing participants

Maria Echaveste
Kitty Higgins
Michael Cohen
Jordan Tamagni
Sarah Farnsworth

Event Participants

The Vice President
Senator John Glenn (D-OH)
Representative Steve Chabot (R-OH)
Education Secretary, Richard Riley
Sharon Draper, 1997 Teacher of the Year
Larry Draper, Husband
Damon Draper, Son, Age 21
Cory Draper, Daughter, Age 19
Crystal Draper, Daughter, Age 15
Gordon Ambach, Executive Director, Council of Chief State School Officers
Richard Robinson, President, Scholastic, Inc.
51 State Teachers of the Year (List Attached)
Full list to be provided by Social Secretary

IV. PRESS PLAN

Open Press

V. SEQUENCE

- o You and the Vice President proceed to the Blue Room to meet the 51 State Teachers of the Year.
 - o You and the Vice President do a receiving line with teachers.
 - o At the end of the receiving line you will meet the National Teacher of the Year, Sharon Draper and her family.
 - o The Draper family will be escorted to seats in the East Room.
 - o WHCA will announce you, the Vice President, Secretary Riley and Sharon Draper into the East Room.
 - o Secretary Riley will make brief remarks and introduce the Vice President.
 - o The Vice President will make brief remarks and introduce you.
 - o You make brief remarks.
 - o At the end of your remarks you introduce Sharon Draper and present her with a crystal apple.
 - o Sharon Draper will make brief remarks.

- o You depart.

VI. REMARKS

To be provided by speechwriting.

Record Type: Record

To: William R. Kincaid/OPD/EOP
cc: Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP
Subject:

April 17, 1997

NATIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD CEREMONY

DATE: April 18, 1997
LOCATION: East Room
TIME: 1:30 pm
FROM: Maria Echaveste
Kitty Higgins

I. PURPOSE

To honor the 1997 National Teacher of the Year, Sharon Draper and the State Teachers of the Year from around the country; and to use this opportunity to highlight some of your education initiatives.

II. BACKGROUND

Now in its 46th year, the National Teacher of the Year Program seeks to recognize and honor the contributions of the American classroom teacher. Sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers in partnership with Scholastic, Inc., this program is the oldest and most prestigious awards program to focus public attention on excellence in teaching.

Each year, every state selects a Teacher of the Year who then enters the national competition. An independent selection committee, representing the major education organizations, selects finalists and then the National Teacher of the Year. This year's other finalists were from Iowa, Kentucky and Oklahoma. This is also the 46th year that the President has introduced the National Teacher of the Year to the nation.

This is an important education event for the White House. Two years ago, for the first time, we invited the State Teachers of the Year from each state. The extensive local press coverage helped to send a strong message throughout the country about your commitment to education. Each year, after attending the White House ceremony and learning more about the Administration's education agenda, these teachers become some of our strong supporters within their states and local communities for your agenda. This year we will use this opportunity to highlight your teaching agenda and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (Master teacher) initiative.

This event will include four elements to promote your Call to Action to make sure that there's a talented and dedicated teacher in every classroom:

- **Your National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Proposal**
 - The new National Teacher of the Year was among the first teachers across the country to be nationally board-certified. This event will provide you with an important opportunity to explain the need for your \$105 million proposal to assist the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) to finish developing content area standards and provide access to the certification process for 100,000 teachers.
 - You will also restate your challenge to states and school districts to support teachers who undertake the NBPTS certification process and reward those who succeed. (NOTE: Currently eight states help teachers pay NBPTS certification fees, while six provide salary supplements to Board certified instructors).
- **New APEC Report and Challenge on Induction Practices**
 - Today you will announce a new APEC study on supporting new teachers, with in-depth case studies of promising practices in Japan, New Zealand, and Australia.
 - You will call on states and school districts to review and improve their strategies for helping new teachers make a successful transition into the classroom.
- **New Guide to Federal Resources for Improving Teaching**
 - In response to your directive on teaching from last September, Secretary Riley will present you with a guide that summarizes key federal resources available to school districts and schools to promote excellence and accountability in teaching.
 - You will encourage states, districts and schools to use these resources creatively to insure that every teacher is prepared to teach to high standards.
- **Secretary Riley's National Teaching Forum**
 - The 1997 state teachers of the year and deans and presidents of some leading teacher preparation institutions are taking place in a two day conference (Thursday and Friday) on attracting and preparing teachers for the 21st Century.
 - You will thank participants (some of whom are in attendance) and call on them to help lead changes in teacher education to ensure that all new teachers are prepared to teach to high standards.

MASTER TEACHER EXPANSION MAY YIELD MULTIPLE BENEFITS

When 84 more educators last week earned recognition as master teachers, they became part of a growing trickle President Clinton hopes will become a flood.

Since 1995, only 595 teachers have passed rigorous assessments from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to earn certification but Clinton wants to boost their ranks to 100,000 by 2006.

He is asking Congress for \$21 million for the NBPTS in fiscal 1998, more than quadrupling its \$5 million allocation this year. That would help the board increase the number of topics for which they offer certificates from six to more than 30 and help pay for exams (ED, Feb. 7).

Only eight states and 23 local districts now help teachers pay for the assessment, but most don't cover the full \$2,000 application fee.

Teachers who decide to go for certification send in a portfolio of their work, including a video of their teaching a class, answer written questions and submit to interviews at testing centers around the country. Other practicing teachers score the tests, which are rigorous: only 81 applicants out of 289 passed the first test given two years ago (ED, Jan. 6, 1995).

Personal, Financial Reward

"This board certification really means something to a group of people who have never been recognized and who've always been blamed for problems in the classroom," said Sharon Draper, a high school English teacher from Cincinnati who was among the first group to be board certified.

"Teachers are used to getting a hug from a third-grader as thanks," she added. "This is not just thanks, it is real recognition."

The certificate also confers credibility on teachers, said Susan Carmon, the National Education Association's (NEA)

liaison to NBPTS. "Colleagues, school boards, and governors call upon them for committees and task forces," she said.

Many local districts and several states also offer bonuses and salary supplements to those who earn certificates, and Carmon said that can help keep talented teachers in the classroom, reducing the financial allure of administrative positions.

Five states and 14 districts offer bonuses and salary supplements. Delaware, for instance, gives master teachers a \$1,500 annual bonus. Mississippi not only will reimburse teachers for the fee but also boost their salaries by \$3,000.

North Carolina Gov. Jim Hunt, is pushing state legislation to give board-certified teachers a 12 percent pay raise, up from the current 4 percent bonus they now get. Hunt chaired the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future which called for this certificate program and served on the national certification board.

Mobile Credentials

Thirteen states will grant licenses to teachers moving into their states with NBPTS credentials.

"There is a mobile national teaching force," said Pat O'Connell Ross, team leader for the Eisenhower Professional Development program, which provides funds for NBPTS, itself an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization. "This is a way to help people move from state to state."

But many teachers who have been through the assessment process say the most important benefit—even for those who didn't win certification—is that it helps them become better teachers.

"Doing this makes teachers think differently about their abilities and boosts self-confidence in your abilities as a professional," said Draper, a finalist for

national teacher of the year this year. "In class, I'm a lot more confident and a lot more reflective."

Certification Categories

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards offers certificates in:

- Early childhood generalist (ages three through eight)
- Middle childhood generalist (ages seven through 12)
- Early adolescence generalist (ages 11 through 15)
- Early adolescence English language arts
- Early adolescence through young adulthood art
- Adolescence and young adulthood mathematics

The board aims to offer certificates in:

- Early & middle childhood (ages three through 12) for:

- art, English as a new language, exceptional needs/generalist, foreign language, guidance counseling, library/media, music and physical education.

- Middle childhood (ages seven through 12) for: English language arts, math, science and social studies/history.

- Early adolescence (ages 11 through 15) for: mathematics, science and social studies/history.

- Adolescence and young adulthood (ages 14 through 18+) for: English language arts, science and social studies/history.

- Early adolescence through young adulthood (ages 11 through 18+) for: art, English as a new language, exceptional needs/generalist; foreign language, guidance counseling, health, library/media, music, physical education and vocational education.

For more information, contact National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 26555 Evergreen Rd., #400, Southfield, Mich. 48076, (810)351-4444; or visit the Internet site, <http://www.npbts.org>. —Laureen Lazarovici ■

APPROPRIATORS GIVE LITTLE CREDENCE TO STUDENT AID PLAN

House appropriators scoffed Wednesday at President Clinton's student aid proposals, citing radical fluctuations in the president's budget requests over the past four years.

"Should we treat this as a serious proposal or is it a place-holder?" asked Rep. John Porter, R-Ill., chairman of the House Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee.

Porter ticked off funding levels for the Perkins Loan program, State Student Incentive Grants, Work-Study and the Direct Student Loan program as examples of erratic funding requests.

He noted that Clinton reduced Work Study funding in 1994, increase funding in 1995, reduce it again for 1996, then wanted large increases late in the budget process for fiscal 1997. The president proposed cuts in Perkins Loan funding in 1994, zeroed out capital contributions in 1995 and restored funding the following year.

David Longanecker, ED's assistant secretary for postsecondary education, said he wants Congress to take the budget seriously. "We have increasingly

built a more informed and aggressive approach to policy," he said.

"In 1994, the leadership in the Congress changed, so our approach changed," he added. "Now we feel we're in a more bipartisan period ... and we've learned some lessons."

Still, Porter was not moved.

"If you look at the history of what the president has sent us, it's hard to make sense of it," he said.

Rep. Dave Obey of Wisconsin, the panel's ranking Democrat, said Clinton's record shows more support for higher education than Republicans'. "I don't think the administration ought to be apologetic at all for the effort to provide tax deductions and Pell Grant increases," he said.

Clinton is proposing a \$1,500 nonrefundable tax credit, called Hope Scholarships, and a \$10,000 annual tax deduction for postsecondary education expenses. He is also requesting a maximum Pell Grant of \$3,000 for fiscal 1998, up from \$2,700 this year (ED, Feb. 7).

Limiting Tuition Hikes

Republicans and Democrats questioned

whether an influx of federal student aid programs would fuel more tuition increases.

Some fear that states would increase tuition by an amount equal to any new benefits.

Obey suggested some type of cost control, such as stripping schools' eligibility for federal student aid if they increase tuition more than 120 percent of the average raise for similar institutions during three preceding fiscal years. He introduced a bill based on that formula last year (ED, Aug. 7, 1996). "If we don't do something, we could get ripped off," he warned.

Longanecker said that economic and political forces would keep institutions from raising their costs. Because students would be getting different amounts from the various benefits, institutions would not want to overcharge other students not receiving the benefits.

The House subcommittee plans to begin writing its fiscal 1998 funding bill in May. Education Secretary Richard Riley is scheduled to speak at a Senate appropriations subcommittee hearing next week. —Rebecca S. Weiner ■



Council for Basic Education

Christopher T. Cross

President

TO: Terry Dozier
 FROM: Cathleen Healy CH
 DATE: April 15, 1997
 RE: Department of Education Survey

Enclosed are the results of the "Teachers of the Year" Survey. To date, we have received 33 responses. Those who have responded are as follows:

Alabama	Montana
Arkansas	New Hampshire
Colorado	New Jersey
District of Columbia	Ohio
Florida	Oklahoma
Georgia	Pennsylvania
Hawaii	Rhode Island
Idaho	Tennessee
Illinois	Texas
Indiana	Utah
Iowa	Vermont
Kansas	Virginia
Louisiana	Puerto Rico
Michigan	Clintonville High School
Mississippi	Charlie's Drug
Missouri	Unknown
	Unknown

Response to Question 7B – *In my estimation, an "adequate length of time for student teaching would be:*

1 Year	11	2 Years	1
1 Year team teaching	1	6 months	1
12 - 16 weeks	3	15 weeks	1
1 Semester	5	9 - 10 weeks	1
60 minutes	1	No Response	2
Provisional year with mentoring plus present requirements			1
From the beginning of their ed, some form of field experience must begin			1
1 year including semester in several contrasting situations			1
1 quarter, but they need more time in classroom before student teaching			1
1 semester, but also several "mini sessions" throughout their first 3-4 years			1
1 semester if coupled with observations; 1 year if not			1

**Responses to the
Council for Basic Education
SURVEY ON TEACHER PREPARATION**
Prepared for 1997 Teachers of the Year

TOTAL RESPONSES:
33

How Well Are New Teachers Being Prepared for the Classroom?

①

QUESTION 1: <i>Teacher candidates and/or new teachers I have mentored understand the content of the subject(s) they are expected to teach.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
5	19	1	4	4	
15 PERCENT	58 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

②

QUESTION 2: <i>Teacher candidates and/or new teachers I have mentored have the pedagogical skills to teach subject-area content.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
1	15	6	10	1	
3 PERCENT	48 PERCENT	18 PERCENT	30 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

③

QUESTION 3: <i>Teacher candidates and/or new teachers I have mentored know how to link their instruction and assessment to the state (or district) K-12 content standards.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
1	7	4	14	7	
3 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	42 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

④

QUESTION 4a: <i>Teacher candidates and/or new teachers I have mentored are prepared to assess how well students learn content by using pen and pencil tests.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
8	22	1	1		1
24 PERCENT	67 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	0 PERCENT	3 PERCENT

QUESTION 4b: <i>by using performance-based assessment.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
1	7	5	17	3	
3 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	52 PERCENT	9 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 4c: <i>by using classroom discussion.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
3	10	7	9	4	
9 PERCENT	30 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	27 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 4d: <i>by using portfolios.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
2	4	5	14	7	1
6 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	42 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	3 PERCENT

⑤

QUESTION 5a: <i>Teacher candidates and/or new teachers I have mentored are prepared to teach all students, including those from a variety of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
2	4	6	16	5	
6 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	18 PERCENT	44 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 5b: <i>Including those with different ability levels and learning styles.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
	9	5	15	4	
0 PERCENT	27 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	46 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 5c: <i>including those with different physical and learning disabilities.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
	6	5	14	8	
0 PERCENT	18 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	42 PERCENT	24 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

⑥

QUESTION 6a: <i>Teacher candidates and/or new teachers I have mentored are adequately prepared to plan daily lessons.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
6	18	1	6	2	
18 PERCENT	55 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	18 PERCENT	6 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 6b: <i>monitor student progress.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
1	18	3	10	1	
3 PERCENT	55 PERCENT	9 PERCENT	30 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 6c: <i>direct classroom activities.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
3	24	1	4	1	
9 PERCENT	73 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	3 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 6d: <i>manage classroom discipline.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
	4	5	22	2	
0 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	67 PERCENT	6 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

QUESTION 6e: <i>engage parents in their children's learning.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
	3	7	15	7	1
0 PERCENT	9 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	46 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	3 PERCENT

Second # 6

QUESTION 6 (misnumbered): <i>University faculty value my assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of teacher candidates with whom I have worked.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
11	8	8	3	2	
33 PERCENT	24 PERCENT	24 PERCENT	9 PERCENT	6 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

7

QUESTION 7: <i>From my experience, teacher candidates today are provided adequate time for student teaching.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
	4	4	12	13	
0 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	36 PERCENT	39 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

In my estimation, an "adequate" length of time for student teaching would be:

500 memo

⑧

QUESTION 8: <i>From my experiences, teacher candidates today are provided multiple experiences in schools and classrooms in addition to student teaching.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
	10	7	8	8	
0 PERCENT	30 PERCENT	21 PERCENT	24 PERCENT	24 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

⑨

QUESTION 9: <i>Teacher candidates and/or new teachers I have mentored know how to use technology in the classroom - for research, instruction, and assessment.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
2	6	4	18	3	
6 PERCENT	18 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	55 PERCENT	9 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

⑩

QUESTION 10: <i>Based on my recent experience, novice teachers are given sufficient support during their first two years of teaching.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
1	4	5	10	13	
3 PERCENT	12 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	30 PERCENT	39 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

⑪

QUESTION 11: <i>Practicing teachers from my school instruct teacher candidates in their university programs.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
1	5	3	9	14	1
3 PERCENT	15 PERCENT	9 PERCENT	27 PERCENT	42 PERCENT	3 PERCENT

(12)

QUESTION 12: <i>It is my impression that new teachers are being better prepared for teaching than I was.</i>					
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
2	9	6	10	6	
6 PERCENT	27 PERCENT	18 PERCENT	30 PERCENT	18 PERCENT	0 PERCENT

Add a paragraph about what the master teacher / board certification is about

avoid trade-off of quality for quantity

professionalize this group of people

Always in the past we have traded quality for quantity

We can't have high academic standards without high quality teachers. In the past we have had a trade-off for quality for quantity. This helps us resolve the trade-off.

America needs some 2 million teachers in the coming decade.

Council for Basic Education survey -- USA Today

Teachers getting ready for the basic stuff, but not technology, discipline problems, special education, standards. Colleges of teacher education not moving fast enough, parental involvement. Reality



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: Bill Conraid

ORGANIZATION: _____

PHONE NUMBER: _____

FAX NUMBER: _____

FROM: Terry Dozier

PHONE NUMBER: 401 - 0607

MESSAGE: _____

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

THIS TRANSMISSION IS INTENDED FOR AND RESTRICTED TO THE NAMED ADDRESSEE ONLY. IT MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU RECEIVE THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR. YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, COPYING, OR DISSEMINATING THE TRANSMISSION. PLEASE CALL 202-401-3000 TO ARRANGE FOR RETURN OF ANY TRANSMISSION SET IN ERROR. THANK YOU.

3 **PAGE(S) TO FOLLOW**



Mid-continent Regional
Educational Laboratory

2550 So. Parker Road Suite 500
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(303)337-0990 FAX (303)337-3005

MEMORANDUM

To: Terry Dozier
From: Tim Waters
Subject: Getting the attention of colleges of education
Date: April 15, 1997

I hope this note will be of value to you as you assist Secretary Riley with his initiatives to improve teacher preparation. My apologies for being so long in getting back to you. I have been either in meetings, on airplanes, or involved with personnel matters since we spoke last week.

Background

From 1986 to 1993 I served as superintendent of the Weld County School District #6 in Greeley, Colorado. In approximately 1989 this school district enrolled 11,500 students in a community that is the home of the University of Northern Colorado (UNC) which is the premier teacher preparation institution in the state.

At that time the UNC College of Education was placing 120 student teachers each semester in public schools in northern Colorado. Since the university sits in the middle of School District #6, it is not surprising that nearly half of the placements occurred in that district. District #6 was also one of the largest employers of the graduates of the College of Education program.

It was clear to me that the school district was both a major supplier to the College of Education program, and a major customer of the college's product. As such, it was important to me to be confident that their program was preparing the nearly 60 student teachers placed each semester and eventually employed by the district with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for success with our students and in our system.

To this end, we attempted to open a conversation with the college about the design and outcomes of the teacher preparation program. Sadly, I found the

college unresponsive to either the concerns I had about their program or the recommendations I and others might have about how to improve it.

Assumptions

With some frustration at the college's seeming disinterest in what one of their major suppliers and customers had to say about the design and results of their program, I considered how other industries respond to the university when it fails to produce graduates who are equipped to become productive, contributing professionals and employees. Following are the assumptions upon which I chose to proceed.

- Institutions of higher education respond to industries when they see and understand them as suppliers and as customers. They invite representatives to join advisory committees, design teams, and review panels to be certain their suppliers (of resources) and customers (of graduates) are satisfied.
- If the customers of institutions of higher education are not satisfied with the product they are getting, they consider several options to help the institution modify its' program. They adjust the resources they supply, how those resources are used, or they begin to look elsewhere to get a better product.
- School District #6 and the other districts in a two county area in northern Colorado were, collectively, the major suppliers to and customers of the College of Education.
- If the school districts wanted the college to be more responsive to their concerns, then the districts needed to begin acting more like suppliers to and customers of the College of Education.

Strategy

My strategy was to enlist the other school districts in Weld and Larimer counties to join my district to approach the College of Education as suppliers of resources (student teaching placements) and as customers (employers of their graduates of both undergraduate and graduate programs). Our message was simple: **design a program that prepares graduates with the knowledge and skills they need to be successful in our districts, or we will not allow students teacher placements in our districts, nor will we employ your graduates.**

This was a difficult message to deliver and was equally difficult to receive. However, because the school districts joined in a strategy and created a message and condition to which the college had to respond, the message was heard and the institution responded. Within two years, much of the undergraduate program and the entire student teaching experience was redesigned.

This approach was effective because the school districts worked together and the college recognized the critical resource they represented. The college acted out their enlightened self interest. The outcome was good for the college, their graduates, and most importantly for the students of the school districts in which they were employed.

Conclusion

If the school boards, superintendents, and school districts of America all acted like the suppliers and customers they are, the colleges of education would become far more responsive to their needs and accelerate their efforts to design programs that prepare graduates to step into and succeed in their districts. While the approach can at first appear adversarial, it can quickly turn into a collaborative and effective model for designing preservice teacher programs.

The power to modify teacher preparation programs rests as much in the school districts of American as it does in the institutions of higher education.

National Board FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

202-463-3008

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JAMES B. HUNT JR.
Chair
BARBARA B. KELLEY
Vice Chair
JAMES A. KELLY
President

ANGELIQUE ACEVEDO
ARTIE ALMEIDA
JULIE ASHWORTH
MAYNARD F. BALDWIN JR.
BARBARA POPE BENNETT
CAROLINE BITTERWOLF
THOMAS T. BLANFORD
M. GARY BLUMENSTEIN
JUDITH BODENHAUSEN
BARBARA BOWMAN
LILLIAN M. BRINKLEY
JOYCE BRISCOE
GAIL BURKILL
MARY A. BUSS
ROBERT CHASE
LYNN CHERKASKY-DAVIS
BEVERLY ANN CHIN
CARLOS R. CISNEROS
JOHN COLE
JOHN F. COOKE
ANTONIA CORTESE
KYLE DAHLEM
LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND
EDDIE DAVIS III
THOMAS R. DAVIS
JERRY DELUCA
MARY E. DIEZ
LOIS DISTAD
ROBERTA G. DOERING
SHARON M. DRAPER
ROBERT EAGAN
JOYCE ELLIOTT
CURMAN L. GARNER
GARY R. GALLUZZO
ANTOINETTE M. GARIBALDI
SANDY GARRETT
JOSEPH R. GOTCHY
JOHN GUARDIA
ARTHUR HAMILTON
GAIL HUFFMAN-JOLEY
HARRIET HUNTER-BOYKIN
CORRINE HYDRICK
JOYCE OUTBWAY JENNINGS
SHARON C. MAHOE
CONNIE R. MITCHELL
CYNTHIA MONBERG
ANTONIO PACIURECO
LARRY J. PETERSON
MARK RACICOT
LEO ARMANDO RAMIREZ
MICHAEL C. RANDALL
JUDITH L. ROHRER
ALBERT SHANKER
WILLIAM M. BOULT
ISABEL STEUWER
DAVID S. TATEL
AARON WALLACE
ROBERT L. WEHLING
HAROLD WEYMOUTH
C. ADRIENNE WHITE
ARTHUR E. WISE

DATE: April 15, 1997

FROM: G. Harrison

TO: Name Bill Kincaid

Dept Domestic Policy Institute

Company The White House

City Washington State DC Zip

FAX NUMBER: 456-7028

TYPE OF DOCUMENT:

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES (EXCLUDING COVER SHEET) 25

If this transmission is not clearly or completely received, please call
202-463-3980

MESSAGE:

Mr. Kincaid:

I spoke to Sally Mernissi and at her request I am faxing you the attached State & Local Action Report for April 1997. She said it should contain all the information that you have requested. If not, please call again. The "Developing Activity" section contains proposed legislation in italics under each appropriate state listing.

Glowena Harrison

Telephone Number: 202-463-3980

OFFICES

SOUTHFIELD, MI
26665 EVERGREEN ROAD
SUITE 400
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48076
810-361-4444
FAX 810-351-4170

WASHINGTON, DC
1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW
SUITE 909
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
202-463-3940
FAX 202-463-3008

State & Local Action Supporting National Board Certification



April 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statements of Support.....	1
National Support	2
State Action.....	3
Local Action.....	8
Developing Activity/Other Involvement.....	15
Map	25

Additions, changes, modifications are reflected in italics.

The effectiveness of National Board Certification rests on the collaborative efforts of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the nation's states and localities.

This report includes actions in support of teachers who seek National Board Certification (NBC). These actions will help to encourage, acknowledge and sustain high quality teaching practice in America's classrooms.

Recent NBPTS Highlights

The following statements have been made in support of National Board Certification:

The President's 1997 State of the Union Address:

"Second, to have the best schools, we must have the best teachers. Most of us in this chamber would not be here tonight without the help of those teachers. I know that I wouldn't be here. For years, many of our educators, led by North Carolina's Governor Jim Hunt and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, have worked very hard to establish nationally accepted credentials for excellence in teaching. Just 500 of these teachers have been certified since 1995. My budget will enable 100,000 more to seek national certification as master teachers. We should reward and recognize our best teachers. And as we reward them, we should quickly and fairly remove those few who don't measure up, and we should challenge more of our finest young people to consider teaching as a career."

What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future, September 1996, National Commission on Teaching & America's Future:

"Clearly, if students are to achieve high standards, we can expect no less from their teachers and other educators. The first priority is reaching agreement on what teachers should know and be able to do in order to help students succeed. Unaddressed for decades, this task has recently been completed by three professional bodies, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Their combined efforts to set standards for teacher education, beginning teacher licensing, and advanced certification outline a continuum of teacher development throughout the career. These standards offer the most powerful tools we have for teaching and rejuvenating the soul of the profession."

Recommendations of the Commission include the following:

- Use National Board standards as the benchmark for accomplished teaching.
- Set goals and enact incentives for National Board Certification in every state and district. Aim to certify 105,000 teachers in this decade, one for every school in the United States.
- Redirect professional development funds to include National Board Certification.

This project is funded in part with grants from the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation. Through September 1996, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has received Federal funds of \$30 million, representing approximately 42% of the National Board Certification project. More than \$42 million (58%) of the project's cost was financed by non-governmental sources.

National Support

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

"Special Loans for AFT Members"

If you are a member of the American Federation of Teachers, you can fund the assessment fee for your National Board Certification through an AFT loan program (AFT-JOIN). Through an AFT-JOIN loan you can set up affordable payments and take several years to repay your loan. For more information or to request a loan application, call the AFT-JOIN line Monday through Friday toll free 1-888-AFT-JOIN.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

"

Special Loans for NEA Members"

If you are a member of the National Education Association, you can fund the assessment fee for National Board Certification through the NEA Higher Education Loan Program (NEA HELP). NEA HELP is provided through Nellie Mac, the largest nonprofit provider of education loans in the United States. Through an NEA HELP Continuing Education Loan, you can set up affordable monthly payments and take up to four years to repay your loan. There's no pre-payment penalty, so you can pay off the loan at any time. For more information, or to request a loan application, call the NEA HELP line Monday-Friday toll-free at 1-888-4NEA-HELP (1-888-463-2435) from 8:00 am to 9:00 pm ET.

State Action Supporting National Board Certification

ALABAMA

Legislation has appropriated \$100,000 to pay the fees for 50 Alabama teachers in 1996-97; Alabama shall use certification by the NBPTS as national reciprocity when National Board Certification has been fully implemented.

ARIZONA

The state of Arizona has signed the NASDTEC Interstate Contract and will award their highest level certificate to any person who has obtained National Board Certification in an area corresponding to that for which certification is sought, provided the applicant also holds a comparable and valid certificate issued by any member state and has complied with any requirements of the receiving state regarding degrees held, citizenship, and moral, ethical, physical, and mental fitness.

ARKANSAS

The state of Arkansas has signed the NASDTEC Interstate Contract and will award their highest level certificate to any person who has obtained National Board Certification in an area corresponding to that for which certification is sought, provided the applicant also holds a comparable and valid certificate issued by any member state and has complied with any requirements of the receiving state regarding degrees held, citizenship, and moral, ethical, physical, and mental fitness.

CALIFORNIA

The Department of Education has formed the California Task Force on National Board Certification which met over an 18-month period, to consider the implications of NBC for California's education system. The Task Force report contains an action plan for implementation, and is available from Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), Graduate School of Education, 3653 Tolman, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720-1670.

COLORADO

The State Board of Education has determined that professionally licensed teachers who achieve National Board Certification (NBC) are eligible for Colorado "master teacher" certification; professional development activities associated with NBC may be submitted for license renewal.

DELAWARE

Legislation has appropriated \$30,000 for 15 teachers seeking National Board Certification. Recognizing the effort involved in pursuing certification, as well as the value it will bring to Delaware teachers, commencing July 1, 1997, a certificate obtained by Delaware teachers under the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will result in an additional \$1,500 in pay for each year such certification is maintained.

The Delaware State Chamber of Commerce is matching school district contributions to cooperatively support 30 teachers pursuing National Board Certification in 1996-97.

Dupont will match the state's funds that will allow up to 15 additional Delaware teachers to pursue National Board Certification in 1997-98

State Action Supporting National Board Certification

GEORGIA

Legislation has established that National Board Certified Teachers will receive a one-time 5 percent rate increase in state salary which will be awarded on the commencement of the school year following certification. The state will reimburse the National Board Certification fee for any Georgia teacher achieving National Board Certification.

The Professional Standards Commission for the State of Georgia has established certification rules that allow "Georgia teachers achieving NBPTS certification during their five-year renewal cycle to renew clear renewable certificate fields for either the next cycle or the subsequent five-year cycle." Teachers entering Georgia will be able to use NBPTS certification to meet Georgia's test, teaching of reading, and recency-of-study/experience requirements; however, special education course work will continue to be required, if not previously met.

The state of Georgia has signed the NASDTEC Interstate Contract and will award their highest level certificate to any person who has obtained National Board Certification in an area corresponding to that for which certification is sought, provided the applicant also holds a comparable and valid certificate issued by any member state and has complied with any requirements of the receiving state regarding degrees held, citizenship, and moral, ethical, physical, and mental fitness.

ILLINOIS

The State Board of Education, financially supported 12 teachers seeking National Board Certification during the 1996-97 school year and provided them with a mentoring/support network.

IOWA

Legislation has established that an individual who has received National Board Certification will receive an Iowa endorsement on his/her license when the State Board of Examiners determines that National Board standards meet or exceed the Iowa requirements. Department of Education professional development funds allocated to each district may be used for participation in National Board Certification.

KENTUCKY

Legislation has established the creation of a new professional development and advanced certification system. Under this new system, to be created by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board, teachers pursuing the most advanced state certification (which is voluntary) can obtain this certificate automatically by achieving National Board Certification. This certification rank carries with it a salary increase that averages approximately \$2,000.

The state of Kentucky has signed the NASDTEC Interstate Contract and will award their highest level certificate to any person who has obtained National Board Certification in an area corresponding to that for which certification is sought, provided the applicant also holds a comparable and valid certificate issued by any member state and has complied with any requirements of the receiving state regarding degrees held, citizenship, and moral, ethical, physical, and mental fitness.

State Action Supporting National Board Certification

MARYLAND

The State Department of Education has adopted a policy that will permit the Maryland State Department of Education to grant a license to National Board Certified Teachers who come from out-of-state without requiring them to meet any other education or testing requirements. CEU equivalents will be granted to teachers who complete the National Board Certification process.

MASSACHUSETTS

The Department of Education has recognized National Board Certification as an option for fulfilling the new requirements for teachers to become recertified. Teachers are asked to develop an "Individual Professional Development Plan" describing the activities that they will undertake within a five-year cycle to acquire the minimum of 120 professional development points for licensure renewal.

MICHIGAN

The State Board of Education has determined that teachers who enter the National Board Certification process and complete the portfolio component of the assessment will receive one-half of the credits (SB-CEUs) required for renewal of the Professional Education Certificate; National Board Certified Teachers will receive full credits for one renewal of the Professional Certificate; National Board Certified Teachers will receive SB-CEUs for participating in assessor training and for serving as assessors.

The state of Michigan has signed the NASDTEC Interstate Contract and will award their highest level certificate to any person who has obtained National Board Certification in an area corresponding to that for which certification is sought, provided the applicant also holds a comparable and valid certificate issued by any member state and has complied with any requirements of the receiving state regarding degrees held, citizenship, and moral, ethical, physical, and mental fitness.

MISSISSIPPI

Legislation has established that teachers achieving National Board Certification and employed in a local district will receive a salary supplement of \$3000 as well as reimbursement of the certification fee.

MONTANA

The state of Montana has signed the NASDTEC Interstate Contract and will award their highest level certificate to any person who has obtained National Board Certification in an area corresponding to that for which certification is sought, provided the applicant also holds a comparable and valid certificate issued by any member state and has complied with any requirements of the receiving state regarding degrees held, citizenship, and moral, ethical, physical, and mental fitness.

NEW MEXICO

The State Board of Education (SBE) has adopted policy to: grant a New Mexico level 1 teaching license to any person certified by the National Board for Professional Standards (applicants must take the Core Battery of the NTE and grant a New Mexico level 3A, Instructional Leader, license to any person possessing a master's degree and certified by NBPTS.

State Action Supporting National Board Certification

The State Department of Education and New Mexico institutions of higher education (IHE) have developed the New Mexico World Class Teachers' project in which funds, either state appropriated or provided through grant application, are provided to IHEs to identify and support candidates for National Board Certification. Graduate credit is granted to candidates who complete the National Board Certification process.

NORTH CAROLINA

Legislation has appropriated \$734,012 for the 1996-97 fiscal year that will be used to provide funds to pay the fee for up to 350 teachers who complete the National Board Certification process and provide up to three days of release time for candidates, to work on their portfolios and prepare for the assessment center exercises.

Previous appropriation provides an annual bonus of 4 percent of teachers' state-paid salary to those who achieve National Board Certification. Teachers will continue to receive this bonus as long as they retain NBC.

The State Board of Education has adopted policy recommendations to:

- Adopt the core propositions of NBPTS;
- Grant a North Carolina teaching license to relocating teachers who possess National Board Certification;
- Waive recertification requirements for up to five years following completion of NBPTS portfolio work;
- Create staff development plans that incorporate the work of NBPTS in the training programs, and
- Develop plans to incorporate the National Board's standards into institutions of higher education programs.

OHIO

Legislation has established that certification fees will be provided for up to 400 teachers in the 1996-97 school year. Individuals achieving National Board Certification will receive an annual award of \$2,500 for the life of the certificate.

The Office of Teacher Education and Certification has determined that any Ohio teacher who completes the NBC process will receive enough equivalent continuing education credits (CEUs) to have his/her license renewed.

OKLAHOMA

Legislation has established:

- The Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation address issues associated with NBPTS as well as the design, development and implementation of a competency-based teacher preparation system.
- Out-of-state teachers who have achieved National Board Certification and are relocating to Oklahoma can receive Oklahoma certification without having to fulfill additional requirements normally required for teachers relocating to Oklahoma.
- The SBE modify teacher licensing categories to be compatible with National Board Certification categories.
- The SBE develop an incentive system to encourage teachers to achieve National Board Certification.

State Action Supporting National Board Certification**RHODE ISLAND**

The state of Rhode Island has signed the NASDTEC Interstate Contract and will award their highest level certificate to any person who has obtained National Board Certification in an area corresponding to that for which certification is sought, provided the applicant also holds a comparable and valid certificate issued by any member state and has complied with any requirements of the receiving state regarding degrees held, citizenship, and moral, ethical, physical, and mental fitness.

VIRGINIA

The Virginia General Assembly has set aside \$75,000 for each of the next two years (96-97 & 97-98) as incentive grants of \$1,000 toward the \$2,000 assessment for Virginia teachers.

The State Board of Education has determined that participation in National Board Certification is an option for an "educational project" that will allow teachers to earn 90 professional points of the required 180 for license renewal.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification

ALASKA

ANCHORAGE

The Anchorage School District (NEA affiliate) will provide, on a matching basis, \$1,000 for teachers completing the National Board Certification Process during the 1997-98 school year.

CALIFORNIA

NEWPORT-MESA

As part of the long range staff development plan accepted by the board of education, "The District will provide the support required to assist teachers in preparing for and passing the National Board Exams (sic)."

SAN DIEGO

Classroom teachers holding National Board Certification who apply for a mentor teacher position and who meet the prior provisions shall automatically be nominated for mentor teacher status and shall not be subject to the ranking process.

VENTURA

In a contract amendment between the Santa Paula Elementary School District and the Santa Paula Federation of Teachers, the district will pay one half of the certification fee to be matched by the teacher. Teachers who achieve National Board Certification will be reimbursed by the district their cost of the fee as well as receive an annual \$2,500 stipend. Teachers are eligible for two certification application fee payments within any five-year period beginning from the date of the first request.

WALNUT

The Walnut Valley Unified School District will reimburse the certification fee upon completion and/or achievement of National Board Certification.

COLORADO

DOUGLAS COUNTY

The Douglas County School District will support 5 candidates seeking National Board Certification during the 1996-97 school year by contributing \$700 toward the fee. School administrators are asked to match funds of \$700 per teacher from staff development funds. The cost to the teachers would be \$600. The District will provide a \$1,000 annual bonus for teachers who achieve "outstanding status" designation ("outstanding status" may include achievement of National Board Certification). In addition, teachers who achieve National Board Certification may be eligible for "state master teacher" designation and further monetary compensation. Douglas County Schools is also maintaining a fund that provides interest free tuition loans for professional development efforts (negotiated with the AFT) and provides a tuition reimbursement plan for professional development (NBPTS fees may be eligible for both of these.)

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification**GILCREST**

The Weld School District RE-1 will provide a \$500 financial bonus for those teachers achieving National Board Certification.

CONNECTICUT**DANBURY**

The Union Carbide Foundation will pay \$1,000 of the certification fee for teachers from the Danbury area. The Danbury Public Schools will provide the matching \$1,000 for 2 teachers.

NEWTOWN

The Union Carbide Foundation will pay \$1,000 of the certification fee for teachers from the Newtown area. The Newtown Public Schools will provide the matching \$1,000 for 2 teachers.

WATERFORD

Teachers will be reimbursed the certification fee by the Waterford Public School District upon completion of National Board Certification.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia Public Schools will award three of the required six in-service/recertification credits to teachers who complete the National Board Certification process.

FLORIDA**BROWARD COUNTY**

Broward teachers achieving National Board Certification will receive a supplement of \$2,000 each year for the term of the certificate. Teachers who complete the National Board Certification process will receive in-service points that can be applied toward state license renewal.

Nova University presented a National Board Certified Teacher with a \$25,000 scholarship to pursue graduate studies. Candidates who were not certified (in 1993-94) were awarded a \$1,000 scholarship in recognition of their lifelong commitment to learning demonstrated through their involvement in National Board Certification.

DADE COUNTY

The Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center in collaboration with the University of Miami, was awarded a Goals 2000 Preservice/Inservice Grant which includes professional development, support and assistance for potential candidates for National Board Certification in 1995-96.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification

GEORGIA

The Georgia Association of Educators is financially sponsoring and supporting 10 candidates pursuing National Board Certification during the 1996-97 school year.

The Professional Association of Georgia Educators is financially sponsoring and supporting 10 candidates pursuing National Board Certification during the 1996-97 school year.

ILLINOIS

NORMAL

The Illinois State University Laboratory School (Normal, IN) will pay the fee for at least 4 teachers seeking National Board Certification.

KANSAS

CARBONDALE

The Santa Fe Trail USD 424 will pay the fee for 3 teachers in 1996-97 and will provide release time for portfolio completion.

KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON

The Fayette County Education Association (FCEA), in partnership with the Pritchard Committee for Academic Excellence, are providing fee support for 4 Fayette County teachers seeking National Board Certification. The FCEA, the Kentucky Education Association (KEA), the University of Kentucky and the Fayette County School District are supporting these candidates

LUDLOW

In a business, university, school district joint venture, the Ludlow Board of Education and Huntington Bank have provided fees for two candidates with Northern Kentucky University staff coordinating this effort.

LOUISIANA

NEW ORLEANS

The New Orleans School Parish and The United Teachers of New Orleans agreed that teachers who hold valid certification from the National Board shall receive in addition to their regular salary an annual 5 percent supplement, provided the teacher is serving in the area for which NBPTS certification has been granted.

MAINE

In an agreement between the Bangor School District and the Bangor Teachers Association, the district will pay the full certification fee for up to three teachers per year, effective in the 1996-97 school year. In addition, each teacher shall be provided a maximum of three days paid leave to prepare his/her portfolio for submission.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification**MASSACHUSETTS****BOSTON**

In a contract negotiated between the Boston Public Schools and the Boston Teachers Union/AFT, the Boston Public Schools will fully reimburse the certification fees for up to 15 teachers in 1996-97, for completion of the National Board Certification process whether or not certification is achieved. Although not a requirement, successful completion of National Board Certification may be considered as a special qualification for "lead teacher" status, which includes a 10 percent to 20 percent salary increase.

MICHIGAN**DEXTER**

The Dexter School District will provide financial support for teachers seeking National Board Certification in 1996-97.

FARMINGTON

The Farmington Education Association and Farmington School District ratified a three-year contract which includes a salary line providing \$1,250 per year to any National Board Certified Teacher. The school district paid one-half of the certification fee for teachers completing National Board Certification in 1995-1996 and will continue support in 1996-97.

ANN ARBOR

The Ann Arbor Education Association and Ann Arbor School District have agreed to a revised teacher evaluation system based on the standards from the NBPTS publication "What Teachers Should Know and Be Able To Do."

MINNESOTA**BLOOMINGTON**

Bloomington Public Schools will pay the fee for up to 20 teachers in the Bloomington School District.

MINNEAPOLIS

The 1995-97 contract for Minneapolis teachers officially reads: "National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: Any Minneapolis Public Schools professionally licensed teacher who achieves National Board Certification will qualify for the next lane (except lane X) on the teachers' salary schedule beginning school year 1996-97." Any teacher going through the National Board Certification process may use this process for his/her MPS professional development plan.

NEW HOPE

Robbinsdale Area Schools will pay the fee for seven teachers and provide computer technology and video equipment to assist with portfolio completion. Recognizing the importance of National Board Certification to the school district, a coordinator position was established to help build support including developing teacher collaboratives, creating conducive learning/training environments and coordinating teacher retreats.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification

ST. PAUL

The St. Paul School District, St. Paul Federation of Teachers, Metropolitan ESCU, Metropolitan Teacher Center and the University of Minnesota collaborated on Project 20/20 to support teachers through the NBC process through the 1995-96 school year. The school district has paid the application fee for 20 teachers; the university and other partners will design and implement professional support programs for the candidates. The project is supported in part by a grant from 3M Company. The St. Paul School District will support 20 candidates in 1996-97.

NEW JERSEY**CENTRAL NEW JERSEY**

The Union Carbide Foundation will pay \$1,000 of the certification fee for teachers from central New Jersey. The Bound Brook, New Brunswick and Franklin Township School Districts have made commitments to provide the matching \$1,000 for their teachers.

NEW MEXICO**GALLUP**

The Gallup-McKinley County School District will pay the certification fee for up to 5 teachers, provide professional leave days as well as technical and collaborative support, and provide a \$1,000 bonus to those candidates achieving National Board Certification.

NEW YORK

The New York State United Teachers (NYSUT) is offering to its 140 Effective Teaching Program instructors \$1,500 to be awarded in three steps for participation in National Board Certification: \$500 upon completion of the assessment process; \$500 upon achievement of National Board Certification and \$500 to remain in the Effective Teaching Program for one year following certification.

JERICHO

The Jericho School District will reimburse the certification fee for all teachers completing the National Board Certification process; pay a \$2,000 stipend to teachers who complete but do not achieve National Board Certification; and give National Board Certified Teachers a \$4,000 stipend.

ROCHESTER

The Rochester Teachers Association (NYSUT/AFT) and the Rochester City School District ratified a four-year contract in December 1993, that included the following provisions:

"Teachers who complete the certification process of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) shall be reimbursed by the District for the costs of certification application fees. Successful completion of NBPTS certification requirements shall be considered as a special qualification for Lead Teacher eligibility."

NORTH CAROLINA**KINGS MOUNTAIN**

Kings Mountain District School Board will reward a \$500 stipend to all teachers who achieve National Board Certification.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification

MOORE COUNTY

The Moore County Board of Education approved a one-time 1 percent salary bonus for any Moore County Schools teacher achieving National Board Certification.

RHODE ISLAND

Coventry Public Schools (CPS) and Coventry Teachers Alliance (CTA) have a contractual agreement where:

- The district will pay the certification fee for up to seven teachers;
- The district will assist and support the efforts of National Board Certification candidates using restricted professional development sources by providing up to five professional development days, and supportive, loaned materials and equipment such as video cameras, editing equipment and computers, that the district owns;
- Completing the National Board Certification assessment process, but not acquiring certification, qualifies a teacher to receive six district approved credits toward the advanced increment schedule;
- Acquiring National Board Certification qualifies a teacher to be placed on the next higher advanced increment level above his/her current level;
- The District and the Alliance will explore other possible roles that National Board Certified Teachers may play in the improvement of education provided for Coventry's students. Such other roles and activities may include, but not be limited to, mentoring, planning and delivering professional development, facilitating school change, and/or developing curriculum.

SOUTH CAROLINA

CHARLESTON

The Diocese of Charleston will financially support seven Catholic school teachers during the 1996-97 school year.

HAMPTON

The Hampton School District reimburses half the cost of the certification fee and provides a \$500 salary increase for those teachers achieving National Board Certification.

SPARTANBURG

Spartanburg School District #7 provides a one-time bonus of \$2,000 for teachers achieving National Board Certification in 1996-97.

TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE

The College of Education at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville has announced its support of two teachers per year who are eligible and ready to stand for National Board Certification by providing \$1,000 each toward the certification fee.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification

TEXAS**CORPUS CHRISTI**

The Corpus Christi Independent School District will pay a \$1,500 salary increase to National Board Certified Teachers each year for the term of the certificate.

LA MARQUE

The Union Carbide Foundation will pay \$1,000 of the certification fee for teachers from southeast Texas. The La Marque Independent School District will provide the matching \$1,000 for one teacher.

VIRGINIA**FAIRFAX COUNTY**

Fairfax County Public Schools will award half of the required "recertification" points to teachers who go through the process of National Board Certification. Recertification is required of all Virginia teachers every two to five years. In 1995-96, Fairfax County Public Schools paid the application fee for a pilot group of teachers. The district instituted a 15-hour course, run by National Board Certified Teachers, to prepare teachers for National Board Certification. Any person completing the course will receive CEUs.

WASHINGTON**VANCOUVER**

The Vancouver School District will provide \$1,500 support for payment of the certification fee for a limit of ten teachers per year. The district will also provide three days substitute release time for NBC candidates to assist with portfolio preparation and will offer the use of materials owned by the district such as computers, video cameras and editing equipment.

WEST VIRGINIA**KANAWHA VALLEY**

The Union Carbide Foundation will pay \$1,000 of the certification fee for teachers from Kanawha Valley. The Kanawha County School District will provide the matching \$1,000 for 6 teachers.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS DESCRIBE ACTIVITY OCCURRING IN STATES CONTRIBUTING TO BUILDING AWARENESS AND SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION.

ALABAMA

- The Department of Education submitted a budget request to appropriate \$100,000 to support fees for 50 NBC candidates in 1997-98.
- A planning meeting with key stakeholders was held on February 5, 1996.
- Early Adolescence/English Language Arts (EA/ELA), Early Adolescence/Generalist (EA/Gen) and Early Childhood/Generalist (EC/Gen) assessment packages were field tested at Auburn University between 1993-1995.
- Alabama is home to eight National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

ALASKA

- A Stakeholders meeting was held on April 7, 1997 in Juneau.
- The Alaska Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the Association of Alaska School Boards (AASB) have unanimously recommended to the Alaska State Board of Education that NBPTS standards be adopted as Alaska's state standards.
- The Klawock School District is working on a proposal for an incentive for teachers who pursue National Board Certification and a greater incentive for those teachers who are awarded National Board Certification. Klawock is in its second year of a three-year contract so any action will not occur until mid-1997.
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Fairbanks North Star Borough School District in 1993-94.
- Alaska is home to five National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

ARIZONA

- A stakeholders meeting was held on February 21, 1997 to help state and local education leaders determine action necessary to launch National Board Certification in Arizona
- The Paradise Valley School District is developing a plan to support candidates for National Board Certification.
- Arizona is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of December 1996.

ARKANSAS

The Teacher Licensure Task Force was commissioned to study advanced teacher standards and their relationship to National Board Certification.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

CALIFORNIA

- The Southern California National Board Task Force, a network of National Board Certified Teachers, is meeting regularly to build awareness and support for candidates.
- (EA/ELA), (EA/Gen), (EC/Gen) and (MC/Gen) assessment packages were field tested at San Diego Public Schools and California State University at Fresno between in 1993-95. Sacramento County Schools and Los Angeles County Schools recruited and supported teacher candidates for the field test. San Diego Public Schools field tested the EAYA/Art assessment in 1995-96.
- Far West Laboratory, San Francisco, developed the Early Adolescence through Young Adult/Art (EAYA/Art) assessment package.
- California is home to 68 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

COLORADO

- The Governor's education budget has requested an increase in funding for professional development of which National Board Certification is a part.
- The Colorado Partnership and the University of Colorado at Denver participated in the 1993-94 field testing of EA/Gen and EA/ELA assessment packages.
- The Colorado Network for National Board Certification, a network composed of National Board Certified Teachers, was organized in December of 1995. Regular meetings are being held.
- Colorado is home to 19 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

CONNECTICUT

- The Commissioner of Education requested the Advisory Council for Teacher Preparation Standards study the implications of National Board Certification. A report was issued in June of 1996 offering recommendations for support, incentives and rewards encouraging Connecticut teachers to pursue National Board Certification. Copies of the report are available from the NBPTS Southfield, Michigan office.
- The Connecticut Department of Education was a co-developer of the EA/ELA assessment package.
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Central Connecticut State University and Waterford Public Schools in 1993-94 and Central Connecticut State University field tested EAYA/Art in 1995-96.
- Connecticut is home to 20 National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

DELAWARE

- The Delaware Professional Standards Council is recommending to the State Board of Education that National Board Certification be included as one of the activities that will qualify for relicensure of teachers.
- The Research and Development Center at the University of Delaware is considering ways to support National Board Certification candidates.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at District of Columbia Public Schools in 1993-94.
- The District of Columbia Public School teachers participated in the Adolescence and Young Adulthood/Mathematics (AYA/Math) assessments in 1995-96.

FLORIDA

- Senate Bill 318 requests an appropriation of \$150,000 from the General Revenue Fund to the State Department of Education for FY 97-98, to be used for teachers seeking National Board Certification.
- The Governor's budget proposal calls for incentives to teachers who become certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- A presentation was made to the Academy of Collier County teachers, the Collier County School Board and representatives of the local affiliate of the NEA on January 10, 1997. All agreed to engage in conversation about how to support teachers (e.g., workshops, incentives) who may pursue National Board Certification. The Collier County Foundation, composed of local businesses, will provide fees for a number of Collier County teachers seeking National Board Certification during 1997-98.
- A presentation was made at the Administrative Professional Development Council of the Hillsborough County Schools to inform them about the National Board and to seek out teacher candidates.
- EA/ELA & EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at School Board of Broward County in 1993-94. Dade County Public Schools recruited and supported several teachers during that field test.
- EAYA/Art assessments were field tested by Broward County in 1995-96.
- Florida is home to 17 National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

GEORGIA

- A stakeholders meeting was held on October 18, 1996 in Atlanta. As a follow-up, the Deans of colleges and universities with teacher preparation programs will meet at GAE on February 17, 1997 to design ways to use the National Board's standards and assessments in their teacher preparation plans.
- EA/ELA, EA/Gen and EC/Gen assessment packages were field tested at DeKalb County School System between 1993-95.
- University of Georgia is the developer of the EA/Gen and MC/Gen assessment packages.
- Georgia is home to nine National Board Certified Teachers as of February 1997.

IDAHO

- The Idaho Education Association adopted a resolution which supports "voluntary professional certification."
- Idaho is home to one National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

ILLINOIS

- The Chicago Quest Center, a part of the American Federation of Teachers, has been granted authority by the State Board of Education to establish the Jacqueline Vaughn Graduate School for Teachers. The masters of arts degree in Teacher Leadership "has been developed to respond to the standards that are emerging from the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards".
- Illinois is home to eight National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

INDIANA

- The Indiana Alliance for National Board Certification, funded by the Lilly Endowment, had its first steering committee meeting on February 7, 1997 in Indianapolis.
- The Northwest Indiana Business Forum made available \$500 per candidate to teachers in 41 northwest Indiana school districts which helped to offset the certification fee for the 1995-96 National Board Certification process.
- A version of Senate Bill No. 224 will be reintroduced during the 1997 session of the General Assembly. The bill calls for a pilot program in which the state would pay the National Board Certification fee for 200 in 1997-98 and requests an appropriation to provide support and recognition for teacher candidates.
- The Indiana Professional Standards Board is studying how best to incorporate National Board Certification into a comprehensive state strategy to strengthen teacher preparation, entry into the profession, and continuing professional development in Indiana.
- Hammond Public Schools participated in the EA/Gen and EA/ELA field tests during 1993-94.
- Indiana is home to 12 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

IOWA

- A forum and reception was held on June 7, 1996, for Iowa National Board Certified Teachers sponsored by the ISEA, the Iowa Reading Association and the IMSA and hosted by Governor Branstad.
- The University of Northern Iowa is developing a Master of Arts in Education degree with a major in Professional Development. The program curriculum is based on the propositions of the NBPTS.
- The State Board of Educational Examiners is continuing to develop a process for appointing professional panels of Iowa educators to recommend to the Board of Educational Examiners whether the standards for National Board Certification meet or exceed the Iowa requirements for an endorsement on an Iowa license.
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at the University of Northern Iowa in 1993-94.
- EAYA/Art assessments were field tested in Iowa during 1995-96.
- Iowa is home to 14 National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

KANSAS

- A proposal will be presented to the state board of education in May, 1997, that will request automatic license renewal for any Kansas teacher completing both components of the assessments for National Board Certification.
- The Kansas State Board of Education honored their National Board Certified Teachers in November 1996 and continue to pursue incentives for NBC.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

- The president of Emporia State University announced the establishment of the Great Plains Center for National Teacher Certification (May 1996) to enhance the work of the National Board in Kansas as well as Missouri, Nebraska and Oklahoma. Plans include supporting teachers, both professionally and financially, who seek National Board Certification.
- The Kansas proposal for licensure redesign includes the option of using NBC for renewal of a teaching license.
- EA/ELA, EA/Gen and MC/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Emporia State University between 1993-95.
- Kansas is home to nine National Board Certified Teacher as of February 1997.

KENTUCKY

- Members of the Pritchard Committee for Education Excellence met on June 17, 1996 to discuss how to help launch National Board Certification in Kentucky.
- Kentucky is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of December 1996.

LOUISIANA

- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at New Orleans Public Schools in 1993-94.
- Louisiana is home to five National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

MAINE

Maine is home to two National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

MARYLAND

Senate Bill 460 was introduced that will create a "State and Local Aid Pilot Program" to encourage up to 45 teachers each year to seek National Board Certification and to ask the state board to establish a statewide staff development program that utilizes the skills and knowledge of teachers who obtain National Board Certification.

MASSACHUSETTS

- Education Development Center (EDC), Newton, MA is the developer of the EC/Gen assessment package.
- Massachusetts is home to six National Board Certified as of March 1997.

MICHIGAN

- Presentations were made to the Michigan Department of Education staff and chief state school officer in November 1996.
- The "Michigan Collaborative" had its most recent meeting on April 25, 1996, at Wayne County RESA.
- The Michigan Education Association Board of Directors approved a position paper supporting National Board Certification.
- The Michigan Federation of Teachers and School Related Personnel approved a resolution that supports the NBPTS mission and applauds its National Board Certified Teachers.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

- EA/ELA, EA/Gen and EC/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Detroit Public Schools and Wayne County RESA between 1993-95. In 1995-96, Detroit field tested the EAYA/ Art assessment package.
- Michigan is home to 55 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

MINNESOTA

- A stakeholders meeting was held in St Paul on October 18, 1996 to develop a plan for state financial incentives for NBC.
- The Minnesota High Success Consortium is a non-profit organization representing more than 125 schools and districts which serve more than half the students enrolled in Minnesota's pre-K - 12 public education. The Learning Community Masters system, developed by the consortium in conjunction with Hamline and Winona State Universities, is a graduate program based on the National Board's five core propositions. Participants develop several "widely held expectations" for each proposition and design their own program to demonstrate how they meet each expectation and proposition.
- The Minnesota Education Association Board of Directors passed a motion in support of NBPTS.
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Minneapolis Public Schools in 1993-94. Minneapolis Public Schools field tested the AYA/Math assessments in 1995-96.
- Minnesota is home to 32 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

MISSISSIPPI

- Mississippi State University is home to the Mississippi World Class Teacher Project. The project has recruited and is supporting over 45 candidates through NBC in 1996-97.
- A Mississippi Stakeholders meeting was held on May 20, 1996, in Jackson to develop action plans to support the recent legislation.
- The MC/Gen, EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at University of Southern Mississippi between 1993-95.
- Mississippi is home to seven National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

MISSOURI

- Officials from the Missouri Department of Education met with NBPTS staff on June 3, 1996, to discuss the creation of a pilot project to launch National Board Certification in the state through recruitment and support of 50-75 teachers in the 1996-97 school year.
- Missouri is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of December 1996.

MONTANA

The Montana Board of Public Education approved a \$5,500 grant and formed the Montana Steering Committee for National Board Certification. In 1995, this committee conducted individual and state-wide meetings with leaders of major education stakeholder groups to study the implications of National Board certification for Montana teachers and submitted its final report in July. Plans are under way for further activity.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

NEBRASKA

- The Nebraska State Board of Education met in June 1996 to discuss possible legislative action to encourage teacher involvement with National Board Certification
- Nebraska is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of December 1996.

NEW JERSEY

- EA/ELA, EA/Gen, and EC/Gen assessment packages were field tested at South Brunswick Public Schools between 1993-95. In 1994-95, South Brunswick Schools and Educational Testing Services (ETS) are developing professional development programs based on NBPTS work through a Dodge Foundation grant.
- Educational Testing Service (Princeton) developed the AYA/Math assessment packages and redesigned the EA/ELA assessment package.
- New Jersey is home to 11 National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

NEW MEXICO

- Proposed legislation will appropriate \$350,000 to the state department of public education for recruiting and assisting qualified New Mexico teachers pursuing National Board Certification
- A teacher network meeting was held on November 16, 1996 in Albuquerque.
- Legislation passed both the House and Senate during the 1996 session to provide funding for the New Mexico World Class Teachers Project (S.B.1) and to provide an additional 4 percent salary bonus to National Board Certified Teachers (S.B. 54). Both bills were vetoed.
- New Mexico is home to 45 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

NEW YORK

- New York State United Teachers (NYSUT) delegates approved a special resolution urging local leaders to seek a variety of incentives as part of upcoming contract negotiations.
- A draft report "Embracing the National Board Process in New York" was prepared and circulated at a May 1995 stakeholders meeting in Albany.
- EA/ELA, EA/Gen, MC/Gen and EC/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Jericho Public Schools, Buffalo State College (includes Buffalo Public Schools) and the New York City Public Schools.
- New York teachers participated in the field testing of EAYL/Art and AYA/Math in 1995-96.
- New York is home to 27 National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

NORTH CAROLINA

- In his State of the State Address, Gov. Hunt proposed a 12 percent salary increase for teachers who achieve National Board Certification
- University of North Carolina-Charlotte, Johnson C. Smith College and Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public Schools created candidate support programs as part of a grant from Philip Morris Company and the North Carolina Department of Education.
- EA/ELA, EA/Gen and MC/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public Schools and Appalachian State University between 1993-95.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

- University of North Carolina-Greensboro is the site for the NBPTS Technical Analysis Group.
- North Carolina Association of Educators continues to provide candidate support workshops and services to more than 100 teachers seeking National Board Certification
- A reception honoring all National Board Certified Teachers was held at the Governor's mansion on April 11, 1996.
- North Carolina is home to 119 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of December 1996.

OHIO

- The Governor's State of the State address called for a two year budget proposal to contain funding to help 800 Ohio teachers apply for certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- A February 1997 reception and forum, hosted by the governor, honored the Ohio National Board Certified Teachers and the 1996-97 NBC candidates.
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Cincinnati Public Schools and Cleveland Public Schools in 1993-94.
- Ohio is home to 52 National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

OKLAHOMA

A \$650,000 appropriations measure will be introduced to pay the fee for 100 teachers and provide a \$2,000 pay raise for certified teachers. Also proposed is funding to create and coordinate a teacher assistance program supported by regional universities.

OREGON

The Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission has proposed a redesign of teacher preparation and licensure. Included in the proposal is language for National Board Certification. It states: " Certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will be encouraged. TSPC's proposed licensure system, with its emphasis on self assessment and continuing professional development, should assist teachers to prepare for NBPTS evaluations. Teachers who achieve NBPTS certification will have met the professional development requirements for the next renewal of their Oregon Continuing Licenses."

PENNSYLVANIA

- The State Board of Education has proposed granting to candidates certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards the state's highest level teaching certificate applicable.
- University of Pittsburgh was a co-developer of the EA/ELA assessment package in 1993-94.
- Pennsylvania is home to two National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

RHODE ISLAND

Legislation has been proposed to provide fee support for a small number of teachers.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

SOUTH CAROLINA

- The Governor's budget proposal has requested support for 30 teachers seeking National Board Certification as well as provide a bonus for those who achieve certification.
- Key educational and legislative stakeholders continue to meet to discuss and explore legislative possibilities.
- The Marlboro County Board of Education approved payment of \$500 of the \$975 certification fee in 1995 and two days professional leave for any teacher who participated in the certification process.
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at University of South Carolina in 1993-94.
- South Carolina teachers participated in the AYA/Math field test in 1995-96.
- South Carolina is home to eight National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The South Dakota State Board of Education is recommending the following for teacher certification/recertification: Professional development activities associated with National Board Certification may be submitted for license renewal; CEU equivalents will be granted to teachers who complete the NBC process; NBC will be recognized for fulfilling the new requirements for teachers to become certified; Participation in NBC will be an option for a professional development plan that will allow teachers license renewal; Any South Dakota teachers completing the NBC process will receive enough equivalent CEUs to have his/her license renewed.

TENNESSEE

- At its March, 1997 meeting the Advisory Council on Teacher Certification drafted a resolution for consideration by the Tennessee State Board of Education which includes fee payment, portability, visible roles and responsibilities for National Board Certified Teachers and compensation for those achieving NBC.
- Legislation has been proposed to provide fee support for 25 teachers.
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Austin Peay State University in 1993-94.

TEXAS

- Senate Bill 1178 was introduced that would provide reimbursement of the \$2,000 certification fee for any teacher who successfully completes the National Board Certification process.
- The Texas Federation of Teachers passed resolutions which 1) support the work of the NBPTS; 2) support legislation which would provide funding from the State of Texas for teachers seeking NBC; 3) provide funding to assist at least one teacher each year by paying the application fee.
- A report titled "Educator Professional Development: A Key Element in States' Education Reform Efforts" was prepared for the Texas Legislature. The Executive Summary notes that: "As the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' voluntary advanced certification process develops, Texas should look for ways to recognize and encourage teacher participation in National Board certification."
- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at East Texas State University. Texas teachers are participated in the AYA/Math field testing in 1995-96.
- Texas is home to five National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

Developing Action/Other Involvement Supporting National Board Certification

UTAH

- In February 1995, the Utah Education Association board of directors took a position favoring National Board Certification.
- Utah is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of December 1996.

VIRGINIA

- Norfolk State University participated in the EC/Gen and MC/Gen field testing in 1994-95.
- George Washington University and Norfolk State University have developed a project to recruit and support teachers throughout the state seeking National Board Certification.
- The Virginia Education Association is piloting an NBC project to support study groups with interested pairs of teachers to study standards and prepare for NBC.
- Virginia is home to nine National Board Certified Teachers as of March 1997.

VERMONT

Vermont is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of December 1996.

WASHINGTON

- EA/ELA and EA/Gen assessment packages were field tested at Vancouver School District in 1993-94.
- Vancouver School District covered \$600 for candidate certification fees and paid for three days of substitute time for candidates in 1995-96.
- Washington is home to 10 National Board Certified Teachers as of December 1996.

WISCONSIN

- The Wisconsin Joint Legislative Council's Special Commission on Teacher Preparation, Licensure & Regulation is exploring the possible need to integrate the National Board standards as well as National Board Certification into the Wisconsin licensure structure. A report of the commission is expected in March 1997.
- Wisconsin is home to one National Board Certified Teacher as of February 1997.