

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 251

SP 033 874

AUTHOR Hange, Jane E.
 TITLE Fostering Change through College-School Collaborative Minigrants.
 PUB DATE 27 Feb 92
 NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (San Antonio, TX, February 25-28, 1992).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *College School Cooperation; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Incentive Grants; Inservice Teacher Education; Nontraditional Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; Teacher Improvement

IDENTIFIERS Appalachia Educational Laboratory WV; Kentucky; *Minigrants; *Partnerships in Education; Tennessee; Virginia; West Virginia

ABSTRACT

In 1986, the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) established a minigrant program to foster collaboration between K-12 schools and colleges of education. Between 1986 and 1991, AEL minigrants offered seed money for 63 college-school partnership projects in Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia. Prior to 1991, college-school collaboration was not a requirement, but over half of the 1986-1990 grants awarded involved such collaboration. A 1991 study examined project effectiveness in creating collaboratives for the improvement of schools and preservice/inservice teacher education. Surveys were mailed to investigators of 30 projects which used college-school collaboration. The survey employed demographic items, Likert-scale items, and open-ended response items to query respondent perceptions of project effectiveness and outcomes. A comparison of 1986-1990 responses and 1991 responses found few differences between the principal investigator or school partner perceptions of project outcomes and effectiveness. The most important outcomes were found in the areas of K-12 students, teacher development or school improvement, collaboration, college-university improvement, and contributions to literature or personal research. Recommendations are offered for school partners, college-university partners, and organizations funding projects. (SM)

 Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Fostering Change through College-School Collaborative Minigrants

ED350251

Jane E. Hange
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jane Hange

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

February 27, 1992

Presented at the American Association of Colleges of Teacher
Education Annual Meeting, February, 1992, San Antonio, TX

Fostering Change through College-School Collaborative Minigrants

Rationale

Since 1983, education reform has increased the pressure on colleges of teacher education to improve undergraduate and graduate programs to prepare educators for the new roles available to them. One is not anointed to become an empowered educator. As Maeroff discusses in The Empowerment of Teachers, Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence, this quality should be dependent on increased knowledge as well as on improved status and opportunities for decisionmaking. Maeroff emphasizes the importance of this knowledge exchange when he states, "The more teachers and professors are put in contact, the more they are likely to learn about each other. The main problem is that there is a paucity of mechanisms for facilitating this contact. The need for greater mutual understanding is profound." (1988, p. 64).

Colleges of teacher education can continue to be the sources of knowledge only insofar as their faculties are willing to update curriculum to become current with the changing scene in roles and responsibilities now occurring within schools. But how do productive working relationships occur between schools and colleges whose faculties usually are motivated by different reward structures? Why would the time and efforts required in collaboration be important to institutions whose professed goals may be similar but whose client groups are so diverse? An appropriate response from John Goodlad concludes, "We have to get beyond the rhetoric. We've got to get at how we create policies that will create support systems to make it possible for teacher educators and

teachers to perform their job well." ("Teacher Education Has Failed," 1990, p. 5).

In discussing examples of partnerships for professional development between colleges/universities and schools, Loucks-Horsley and others in Continuing to Learn: A Guidebook for Teacher Development described three clusters based on support, cooperation, or collaboration. While the intentions of some partnerships may be to never advance beyond establishing better ties by providing short-term activities with low risk (characteristics of support partnerships), the authors conclude that the three clusters can also represent the stages of development of a single partnership. They maintain that inherent or intentional in successful partnerships are four conditions: realistic expectations, involvement, commitment (includes time for development), and leadership (Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, C., Arbuckle, M., Murray, L., Dubea, C., & Williams, M., 1987).

Ascher and Schwartz discussed this development or "stages" as one of four essentials of collaboration uncovered in their synthesis of recent literature ("School-College Alliances," 1989). The involvement of top leadership, "hands-on" participation of those with the most to gain, and broad-based and long-term funding were three other components common to collaboratives reviewed for their monograph and Digest.

Reed and Cejda (1987) reviewed 45 studies applicable to interorganizational collaboration that also specified the conditions, elements, principles, or preconditions of such collaboration. Similar to the findings of Ascher and Schwartz, their work names five attributes for sustained interorganizational collaboration: (1) promotive interdependence (defined

as positive correlations between goal attainments on the part of each organization as well as its organizational actors), (2) a balanced exchange of valued commodities, (3) a continuously renegotiated pluralistic order (realization that both the individual and the collective must be understood and responded to in terms of their dependency and influence on each other), (4) environmental scanning and adaptation, and (5) a multifaceted enabling framework (leadership, linkages, funding, and effective delivery modes for achieving purposes of the collaborative).

The development of a collaborative often begins with the success of a short-term project that intentionally or coincidentally meets many of the conditions identified by Ascher and Schwartz, Reed and Cejda, and Loucks-Horsley and coauthors. In two articles focusing on models of collaboration in Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal, teacher educators described a key difference between collaboration and college/university-school interactions of the past. Poteet, Pace, and Yewah described this difference in their discussion of several components of the Albion College-Albion Schools (Michigan) partnership stating,

Help, in the form of working with rather than working for or on is the only way. In other words, equal participation in concept and design, no matter which part 'delivers' the majority of the services, is key....These efforts in no sense constitute college experimentation on an outside party. Systems are important, but people to modify them--and empowered to do so as circumstances suggest--are the difference between success and insignificance. (1991, pp. 113-114)

In a description of the collaborative projects between Lake Forest College and Lake Forest High School also included in Thought and Action, Hansen explains the benefits of partnerships, stating,

Small scale collaborations can engender ties of mutual respect across the school-college divide and provide the basis for

subsequent common efforts without locking people into a long-term commitment. All that is required, really, is that teachers themselves (both school and college) expand their notions of collegiality vertically instead of only horizontally and that they use their initiative to enrich the learning of their students. (p. 120)

Numerous benefits accrue to those willing to take the risk to form well-planned collaborative projects or partnerships between schools and colleges/universities. Hundreds have realized these benefits so that today networks of partnerships have formed and national directories of collaborative projects must be annually updated. Examples of the former include: The College Board's Educational Equality Project Models Program, the Council Collaboration Project, the National Association of State University and Land-Grant College's University/Urban School Collaborative Program, and John Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal. The National Directory of School-College Partnerships, Linking America's Schools and Colleges: Guide to Partnerships and National Directory, and the NEASC Demonstration Partnerships: 1990-91 from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc. are three comprehensive directories useful to collaborative initiators (Wilson, M.A., p. 15).

The Appalachia Educational Laboratory's Colleges and Schools Program established the Minigrant Program in 1986 to foster such collaboration between K-12 schools and colleges of education. Program staff expect that this collaboration between colleges and schools will lead to more relevant teacher education and interdependency between the two for future improvements. This study examined the effectiveness of the funded minigrant projects in creating collaboratives for the improvement of schools, preservice teacher education, and/or inservice teacher education.

Minigrant Program Description

Designed to expand the capacity of personnel in both schools and colleges, encourage ongoing needs-directed activities, and assure success for all students, AEL minigrants provide "seed money" for college-school partnerships. For two annual competitions, Colleges and Schools staff prepare and disseminate more than 1,000 Minigrant Program announcement fliers (see Appendix A) to teacher educators through the 115 institutional contacts in institutions affiliated with the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) throughout AEL's four-state Region (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia).

One or more faculty members from these institutions, working in cooperation with their school partners, may submit one or more minigrant applications. Up to \$1,000 for planning a new college-school partnership and/or project or up to \$3,000 for carrying out a collaborative college-school project may be requested. Two rounds of competition, fall and spring, occur annually. The Partners, Purpose, Process, Outcomes, and Budget and Evaluation are required sections along with the application cover sheet. The application's narrative outline must explain how the project will improve teacher preparation, inservice teacher training, or school performance.

Faculty members from AACTE affiliates in AEL's Region serve as reviewers. Each application is read by at least three reviewers and members of the Colleges and Schools Program Advisory Committee. The latter make resource allocations based upon reviewer critiques. No application is read by a faculty member from the same state as the submitting institution. Funds cannot be used to supplant salary and

other resources provided by the college or university. Projects, generally, are of one-year duration. A final project report (10-20 pages) and a financial report are required. AEL publishes and disseminates the final reports.

Since 1986, 63 projects have been funded. The Colleges and Schools program typically designates \$40,000 annually to fund minigrants in the two competitions. AEL announces both minigrant awards and availability of final reports in the Colleges and Schools insert to The Link, AEL's quarterly newsletter. While collaboration between colleges/universities and schools has been a requirement for application only since 1991, many previously funded projects included possible impact on the schools and institutions that collaborated. Consider the following examples:

School Factors Influencing the Success and Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers: An Exploratory Study,

Search for Sources of Treatment Effects in a Teacher Effectiveness Training Program, The Professional Development of Teachers and Faculty Within a Collaborative School-University Model,

Comparison of Teacher Training Content and Classroom Practices of Teachers of Behaviorally Disordered Students: "Do They Practice What We Preach?,"

The Impact of Internship Training on Resource Teachers and Teacher Educators, and

Training Required by Clinical Faculty Members and Teacher Mentors: A Descriptive Study.

Methodology

Heretofore, AEL has not collected perceptions from minigrant recipients or collaborators in schools, beyond the final reports, regarding accomplishment of project purposes, quality of collaboration

between partners, evidence of change in classroom teacher or school practices, evidence of change in college or university programs or practices, perceived importance of minigrant funds to project achievement, and evidence of increased collaboration between colleges or universities and schools as a result of minigrant project participation. The Colleges and Schools staff undertook this task with a survey mailed in late 1991 to each principal investigator and the key school collaborators. This paper describes the study and survey findings and makes recommendations for collaborators and organizations funding similar college/university partnerships.

The author-developed 13-item survey (see Appendix B) was reviewed by a survey research expert external to AEL. Following revisions, the survey was mailed with a postage-paid return envelope to principal investigators of 30 projects selected, based upon their final reports, for their use of college-school collaboration. Although college-school collaboration was not required until 1991, this number includes approximately half of the total minigrant projects funded from 1986 through the spring competition of 1991. Colleges and Schools staff requested that principal investigators contact AEL to provide addresses of two or more school collaborators in their projects. In response, 23 investigators provided this information. Subsequently, surveys were mailed to 24 school participants (two for one project).

To capture the richness of results of individual projects while also considering the success of the minigrant program across projects, the survey employed two demographic items, seven Likert-scale items, and four open-ended response items. All items queried respondent perceptions of

project effectiveness and outcomes. Both descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations for Likert-scale items) and emergent category qualitative analysis (open-ended responses) were used in analysis of the data. Due to the low response rate of school participants (seven surveys returned), all surveys were aggregated in entering quantitative data. Discussion of investigator versus school participant findings is included in the reporting of qualitative data.

Quantitative Findings

As indicated in items one and two of the survey data summary (see Appendix C), 23 of the initial group of 30 college/university principal investigators and seven of the 24 school participants returned completed surveys (a response rate of 56%). A review of means and standard deviations for items three through nine, calculated from ratings on the five-point Likert scale for the aggregated responses of these groups, indicates that respondents viewed migrant projects as achieving their outlined purposes ($\bar{X}=4.62$, item #3), involving high quality collaboration between partners ($\bar{X}=4.63$, item #4), and incorporating effective project activities ($\bar{X}=4.48$, item #5). Participants and investigators responded that AEL funds were very critical to project completion ($\bar{X}=4.96$, the highest rated item, item #8) and that they were likely to again collaborate with the same partners ($\bar{X}=4.72$, item #9).

Rated positively but somewhat lower were the extent to which teacher practices had changed in the school as a result of the project ($\bar{X}=3.31$, item #6), and the extent to which the college/university teacher education program had changed as a result of the project ($\bar{X}=3.25$, item #7).

Significantly, fewer respondents completed these items; some noting that these changes were not the foci of their projects, and standard deviations for both were high (1.15, and 1.14, respectively).

Qualitative Findings

Descriptive information regarding individual projects and the Minigrant Program was reported in response to the four open-ended response items (#10-13). The author employed emergent category analysis to summarize these responses.

Major Outcomes. When asked to describe the most important outcome of the project in question #10, the 31 responses (more than one outcome cited by some respondents) related to five emerging categories: K-12 students (five responses), teacher development or school improvements (six), college/university improvements (four), collaboration (eight), and contributions to the literature or to personal research (dissertation completion) (six).

Outcomes related to K-12 students included: "helping at-risk students through more individual attention, increased parental involvement, and exposure to the concept of higher education," "children developing positive attitudes, increased self-esteem, and confidence with reading-writing activities," and "demonstrating that at-risk children in whole-language settings (rural and urban) learn as well as, and in some ways better than, their counterparts in traditional classrooms." Those that reflected outcomes more focused on teacher development or school improvement included: "having teachers from a fairly remote setting come to the writing project and bringing back to their colleagues practices

and materials," "increased awareness of modeling, coaching, and conferencing techniques, enhanced observation skills, and development of mentoring skills," and "enabled teachers to develop confidence in their teaching abilities as well as their ability to do research."

Some examples of the college/university-related outcomes were: "inservice teachers supervising student teachers in physical education are now reinforcing the teaching behaviors taught in the undergraduate physical education program," "[increased] awareness of partnerships to university's Curriculum and Instruction division and the Dean's office," and "communicating program activities to colleagues and planning activities for the second year of the program." For some investigators and participants, the collaboration that resulted was the most important outcome of the project. Their descriptions included: "demonstration of university/school district working together," "continuation of faculty activities and a grant from MCI to cover the school's expenses," "better communication with college student teacher advisor and improved evaluation skills," and "opportunity to explore our growth as educators with other professionals--We have been able to share these understandings and insights with future practitioners."

Finally, in keeping with the original goal of the Minigrant Program from 1986-90--to foster research--six major outcomes cited contributions to the literature or to personal research. These responses included: "understanding that contrary to existing literature, reading clinicians are as consistent and operate in the same manner as other clinicians," "provision of detailed data on a student teacher's cognitive change during student teaching," and "understanding of young gifted females and

family issues affecting success in this type (college acceleration) program."

Continuation of Project Activities. Fifteen respondents answered "Yes" to question #11, which asked if any activities or effects continued in the school or college/university. Of these, eight provided examples of school activities that continued while ten described college/university changes that persisted and two cited examples that included other partners. Some examples of those that named school activities are: "Foxfire networks around the country are following our model," "more such classrooms (whole language) were developed, more teachers tried parts of whole language (various strategies), "teachers were more aware of resumes of individuals and in materials ordered," and "one team continued for two more years, and teachers, students, and faculty presented concepts, activities, and outcomes at state professional educational meeting and at ATE."

The modification of coursework; commendations from NCATE for a project-conducted survey; longitudinal research, continued collaboration between the college and a network of teachers; and creation of a second year of a Regional Program for the Preparation of Principals, extension of the program to a new area and development of field-based doctoral program were among the ten descriptions of lasting effects on the college/university that originated with minigrant projects. Business involvement was discussed in one example of institutionalization with partners other than schools. The respondent cited, "Teachers and business participants really liked being part of the study and were quite interested in reading the results; it improved the business partnership."

Increases in collaboration as a result of project. The Minigrant Program has consistently described the available funds for planning or project grants as "seed money" for the creation of college-school partnerships. When queried in question #12 about possible increases in collaboration between the school or school systems and college/university as a result of the minigrant-funded project, twenty respondents stated "Yes," four "No," two indicated their projects continued in progress, and four had no response or indicated they did not know. These responses enable staff to track the impact or "spin-off" projects that resulted from an initial modest investment in each minigrant. Some of the examples of increased collaboration included: "more inservice/staff development and more involvement of school staff at the university level," "More definitely! Several planning and evaluation conferences have been held, and others will follow," and "Professional Development Teams have involved faculty in a Guest Reading Program and in research regarding reform initiatives."

Suggestions to improve Minigrant Program. Through feedback from minigrant reviewers, Colleges and Schools Program Advisory Committee members, and minigrant applicants, AEL staff continue to revise the Minigrant Program to improve the process for institutional contact persons, applicants, reviewers, and those receiving grants, and to improve the quality of the products, the minigrant final reports. When asked what suggestions they would have to improve the Minigrant Program (item #13), sixteen answered "none" or gave no response.

Two responses were given more frequently than all others (each cited by three respondents)--provide more time and more funds for minigrants.

Specific suggestions included: "longer time frames, sometimes the period is just too short," "extend to grants longer than one year projects, more flexibility in types of projects allowed include more nontraditional educational projects," "suggestions to school systems for matching funds via the proposal process," "increase funding maximums and allow two-year projects," and "make the grant a continuing one when needed--I'm still getting calls to help and I do all I can because I care." Some respondents used their responses to send praises which included: "no suggestions--it's great!," "none--AEL has been cooperative and helpful," "Continue flexibility which allows linkages to ongoing activities," and "Given the money that is available, I feel that it's [Minigrant Program's] efforts are well targeted."

Comparison of Principal Investigator and School Partner Responses.

Completed surveys were received from seven school partners of the 24 identified by the principal investigators, the minigrant recipients. Four of these were responses from partners in minigrant projects funded in the spring 1991 competition, the first in which college-school collaboration was required. While principal investigator and school partner responses were aggregated for quantitative data analysis, their responses to open-ended questions can be compared. Overall, school partners provided fewer comments to all qualitatively analyzed questions, items #10-13. Most encouraging were responses referring to increased collaboration. These included: "Collaboration has increased as a result of increased frequency of contacts during and between planning sessions," "Teachers more readily cooperate in research projects from ... and other universities. Teachers see themselves as researchers," and "The most

important outcome has been increased collaboration between the college and surrounding schools."

School partners were generally less informed about changes in the college/university teacher education program as indicated by "not applicable" or "don't know" responses to item #7. Also, while three of the seven responded that they did not know how critical AEL funds were to the project, four indicated high importance to item #8. On item #6 which inquired as to the extent of change of teacher practices as a result of project participation, four indicated they did not know and the highest rating provided by any other school partner was three (on the five-point Likert scale). Since change in teacher practices was not a focus of all minigrants, this may not be a significant finding. Of more significance to the purpose of minigrants, namely the fostering of college-school partnerships, was the unanimous rating of five on item #9, indicating that it was very likely that these school partners would participate in another collaborative project with this same college/university.

Comparison of Responses of Minigrant Collaborators of 1986-90 with Those of 1991 Minigrant Collaborators. Prior to 1991, college-school collaboration was not a requirement for minigrant applicants. However, more than half of the minigrants awarded during AEL's 1986-90 funding cycle involved such collaboration. In proposing this study, it was expected that differences between the outcomes of 1986-90 included in this study (22 projects) and those of 1991 (8 projects) might become apparent. However, the selection for inclusion in the study of only projects with apparent college-school collaboration from all 1986-90 projects funded may have obscured these findings. Few differences were noted between the

principal investigator or school partner reports of perceptions of the outcomes and effectiveness of the projects.

It is notable that of the most important outcomes reported by 1991 minigrant participants in response to item #10, only one related to a non-school related outcome, namely research. The other six descriptions were categorized as relating to K-12 students, the improvement of teacher professional development or school improvements, or collaboration. One other indication of the level of involvement in the collaboration by the school partners may be the four responses received from 1991 minigrant school partners compared to the three received from all 1986-90 projects included in the study. School partner responses were received from three of the eight 1991 projects included in the study. The passage of time since project involvement may also have taken a toll on the response rate of school partners from 1986-90.

Recommendations

This study of the results of AEL's college-school Minigrant Program sought to report the extent of lasting effects of collaboration and to determine ways in which the program, or similar small grant programs for college/university-school partnerships, could be improved. Based upon the quantitative and qualitative data discussed above, the following recommendations can be made for:

College/university partners in collaborative projects:

- Establish school partner involvement in planning and implementing the project, include teachers and administrators in project decisionmaking;

- Conduct formative and summative evaluation of the project activities; processes; outcomes (including any effects on students, if appropriate) and participant perceptions of change, collaboration, and project effectiveness;
- Respond through communications and adjustments of project activities as problems are uncovered by either school or college partners; and
- Maintain communications with school partners after the initial project is completed to enhance opportunities for future collaboration.

School partners in collaborative projects:

- Give more than access to the schools, classes, teachers, and students. Become involved in planning before the project begins and make all those affected aware of the changes and requests for their time and efforts;
- Look for benefits to school participation in the partnership. If the project will lead to improvements in curriculum, instruction, organization, student outcomes, assistance to teachers, etc., explain these to central administration and the public;
- Monitor changes in administrator, teacher, and student (if appropriate) practices and perceptions of the project as it progresses and advise college/university collaborators of needs; and
- Maintain communications with college/university partners after the project is completed to enhance opportunities for future collaboration.

Organizations funding college/university-school collaborative projects:

- Establish a reliable review process to identify collaborative projects with high probability for lasting effects of mutually supported change in school or college/university programs;
- Initiate early contact and maintain communications with principal investigators regarding project progress throughout the duration of the project;
- Require and review results of summative evaluation reports submitted by all projects and include in final reports to be disseminated;

- Annually assess college/university and school participant perceptions of project effectiveness, outcomes, collaboration, and impacts including institutionalization of changes and subsequent collaborative projects; and
- Revise program goals, requirements, activities, technical assistance, communications, and dissemination strategies based upon formative and summative evaluation data.

The topic of college/university collaboration or partnerships holds much promise for future research. As budgets at the federal, state, and local levels for K-12 and postsecondary education continue to suffer cuts, collaboration offers opportunities for preserving (and extending) essential services through imaginative means. Increased attention to the documentation and evaluation of these collaborative efforts will help others who wish to establish similar projects and will document the real improvements taking place where college and school faculties work as equals in professional development. Hansen sums the importance of collaboration and of the followup of collaborative efforts well when he stated, "The collaboration that works best is the collaboration that takes the word in its fullest sense as an ideal and as a mode of operation: instruction, feedback, modification, new initiative, and an ever widening circle of participants supporting and learning from each other work to the advantage of all" (p. 114).

References

- Ascher, C., & Schwartz, W. (1989). School-college alliances: Benefits for low-income minorities (Digest No. 53). New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.
- Hansen, F. (1991). School-college collaboration in a small world. Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal, 7(1), 115-120.

Goodlad: Teacher education has failed. (1990, Fall). State Education Leader, pp. 4-5.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, C., Arbuckle, M., Murray, L., Dubea, C., & Williams, M. (1987). Continuing to learn: A guidebook for teacher development. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Education Improvement of the Northeast and Islands and The Nation Staff Development Council, pp. 116-125.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the Crisis of confidence. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Poteet, D. P., Pace, L., & Yewah, E. (1991). College-school collaboration in Michigan. Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal, 7(1), 105-114.

Reed, P., & Cejda, B. (1987). Attributes and preconditions of collaboration between and among schools, institutions of higher education, and state education agencies. Elmhurst, IL: The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Wilson, M. A. (1991, Winter). The reading corner. Partners: A Newsletter of School/College Collaboration, p. 15.

New Minigrant Program for 1992

Teacher educators in the four-state Region—Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia—represent a tremendous potential resource for improving the schools near them, and collaborative efforts between colleges and schools can benefit both institutions. As higher education institutions work hand in hand with schools to improve education and train teachers, these partnerships also serve to:

- expand the capacity of personnel in both institutions,
- encourage ongoing needs-directed activities, and
- assure success for all students.

What Are AEL Minigrants?

- Through AEL Minigrants, the Lab hopes to foster the creation of college-school partnerships.
- AEL Minigrants provide "seed money" to supplement—not supplant—the salary and other resources already being provided by partner institutions.
- AEL Minigrants will now be available to provide seed money for two purposes:
 - (1) up to \$1,000 for planning a new college-school partnership and/or project
 - (2) up to \$3,000 for carrying out a collaborative college-school project
- Projects that focus on meeting the needs of at-risk students will be given special consideration, as will projects showing considerable innovation or creativity.

How Can I Apply for an AEL Minigrant?

Directions for applications are included on the application cover sheet provided on the reverse side of this announcement.

Who May Apply?

One or more faculty members from member institutions of KACTE, TACTE, VACTE, or WVACTE (state affiliates of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) may submit an AEL Minigrant application.

Each application must represent a partnership project or planning effort in which higher education and local school personnel collaborate. Such partnerships must include one or more state ACTE-member institutions and one or more local public or nonpublic schools.

When Are Applications Due?

There will be two rounds of competition for AEL Minigrants in 1992. Deadlines are:

March 31, 1992
September 30, 1992

All applications received by the above dates will be considered in the appropriate review cycle.

Requirements described on both sides of this announcement are considered in evaluating each application. Specific evaluation criteria for planning and/or project grant applications are available from your institutional contact, or phone Colleges and Schools program staff at AEL.

Restrictions and Requirements

- No indirect costs (overhead) will be paid on AEL Minigrants.
- No equipment purchases will be supported by AEL Minigrants (items costing \$300 or more and having a usual life of more than one year).
- No dissemination costs will be supported by AEL Minigrants (reproduction/distribution of products or travel for presentation of outcomes).
- The fiscal agent for administering AEL Minigrant funds must be either a state ACTE-member institution or a local school district.

AEL Minigrant recipients are expected to submit:

- a brief (10- to 20-page) final report (guidelines provided) for publication in AEL's Minigrant Report Series and
- a financial report accounting for the use of AEL Minigrant funds.

Both are due within one month following end of project timeline.

If you have questions or need more information, call the Colleges and Schools program staff. For a description of criteria used in evaluating proposals, see your AEL contact or phone Jane Hange or Carla McClure at AEL.
800/624-9120 (outside WV)
800/344-6646 (in WV)
304/347-0400 (Charleston area)

(Application on Reverse Side)

Application Cover Sheet

(Deadlines: March 31, 1992, and September 30, 1992)

This cover sheet must be completed and submitted as part of each application for an AEL Minigrant.

Applicant Information	
_____ (Name)	_____ (Title of Proposed Project)
_____ (Position/Title)	_____ (Total AEL Funds Requested)
_____ (Institution of Higher Education)	Signatures (Required):
_____ (Mailing Address)	1. _____ (Applicant)
_____ (City, State, Zip Code)	2. _____ (Dean/chairperson of education, college, school, or department)
_____ (Telephone)	_____ (Position/Title)
	3. _____ (Local school superintendent, principal, or headmaster)
	_____ (Position/Title)

Applicants must attach a narrative statement to this cover sheet.
Be sure to check the applicable box below and follow the corresponding instructions.

- AEL Minigrant to **plan** a college-school partnership project

Planning Narrative Outline

Partners: Identify specifically the college(s) and school(s) that will be involved in planning.

Purpose: Explain the purpose of the planning effort. Include your thoughts about what you hope to achieve through the project you anticipate planning.

Process: Describe the planning process that you intend to undertake, including an expected starting date, key events, and end date.

Outcomes: Describe the primary outcome(s) expected from the planning process.

Evaluation: Explain your plan for evaluating the planning process.

Budget:

- Identify the items and amounts: (1) to be paid from the AEL Minigrant and (2) to be contributed as in-kind support by the partner institution(s).
- Explain how AEL Minigrant funds will enable or facilitate the proposed work.

- AEL Minigrant to **conduct** a college-school partnership project

Project Narrative Outline

Partners: Identify by name and title participants in the colleges and schools partnership. Describe in detail the roles of each partner in this collaborative effort.

Purpose: Explain the purpose of the project and how it will improve one or more of the following: (1) teacher preparation, (2) inservice teacher training, or (3) school performance.

Activities: Describe the activities to be undertaken. Provide a timeline that includes expected starting date, key events, and end date.

Outcomes: Describe the primary outcome(s) of the project. Explain the relationships between purpose, activities, and outcomes.

Evaluation: Explain your plan for evaluating the project.

Budget:

- Identify the items and amounts: (1) to be paid from the AEL Minigrant and (2) to be contributed as in-kind support by the partner institution(s).
- Explain how AEL Minigrant funds will enable or facilitate the project work.

Send the application cover sheet, along with the application narrative, to:
Colleges and Schools Program, Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Post Office Box 1348, Charleston, West Virginia 25325

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

December 6, 1991

Minigrant Recipient or School Partner

Dear _____:

As you may know, since 1985 AEL's Colleges and Schools (formerly Professional Preparation and Research) Program has provided small grants to foster research, especially collaborative forms, by teacher educators in colleges and universities throughout its four-state Region (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia). The current Minigrant program focuses solely on providing "seed money" for grants to plan (up to \$1,000) or to implement (up to \$3,000) college and school partnerships. True collaboration between the institutions of higher education and the schools is a major criterion guiding reviewers as they evaluate proposals. Evaluation is also the objective of this mailing to you, a former or current Minigrant participant.

Colleges and Schools staff seek to evaluate the Minigrant program in order to guide future budget decisions and to release the findings if this strategy for collaboration is found to be effective. We believe that some of the most important evaluation information should be obtained from the college and school personnel associated with the Minigrants. We need your help in completing the evaluation of the Minigrant as a strategy for collaborative research.

Please read and carefully complete the enclosed survey and return it in the envelope provided by December 13, 1991. We have provided some information from your Minigrant project to refresh your memory. Please feel free to correct this section, if necessary. If you have any questions, please phone me at the AEL phone numbers indicated.

Thank you for your assistance with the improvement of the Minigrant program and with tracking of impact from previously funded Minigrants. I look forward to receiving your completed survey. Please phone whenever AEL can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Jane E. Hange, Ph.D., Director
Classroom Instruction and Colleges and Schools Programs

AEL Minigrants Program
College-School Partnerships Survey

Please assist us in evaluating AEL's Minigrant Program by completing the following questions and returning the survey by December 13, 1991, to Jane Hange at AEL in the enclosed envelope. Your responses will be aggregated and used in program evaluation and conference papers. Please contact Jane Hange, AEL, 800/624-9120 (TN, VA, WV), 800/344-6646 (WV), and 347-0411 if you have questions. Thank you.

Title _____

Partners _____

Purpose _____

Project Timeline _____

1. Were you the principal investigator in this Minigrant Project?

Yes

No

2. Were you a member of the participating college/university or school?
Circle one.

College/University

School

Other _____

Please circle your response (1--lowest rating to 5--highest rating or DK--don't know) for each question below.

3. To what extent did the project achieve its purpose?

low high
1 2 3 4 5 DK

4. How would you rate the quality of collaboration between the college and school partners in this Minigrant project?

low high
1 2 3 4 5 DK

5. How effective were the project activities?

low high
1 2 3 4 5 DK

6. To what extent have teacher practices changed in the school as a result of project participation?

low high
1 2 3 4 5 DK

7. To what extent has the college/university teacher education program changed as a result of project participation? (NA=not applicable)

low high
1 2 3 4 5 DK NA

8. How critical were AEL Minigrant funds to the completion of the project?

low high
1 2 3 4 5 DK

9. How likely is it that you would participate in another collaborative project with this same school or college/university?

1 2 3 4 5 DK

Please answer each of the following completely. Attach additional sheets, if necessary.

10. Please describe what you would consider to be the most important outcome of the project?

11. After the conclusion of the Minigrant project, did any activities or effects continue in the school or college/university? If so, please describe any that occurred in your setting.

12. Has collaboration between the school or school district and the college/university increased as a result of the Minigrant project? Please explain and provide examples.

13. What suggestions would you make to improve the Minigrant Program?

Thank you for returning the completed survey to Dr. Jane Hange, AEL,
P. O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325, in the enclosed envelope.

AEL Minigrants Program
College-School Partnerships Survey
EVALUATION SUMMARY

Please assist us in evaluating AEL's Minigrant Program by completing the following questions and returning the survey by December 13, 1991, to Jane Hange at AEL in the enclosed envelope. Your responses will be aggregated and used in program evaluation and conference papers. Please contact Jane Hange, AEL, 800/624-9120 (TN, VA, WV), 800/344-6646 (WV), and 347-0411 if you have questions. Thank you.

Title _____

Partners _____

Purpose _____

Project Timeline _____

1. Were you the principal investigator in this Minigrant Project?

Yes 23 No 7

2. Were you a member of the participating college/university or school?
Circle one.

College/University 23 School 6 Other 1

Please circle your response (1--lowest rating to 5--highest rating or DK--don't know) for each question below.

3. To what extent did the project achieve its purpose? N \bar{X} SD

low					high			
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
						29	4.62	.66

4. How would you rate the quality of collaboration between the college and school partners in this Minigrant project?

low					high			
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
						30	4.63	.65

5. How effective were the project activities?

low					high			
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
						29	4.48	.49

6. To what extent have teacher practices changed in the school as a result of project participation?
- | | low | | | | high | | N | \bar{X} | SD |
|--|-----|---|---|---|------|----|----|-----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | 16 | 3.31 | 1.15 |
7. To what extent has the college/university teacher education program changed as a result of project participation? (NA=not applicable)
- | | low | | | | high | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|------|----|----|----|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NA | 16 | 3.25 1.14 |
8. How critical were AEL Minigrant funds to the completion of the project?
- | | low | | | | high | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|------|----|----|------|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | 27 | 4.96 | .18 |
9. How likely is it that you would participate in another collaborative project with this same school or college/university?
- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | 29 | 4.72 | .78 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|------|-----|

Please answer each of the following completely. Attach additional sheets, if necessary.

10. Please describe what you would consider to be the most important outcome of the project?
11. After the conclusion of the Minigrant project, did any activities or effects continue in the school or college/university? If so, please describe any that occurred in your setting.
12. Has collaboration between the school or school district and the college/university increased as a result of the Minigrant project? Please explain and provide examples.
13. What suggestions would you make to improve the Minigrant Program?

Thank you for returning the completed survey to Dr. Jane Hange, AEL,
P. O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325, in the enclosed envelope.