U.S. Department of Education
The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

LEARNING ANYTIME ANYWHERE PARTNERSHIPS (LAAP)

Information and Application Materials
Fiscal Year 2001
Deadline for Submission: March 15, 2001

1998 AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

P.L. 105-244

SEC. 410A. LEARNING ANYTIME ANYWHERE PARTNERSHIPS.

Subpart 8 of part A of title IV (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

Subpart 8--Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships

SEC. 420D. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The nature of postsecondary education delivery is changing, and new technology and other related innovations can provide promising education opportunities for individuals who are currently not being served, particularly for individuals without easy access to traditional campus-based postsecondary education or for whom traditional courses are a poor match with education or training needs.

(2) Individuals, including individuals seeking basic or technical skills or their first postsecondary experience, individuals with disabilities, dislocated workers, individuals making the transition from welfare-to-work, and individuals who are limited by time and place constraints can benefit from nontraditional, noncampus-based postsecondary education opportunities and appropriate support services.

(3) The need for high-quality, nontraditional, technology-based education opportunities is great, as is the need for skill competency credentials and other measures of educational progress and attainment that are valid and widely accepted, but neither need is likely to be adequately addressed by the uncoordinated efforts of agencies and institutions acting independently and without assistance.

(4) Partnerships, consisting of institutions of higher education, community organizations, or other public or private agencies or organizations, can coordinate and combine institutional resources--

(A) to provide the needed variety of education options to students; and

(B) to develop new means of ensuring accountability and quality for innovative education methods.

SEC. 420E. PURPOSE; PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) PURPOSE- It is the purpose of this subpart to enhance the delivery, quality, and accountability of postsecondary education and career-oriented lifelong learning through technology and related innovations.

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED-

(1) GRANTS-

(A) IN GENERAL- The Secretary may, from funds appropriated under section 420J make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, eligible partnerships to carry out the authorized activities described in section 420G.

(B) DURATION- Grants under this subpart shall be awarded for periods that do not exceed 5 years.

(2) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP- For purposes of this subpart, the term `eligible partnership' means a partnership consisting of 2 or more independent agencies, organizations, or institutions. The agencies, organizations, or institutions may include institutions of higher education, community organizations, and other public and private institutions, agencies, and organizations.

SEC. 420F. APPLICATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT- An eligible partnership desiring to receive a grant under this subpart shall submit an application to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require.

(b) CONTENTS- Each application shall include--

(1) the name of each partner and a description of the responsibilities of the partner, including the designation of a nonprofit organization as the fiscal agent for the partnership;

(2) a description of the need for the project, including a description of how the project will build on any existing services and activities;

(3) a listing of human, financial (other than funds provided under this subpart), and other resources that each member of the partnership will contribute to the partnership, and a description of the efforts each member of the partnership will make in seeking additional resources; and

(4) a description of how the project will operate, including how funds awarded under this subpart will be used to meet the purpose of this subpart.

SEC. 420G. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

Funds awarded to an eligible partnership under this subpart shall be used to--

(1) develop and assess model distance learning programs or innovative educational software;

(2) develop methodologies for the identification and measurement of skill competencies;

(3) develop and assess innovative student support services; or

(4) support other activities that are consistent with the purpose of this subpart.

SEC. 420H. MATCHING REQUIREMENT.

Federal funds shall provide not more than 50 percent of the cost of a project under this subpart. The non-Federal share of project costs may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including services, supplies, or equipment.

SEC. 420I. PEER REVIEW.

The Secretary shall use a peer review process to review applications under this subpart and to make recommendations for funding under this subpart to the Secretary.

SEC. 420J. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subpart $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

INTRODUCTION

The Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships (LAAP) program is a grant competition authorized by the 1998 Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965. $15.5 million dollars in grants will be awarded in Fiscal Year (FY) 2001. LAAP supports partnerships among colleges and universities, employers, technology companies, and other relevant organizations to create postsecondary programs that deliver distance education "anytime and anywhere." These programs should be implemented on a national or regional scale and should be innovative within the context of national trends in distance education.

ELIGIBILITY

Eligible partnerships must consist of two or more independent agencies, organizations, or institutions. The partners may include institutions of higher education, community organizations, and other public and private institutions, agencies, and organizations. A non-profit organization should be designated to serve as the lead applicant and fiscal agent for the partnership.

Partnerships among community colleges, vocational or technical colleges, liberal arts colleges, universities, consortia, state systems, accreditors, associations, community organizations, publishers, hardware or software companies, employers, state or local agencies, and many other types of organizations are encouraged to apply. The partnerships may be existing or newly formed. Other organizations may be eligible; the list here is not exhaustive.

FUNDABLE ACTIVITIES

Funds awarded through LAAP grants may be used to develop and assess model distance learning programs or innovative educational software; to develop methodologies for the identification and measurement of skill competencies; to develop and assess innovative student services; or to support other activities consistent with the purposes of the competition.

LAAP encourages proposals to develop and implement courses, certification or degree programs, and even non-credit learning experiences that prepare students for employment. However, the types of partnerships and the problems outlined in this proposal package are not exhaustive. LAAP will consider any innovative ideas consistent with the authorizing legislation that promote greater access and quality education.

AWARDS

LAAP grants may provide up to three years of funding, depending on the scope of the requested activities. Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 projects may begin as early as September 1, 2001, but preferably no later than January 1, 2002. We estimate that 35-40 new awards will be made. Most grants will be for one, two, or three years of funding. These grants will likely range from $100,000 to $500,000 per year, with an average of $333,333 per year. A few grants of exceptional scope and significance may be larger, with an average of $500,000 to $750,000 per year. Only the first year of funding will be obligated from FY 2001 funds; funding for subsequent years is contingent upon Congressional appropriations.

MATCHING FUNDS

Federal funds shall provide not more than 50 percent of the total cost of LAAP-funded projects. In other words, an equal match is required. For each dollar requested, the partners must collectively contribute at least one dollar in matching funds. The non-federal share of project costs may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including services, supplies, or equipment. The program aims to promote the leveraging of resources among institutions and, in particular, to encourage investments and contributions from private sector partners.

EQUIPMENT/INFRASTRUCTURE

LAAP does not expect to provide support for large equipment purchases or for the development of computer networks or other infrastructure. However, applicants are encouraged to leverage institutional and private investments to support these costs, and to proceed with their planning and program development by directly coordinating with the appropriate computer networking professionals.

TWO-STAGE APPLICATION PROCESS

All applicants must submit a "preliminary proposal" up to seven pages in length. These preliminary proposals will be reviewed and a select number of applicants will be invited to submit a "final proposal" up to twenty-five pages in length. Award decisions will be based upon review of the final proposals. The review process is more fully described below in the section entitled "Guide to Proposal Development."

AUTHORITY

The specific authority for LAAP is found in Title IV of the Higher Education Act as amended in 1998. Regulations are contained in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 34 Part 75. In addition, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 74, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 85 also apply.

APPLICATION NOTICE

The official Application Notice is published in the Federal Register. The information in this application package is intended to aid in preparing proposals for this competition. Nothing in this application package supersedes the priorities published in the Federal Register.

CONTACT INFORMATION

LAAP is being administered by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). FIPSE's address is (please do not use this address to submit proposals):

FIPSE, 8th floor
1990 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-8544

Telephone: (202) 502-7500
E-mail: LAAP@ed.gov

FIPSE/LAAP WEBSITE

For information about the LAAP program, including abstracts of FY 1999 and 2000 grantees and technical assistance materials aimed at potential applicants, visit LAAP's website at:

http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE/LAAP

LEARNING ANYTIME ANYWHERE PARTNERSHIPS

Technology now makes it possible to deliver education anytime and anywhere, but most educational institutions, including those providing distance education, continue to follow traditional practices. Courses are delivered on fixed academic schedules (usually semesters or quarters), degrees or certifications are awarded to students who complete a set number of credit hours, and students generally choose to attend institutions that serve the geographic region in which they live.

In recent years, the growth of distance education has partially challenged assumptions about geography. Technology now provides the possibility that students may access courses and programs from almost anywhere, and this in turn has changed the ways institutions recruit students. Even so, tradition, funding, policy, and other factors often constrain institutions to honor geographic boundaries that technology and learner demand may not respect.

Furthermore, until recently, even distance education has not seriously challenged many assumptions about time. Educational institutions generally assume that students will enroll in courses of fixed length and delivered in fixed formats. But increasingly, some students need affordable alternatives that may not conform to fixed academic schedules or that are offered only at specific hours during a week or for specific weeks during the year. It has frequently been observed that what our postsecondary institutions offer are fixed programs leading to variable or uncertain outcomes, while increasingly the need is for more flexible programs yielding verifiable outcomes.

Welfare recipients or dislocated workers in rapid need of employment may not have the luxury of waiting for the start of fall semester before beginning semester-length courses. Workers in fast-changing industries may miss complete product cycles if they cannot access skills training precisely when they need it. Working parents may need to fit education around their children’s schedules or other duties in the home. Such students could all benefit from education that is shaped to accommodate their needs, and in an increasingly competitive environment, they will choose the providers who can give it to them.

As educational institutions currently operate, however, the goal of learning anytime anywhere cannot easily be accomplished. Putting a course on the Web does not necessarily mean that it will be interactive. Learning should still connect students with instructors, with communities of other learners, and with first-rate scholarship. It should be guided and monitored, with plenty of feedback, and with opportunities for investigation and practice. To try to provide some or all of these functions in a technology-mediated environment is expensive. Educational providers may not have the resources on their own to design and implement this kind of education to its fullest potential. They will not have the money for development (except perhaps for a limited array of offerings), nor will they necessarily gain the enrollments to recoup their investments and sustain their offerings.

If learning anytime anywhere is going to be achieved, and if students are going to have the options they need, educational providers will have to find new ways to leverage their investments, to build economies of scale, and to share courses and programs. They can do this through partnerships. In American postsecondary education today, there already exist many virtual universities, consortia, and other partnerships that are in their infancy and in need of educational programs and models for student services. And there are colleges or private sector companies that have developed solutions that others might benefit from, but when acting alone have not been able to implement these solutions on a significant scale. Finally, there are students, targeted by a whole new wave of vendors and educational providers, who are not necessarily well equipped to make choices in the rapidly changing distance education environment. Partnerships can serve them too.

WHAT IS LAAP SEEKING TO SUPPORT?

- **LAAP seeks to support "anytime anywhere" distance education that uses predominantly asynchronous technologies to reach students wherever they may be, whatever time of day**. In most cases, this means Internet course or program delivery, but it also means more than that. For example, in some cases, LAAP grants may allow students to customize their education or to proceed at their own pace, without being tied to conventional academic calendars. Often working adults need training delivered "just in time" to meet the needs of employers, for example. In order for this to occur, programs may need to be competency-based – so that there are alternatives to seat-time and credit hour measurements of student progress. Additionally, all LAAP projects should seek to improve the quality of asynchronous distance education, in most cases as measured by student learning and program completion.

- **LAAP seeks to fund strategic partnerships among colleges and universities, technology companies, groups of employers, professional associations, publishers, and any other relevant organizations**. One great strength of LAAP partnerships is that they can promote better cooperation across sectors – for example, between academia and industry – and thereby overcome the limitations of any one sector working alone. Another great strength of partnerships is that they can help institutions leverage resources and achieve complementarity of effort. On their own, postsecondary institutions may not have the faculty or resources to create and deliver first-rate online curricula. Through a LAAP-funded partnership, institutions can pool development resources; share courses, programs, or services; and market these programs to students over larger geographic areas to achieve economies of scale.

- **Though the configuration of partners may vary according to need, LAAP seeks partnerships that will implement "anytime anywhere" distance education on a regional or national scale.** Generally LAAP is not interested in the kinds of local partnerships that many postsecondary institutions undertake routinely to meet the needs of students in their traditional service regions. Rather, the goal of LAAP is to stimulate improvements in access, quality, and cost-efficiency made possible when partners with common interests – or who would otherwise even be competitive – join together in ambitious new combinations. Many LAAP partnerships operate statewide, in multiple states, or even nationally. In such cases, a postsecondary institution may serve its local students by delivering consortially developed curricula, by brokering externally delivered programs, or by providing technology support and student services.

INVITATIONAL PRIORITIES

LAAP invites proposals to support partnerships that deliver innovative "anytime anywhere" distance education on a national or regional scale. Specifically, LAAP seeks proposals that address one or more of the invitational priorities outlined below. However, the list is not exhaustive. Funded projects may also target other issues relevant to "anytime anywhere" distance education that are consistent with the program legislation.

CREATING ECONOMIES OF SCALE

One of the significant challenges facing "anytime anywhere" learning is cost. To be effective for most learners, "anytime anywhere" instruction must make it possible for students to learn *actively* -- to tackle problems and get feedback, for example. But "anytime anywhere" teaching materials that enable students to learn actively often have very high development costs. For instance, software programs that "tutor" students in science – posing problems, correcting students' solutions, suggesting appropriate review – have certainly been developed, and they have been shown very effective. But they are expensive to construct. To take a less obvious example, instruction delivered asynchronously over the Internet by real instructors can also involve upfront development costs for such things as careful course design and instructor training. Such investments may hold down the incremental costs of adding a group of students by making it possible to utilize lower-cost graduate students or peer instructors as teachers; nevertheless, the initial investments may be significant.

Plainly, then, given its high development costs, "anytime anywhere" instruction that allows for active learning becomes cost-effective only when development costs are amortized over many enrollments. However, there are a number of barriers to wide usage of technology-delivered instruction. Some of these barriers are practical – with courseware, for example, the lack of systems whereby faculty in one institution can locate and determine the usefulness of materials developed elsewhere, and the lack of systems for transferring income from users to developers. Others barriers are "cultural," stemming from the professorial tradition of developing distinctive syllabi and teaching materials.

Accordingly, the LAAP program invites applicants to find new ways of aggregating enrollments so that significant development costs are justified, and to find new ways for consortia to overcome the barriers that may inhibit faculty across institutions from working collectively. One recommended approach is for multiple institutions to share in the creation and delivery of a new program, and then to market it to students over wider geographic regions. By aggregating small enrollments across many areas, overall enrollments may become large enough to generate tuition revenues sufficient to support programs that would not otherwise be economically unfeasible.

DEVELOPING PORTABLE INTERACTIVE COURSEWARE

Most courseware developed within postsecondary institutions has been created by individuals or small groups of faculty and programmers. Although much of this courseware may be very good, it has generally been designed to supplement traditionally constructed courses or distance education and usually does not adhere to the principles of learning anytime anywhere. Such courseware is often an expensive "add-on," and if one were attempting to construct meaningful courses from the disparate products available, one would run into several problems: software that does not run on multiple platforms, constantly changing user interfaces, and sloppy documentation are a few examples. Because academic courseware has usually been created for local use, it has generally not been tested adequately for use in wider markets, sometimes for lack of adequate staffing and resources. However, private courseware developers have often been reluctant to enter the postsecondary education market, unsure of how to recoup large investments in a fragmented marketplace characterized by individual faculty who take pride in shaping the content of their own courses and therefore often resist products created by others.

In order to develop the high quality courseware necessary for fully interactive, "anytime anywhere" learning, private industry and academics need each other. Private industry can provide the discipline, cross-platform functionality, and attention to standards. Academics can provide the scholarly content and attention to pedagogy.

But large investments in courseware development will never be recouped unless the courseware can be implemented in ways that achieve scale. Consequently, LAAP invites partnerships in courseware development only if they address widespread faculty adoption at the same time. For example, a large consortium of institutions might partner with private developers, pool their faculty expertise to define learning modules that can be used in a variety of settings, and mutually agree upon a common, but flexible, plan to implement the courseware throughout the consortium. No such plan is likely to succeed without a respect for the faculty's right to shape and modify academic content; nor will it succeed, however, without channeling their energies into the goals decided upon by a collaborative team. Such projects should also be based upon clear, mutually agreed upon policies regarding intellectual property and ownership, and the distribution of revenues.

PACKAGING COURSES AND PROGRAMS

Because technology enables students to access courses from anywhere in the country, students may enroll in courses from multiple providers, and they may wish to assemble a complete education from these component parts. This will surely strain the existing mechanisms for credit transfer and articulation among postsecondary institutions, and it will pose some issues about the meaning of credentialing too. The problem with assembling offerings from multiple providers is three-fold. First is the question of what is included in a course and whether an institution will have assurances both of its content and of its fit with other offerings. Second is the question of control over the shape of a program. Students may in many ways be served by a broader menu of choices, but will they select a coherent collection? Finally, what is the meaning of a credential? Who grants the credential, and who determines how it will be comprised?

Institutions will also have the motivation to become better "packagers" of courses, both to accommodate student demand and to remain competitive with other providers. But there is much to be gained by institutions cooperating with one another. A state system, virtual university, or consortium might benefit from directly sharing courses, and in the process, reduce duplication of efforts and expand student options. Cooperation might allow for individual institutions to specialize in their strengths and draw upon the strengths of others instead of thinly distributing resources into too many areas.

For these kinds of efficiencies to be achieved, groups of partnering institutions might need to develop new mechanisms for cataloging and describing courses, for mutual credit recognition, or even for jointly offering credentials. They might need to establish financial models for sharing the costs of curriculum development, teaching, and using computer networks, and they might need to establish mechanisms for sharing tuition and other revenues. Or, they might need to explore alternatives to traditional residency or degree requirements or to work together to redefine general education. LAAP invites proposals to address all of these issues.

USING COMPETENCIES TO MEASURE STUDENT PROGRESS

In many instances, the concept of "anytime anywhere" learning implies some other method of testing learning outcomes. Students may, for example, wish to learn at their own pace, starting when they want, taking the necessary time they need to master the material, and achieving certification of learning when they are ready to do so. If seat time and credit hours are no longer applicable, then how otherwise do you measure student progress and achievement? Rather than taking for granted that learning is a function of time spent in the classroom, competencies can provide guarantees that students are mastering the course material they need. For working adults seeking just-in-time job training, competency-based learning is an ideal way to identify what they need to learn, to help them focus on what they do not yet know, and to prove to employers what they have achieved. Certification of competencies may, in some circumstances, offer employers better assurances of job readiness than a traditional credential.

Competencies can serve other functions as well. They can provide outlines for courseware and curriculum developers to use in creating "anytime anywhere" materials. Or, if courses are mapped to specific learning competencies, institutions can better analyze transcripts, make judgments about credit transfer, or advise students seeking enrollment information. As a result, competencies are useful for matching courses with students, and for ensuring that different courses will complement each other. Finally, competencies might be used as a way to ensure that students who have prior experience or training can enroll in certificate or degree programs without duplicating prior learning. Consequently, LAAP partnerships may find that competency-based education can be used to address many of the barriers to "anytime anywhere" learning.

IMPROVING QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

One of the greatest challenges facing the practice of learning anytime anywhere is quality assurance and accountability. American higher education has a longstanding tradition of quality assurance based on voluntary peer review of institutions and programs through accreditation. Many of the criteria used to assure the quality of higher education are based upon traditional course delivery and teaching at institutions. The challenges are many. How do we assure the quality of programs and courses that start outside of the context of the traditional academic calendar or that are offered across state and regional borders? How do we measure quality without the traditional parameters of seat time and credit hours to help us? How do we measure progress and certify achievement when students are engaged in "anytime anywhere" learning?

The LAAP program encourages the development of new ways to think about assessment, quality assurance, and accountability. Partnerships are encouraged to engage educational providers, professional associations, and the accreditation community to rethink the issue of quality assurance and accountability to ensure that credentials are meaningful, that educational providers are accountable, and that educational courses meet at least the same high standards demanded of traditional means of delivering education.

CREATING NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR UNDERSERVED LEARNERS

LAAP seeks to expand access for any learners seeking postsecondary education or career-oriented lifelong learning, or who can benefit from the removal of time and place constraints. But LAAP is especially interested in proposals specifically targeting one or more of the following groups of learners who have not always been well served by either traditional campus-based education or common forms of distance education, including:

- individuals with disabilities
- individuals who have lost their jobs
- individuals making the transition from welfare to the workforce
- individuals seeking basic or technical skills
- individuals seeking their first postsecondary education experience

In the past, some distance education has worked successfully with independent, experienced, and self-motivated leaners, but LAAP is interested in exploring what it takes for individuals with other characteristics to succeed as well. Do the same basic lessons and assumptions hold true?
New enrollment opportunities are meaningful only if students have a reasonable chance to complete their postsecondary degree, certificate, or job training programs.

Very likely, many of these underserved student populations will need personal attention, counseling, and other kinds of support in order to succeed. Remember, learning anytime and anywhere does not have to mean that students are learning in isolation. Rather, there may be innovative ways to connect students with other learners – and perhaps even with working professionals, community leaders, or others who might facilitate learning. LAAP encourages applicants to choose carefully the pedagogical and support strategies that will best promote retention.

IMPLEMENTING COMPREHENSIVE ONLINE SUPPORT SERVICES

All students should have access to the support services they need to be successful. One of the disadvantages of enrolling in distance education is that you are often removed from access to many of the support services that traditional campus-based students take for granted. If your courses are available anytime and anywhere, will you likewise have "anytime anywhere" access to registration, advising, financial aid, counseling, assessment, study skills, libraries, and other services? Advising is critically important, for instance, when individual students may be drawing courses from multiple providers.

Many institutions and commercial providers are recognizing the problem and beginning to develop systems to address these needs. But a recent survey of over one thousand institutions conducted by the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications suggests that very few comprehensive models for the delivery of support services exist, and that institutions will likely have to undergo a rather significant cultural shift to reform the way support services are administered. One important problem is the structural segregation on most campuses of many support service functions. What is needed are systems in which students can do one-stop-shopping for assistance with a variety of needs. Some information or routine transactions might be handled electronically, but this will require integrated data systems. Other services might be dependent upon interactions with staff, who may need new training to address the full variety of student needs.

Consortial partnerships to deliver courses or degree programs may face particular challenges with regard to some of these problems – especially if data exchange between institutions is necessary. <u>But all LAAP-funded projects should make the provision of quality support services a top priority</u>. Partnerships between postsecondary institutions and commercial providers who are working on these problems may lead to efficient ways of coordinating systems, sharing already developed products, and expanding student access to services.

REDUCING POLICY BARRIERS

Frequently, "anytime anywhere" learning may be difficult to implement because of restrictive institutional, system, state or other policies which were developed in the context of more conventional modes of instructional delivery and institutional practices. For example, within a state college system, the pooling of faculty and sharing of courses and programs might be inhibited by funding allocations or staffing levels based upon student enrollments. In this situation, the individual colleges may be motivated to duplicate offerings and compete with one another for students. Any attempt to share courses or faculty may require the creation of new mechanisms for sharing instructional costs, distributing tuition revenue, and the like.

As another example, a college attempting completely self-paced, open entry/exit, and competency-based degree programs may find that it needs tremendous flexibility in matching students to faculty. But implementation of such a program might be obstructed by a collective bargaining agreement ensuring that faculty be assigned to a specific number of course units and students per course. In this case, a good idea may have to be abandoned or compromised because policy assumes conventional seat time and credit hours.

LAAP therefore encourages all applicants to address explicitly all relevant policy issues that arise among partners, revising policy when it is outmoded or outdated and creating new policy to reflect new challenges. However, LAAP also invites applications specifically targeting the restrictive distance education policy of college or university systems, states, regions, consortia, or any other relevant group of partners. Such efforts should aim to go beyond merely local reform and pave the way for the creation of new "anytime anywhere" distance education programs that are scalable and nationally or regionally implemented.

SOME ADVICE ON FORMING PARTNERSHIPS

In most cases, LAAP partnerships will be expected to work collectively toward several goals: first, to become self-sustaining; second, to grow to reach increasingly large numbers of students and perhaps take on additional partners; and, finally, to create products or model practices that will be adopted in other settings. If your partnership is to reach these goals, you must plan from the outset, starting with the commitments you make to each other. It is especially important that you clearly define the roles and expectations for each project partner. You should formalize your promises to each other up front, especially regarding cost sharing commitments and such thorny issues as intellectual property rights or revenue sharing. In some cases, it may be necessary for you to explicitly address policy issues. Additionally, it is recommended that you think carefully about how you will build a staff and budgetary infrastructure to sustain the project, including mechanisms for ongoing communication and operations.

EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE PARTNERSHIPS

The most interesting partnerships should be formed on the basis of a clearly stated added value of a linkage of two or more organizations. In other words, the goal of the partnership should be to create new opportunities, educational or otherwise, not possible from institutions or organizations acting on their own.

Of course, there are many possible partnerships that fit the LAAP guidelines. We have listed below a few illustrations of the types of partnerships that aim to achieve a strategic purpose, solve a particular problem, or overcome barriers to achieving successful learning anytime anywhere. These examples are by no means exhaustive and do not represent a preference for funding by FIPSE:

- Partnerships among state systems of higher education, private college consortia, regional educational consortia, accrediting agencies, professional or industrial associations, or regional or national telecommunications networks in order to join those with allied interests, coordinate efforts, reduce duplication, and leverage resources. Such partnerships can promote the sharing of courses or programs, encourage course and credit transfer, and promote economies of scale in program development and delivery.

- Partnerships among postsecondary education institutions and consortia of employers in a particular industry to define workplace competencies. The partnership might then be enlarged to include software companies who can aid in the collaborative development of modular interactive courseware that could be used in the delivery of a competency-based "anytime anywhere" training program suited to employer needs.

- Partnerships among educational providers, software developers, professional associations, and/or publishing companies to create larger markets for the development of quality interactive courseware that is responsive to a national educational demand. Educational providers, software companies, and publishing companies may wish to team up with professional associations in the field of health care, for example, to produce programs that meet the needs and the market demands of their constituents.

- Partnerships among educational providers, state agencies, professional associations and accrediting organizations to explore new ways of assuring educational quality and certifying student attainment that is accepted by academic, professional, and business communities.

- Partnerships among state higher education systems, member colleges, and state governments – or among other kinds of regional or national consortia of colleges and universities – to revise institutional, system, or other policies that inhibit the delivery of “anytime anywhere” learning. For example, state funding allocations based upon student enrollment may be a disincentive for colleges to pool courses into shared degree programs.

To see specific examples of partnerships funded in the FY 1999 and 2000 competitions, visit the LAAP website at:

http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE/LAAP

GUIDE TO PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT

This section is intended to help you develop and write a stronger proposal by making you aware of the ways it will be reviewed and assessed.[1] The LAAP program, by virtue of its emphasis on partnerships and the development of innovative programs of national and regional significance, has a very broad perspective. Proposals can focus on a variety of issues and strategies involving the innovative application of distance learning technology and practices.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

In order to effectively evaluate a large number of proposals addressing a variety of technology-based education strategies, the LAAP program? s review process consists of two stages: the preliminary proposal (a seven page, double-spaced narrative with a summary budget) and the final proposal (a twenty-five page, double-spaced narrative with a detailed budget and budget narrative).

The review schedule will be as follows. Preliminary proposals will be due March 15, 2001. By April 25, the preliminary proposal review will be completed and a smaller number of applicants will be invited to submit a final proposal. Final proposals will be due June 15, 2001. It is anticipated that awards will be announced by the end of July 2001.

PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS

Preliminary proposals are first examined by a group of external reviewers, identified and selected each year from among national experts in the area of distance learning and technology-based education (faculty, administrators, business and industry experts, or other distance learning professionals across the country). Preliminary proposals are also examined by an internal staff reviewer. A new group of readers will be selected each year.

Your preliminary proposal should give external reviewers and staff a concrete understanding of the problem your partnership is addressing and the solutions and strategies it proposes, including a brief description of how you will evaluate the results. As noted above, it should be clear how your project strategy differs from and improves upon current practice at the partner institutions, and as compared to educational practice across the country.

It is important to write the proposal narrative in clear, direct language, avoiding jargon, cliches, and acronyms whenever possible. *Given the volume of submissions, the preliminary proposal narrative must be limited to seven double-spaced pages, or approximately 1,750 words*. We recommend that no resumes or appendices be submitted at this stage.

FINAL PROPOSALS

[1] This program information is intended to aid applicants in applying for assistance under this competition. Nothing in this application package is intended to impose any paperwork, application content, reporting, or grantee performance requirement beyond those specifically imposed under the statute and regulations governing the competition.

If you are invited to submit a final proposal, a FIPSE program officer will discuss with you by telephone both the external readers' and the staff? s reviews of your preliminary proposal and will remain available to answer questions and offer suggestions to assist you in strengthening the final proposal.

Final proposals will be read carefully by two outside reviewers and one internal staff reviewer, and these reviewers will meet for a panel discussion of the proposal. Additionally, project directors of the most competitive proposals may be telephoned to clarify information about their projects. Staff may also contact others who know the applicant? s work and plans or who will be affected by the project.

Again at the final proposal stage, it is important to present your ideas in clear language that will help readers to understand precisely what you intend to do and how you will do it. *Your final proposal narrative should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, or approximately 7,500 words.*

To ensure that all applicants enjoy the same opportunity to present their ideas, please conform to the page limitations noted above, maintain 1" margins, and avoid font sizes smaller than 11 point.

SELECTION CRITERIA

Our intent in this section is to identify the selection criteria and help applicants understand how they will be applied during the preliminary and final review processes. Earlier in these guidelines, we have identified a number of ways American students may be assisted in learning anytime anywhere. Note, however, that the LAAP review does not separate proposals rigidly by types of activities, sectors of postsecondary education, or other discrete categories, nor does it assign specific amounts of its budget to specific types of activities. Instead, each proposal competes with all others, using the criteria identified below.

Preliminary proposals and final proposals will be judged on the basis of criteria selected from the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). Preliminary proposals will be judged on the basis of four selection criteria: the need for the project, the significance of the proposed project, the quality of the design of the proposed project, and the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. Final proposals will be judged on the basis of these four criteria as well as on the basis of three additional ones: the quality of the management plan, the quality of the personnel for the proposed project, and the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.

Each selection criterion is presented in bold type below and followed by a discussion of how it applies to the competition. The external and staff readers of your proposal use these criteria to guide their reviews at both stages of the LAAP competition, so it is in your interest to be familiar with them. Final proposals provide much more detail and description. The final decision on a proposal is based on an overall assessment of the extent to which it satisfactorily addresses all of the selection criteria, weighted equally.

Preliminary proposals will be considered according to the following criteria, weighted equally:

1) The need for the project, as determined by the following factors:

a) the magnitude or severity of the problem addressed by the project; and

b) the magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the project.

You should specifically describe the nature and magnitude of the issue or problem you wish to address, in the context of each individual partner, the entire partnership, and the scope and scale you wish to reach nationwide. These guidelines have identified areas of emphasis. You may choose to address more than one topic in a single project.

How central is the problem you have identified to the future of postsecondary education? What will be the consequences of a successful completion of the project? How will others benefit or learn from your experience?

Note that the intent of the LAAP program is not to support basic research; rather, its focus is on establishing viable partnerships to develop, test, and foster new approaches to learning anytime anywhere.

2) <u>The significance of the project</u>, as determined by the following factors:

a) the national significance of the proposed project;

b) the extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies; and

c) the importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

You should describe the nature and scope of the proposed project, the key elements and reasons for the proposed partnership, and the national context of the outcomes. What strategies are being employed? How central is the program to the vitality or the effectiveness of developing learning anytime anywhere? How important is the partnership to the success of the program? What will be the national or regional consequences of a successful completion of your project? How are other educational providers likely to benefit or learn from your experience in ways that would enable them to provide learning anytime anywhere?

Reviewers will appreciate any evidence you can include to illustrate how your project differs from and improves upon previous efforts. Describe the potential contribution of your project to increasing the postsecondary community? s knowledge about distance learning and technology-based education, and the likely utility of the products and processes that will result from it. It is the applicant's responsibility to set a context within which reviewers can assess the project's importance to establishing the appropriate national context for learning anytime anywhere.

3) <u>The quality of the project's design</u>, as determined by the extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Your narrative should offer reviewers a clear description of the roles to be played by each of the partners, who will do what, when, and where, to what ends, and with what anticipated results. Your strategies should be carefully designed to address the central causes of the problem you are addressing, based on your own research and experience, and based on previous experiments by others. Scattershot approaches to vaguely-defined problems make poor prospects for funding. The project's goals and objectives should be clearly identified and measurable.

4) <u>The quality of the project evaluation</u>, as determined by the extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Evaluation should be an important part of your project planning, and your preliminary proposal should include a brief description of how you intend to document the activities and results of your project. In the final proposal, we ask for a specific section on evaluation in which you state your objectives clearly and present the details of your evaluation design.

<u>Final proposals will be considered according to the following criteria, weighted equally:</u>

1) <u>The need for the project</u>, as determined by the following factors:

a) the magnitude or severity of the problem addressed by the project; and

b) the magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the project.

You should specifically describe the nature and magnitude of the issue or problem you wish to address, in the context of each individual partner, the entire partnership, and the national scope you wish to reach. These guidelines have identified areas of emphasis. You may choose to address more than one topic in a single project.

How central is the problem you have identified to the future of postsecondary education? What will be the consequences of a successful completion of the project? How will others benefit or learn from your experience?

Note that the intent of the LAAP program is not to support basic research; rather, its focus is on establishing viable partnerships to develop, test, and foster new approaches to learning anytime anywhere.

2) <u>The significance of the project</u>, as determined by the following factors:

a) the national significance of the proposed project;

b) the extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to existing strategies; and

c) the importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

You should describe the nature and scope of the proposed project, the key elements and reasons for the proposed partnership, and the national context of the outcomes. What strategies are being employed? How central is the program to the vitality or the effectiveness of developing learning anytime anywhere? How important is the partnership to the success of the program? What will be the national or regional consequences of a successful completion of your project? How are other educational providers likely to benefit or learn from your experience in ways that would enable them to provide learning anytime anywhere?

Reviewers will appreciate any evidence you can include to illustrate how your project differs from and improves upon previous efforts. Describe the potential contribution of your project to increasing the postsecondary community? s knowledge about distance learning and technology-based education, and the likely utility of the products and processes that will result from it. It is the applicant's responsibility to set a context within which reviewers can assess the project's national importance.

3) <u>The quality of the project's design</u>, as determined by:

a) the extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs; and

b) the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Your narrative should offer reviewers a clear description of the role of each of the partners: who will do what, when, and where, to what ends, and with what anticipated results? Your strategies should be carefully designed to address the central causes of the problem targeted by your project, based on your own research and experience, and based on previous experiments by others. Scattershot approaches to vaguely-defined problems make poor prospects for funding. The project's goals and objectives should be clearly identified and measurable.

An important element of your design is the level of commitment from all of the partners. Partners should not be selected only because of name recognition or size. Partners should be selected for their demonstrated level of interest in being part of the project as well as for providing evidence for making a substantial commitment to the success of the project.

Commitment includes strong support from the highest levels of administration, and is marked by adequate staff resources and financial contributions to successfully meet the goals of the project. It also includes the participation by all of the partners as active players devoting both the time and resources to implement the innovation and providing the sustained involvement of management, administrators, faculty, and staff within the partnership.

All proposed projects should plan for disseminating their findings and scaling up their activities. Reviewers will be seeking evidence that your project will eventually advance beyond pilot testing to reach significant numbers of students and become economically sustainable. Also, reviewers will be interested in your plans to inform others of your project results and your strategies to encourage adaptation or replication of model practices or products. In reviewing plans for dissemination and scale up, we ask whether the methods proposed are appropriate for the project in question and whether they improve upon methods used elsewhere.

4) <u>The quality of the project evaluation</u>, as determined by the following factors:

a) the extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project; and

b) the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

Formative evaluation can help you manage your project more effectively, and a strong summative evaluation, especially if it documents the project's effects on learning outcomes, can turn a successful project into a national model for improvement in postsecondary education. As you develop your evaluation plan, place yourself in the position of the recipient of your final evaluation report. What would count as solid quantitative and qualitative evidence that your project had succeeded or failed to achieve its goals? It may be difficult, within the term of the grant, to assess accomplishment of long-range objectives, but you should be able to identify some short-term indicators. Bear in mind that the goals of project sustainability and national impact may well elude you unless you can provide solid evidence that your project is achieving its aims. *Developing such evidence should not be put off until the last stages of a project. It must be a consideration from the design stage onward.*

FIPSE provides a short bibliography of books and articles on program evaluation to assist you with evaluation design. These references clarify formative and summative evaluation. They address evidence, measurement, and sampling questions, and discuss the immediate and long- range outcomes you can expect, based on your project objectives. This bibliography is available on the FIPSE/LAAP website, or by telephone or mail request to the FIPSE office.

<u>5) The quality of the management plan</u>, as determined by the plan? s adequacy to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and with budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Charts and timetables are particularly helpful in describing the structure of your project and the procedures for conducting it to a successful conclusion. Objectives, actors, events, beneficiaries, and anticipated results should be clearly spelled out.

6) <u>The quality of project personnel</u>, as determined by:

a) the qualifications, including training and experience, of key project personnel; and

b) the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

The qualifications of key personnel, including the project director and any consultants or subcontractors, should be briefly outlined in an appendix to the final proposal. Please note that a standard curriculum vitae is usually not appropriate for this purpose. What is needed is a short form resume and a brief narrative summary of each individual's background, with a special focus on those experiences related to the topic of your proposal.

7) <u>The adequacy of resources for the proposed project</u>, as determined by the following factors:

a) the extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project;

b) the extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project;

c) the demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;

d) the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the applicant organization; and

e) the potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

It should be clear that you have carefully allocated appropriate resources and personnel for the tasks and activities described in your proposal. Even at the preliminary proposal stage, it is in the applicant? s best interest to prepare an estimated budget carefully. There is no point in jeopardizing the success of the project through insufficient allocation of funds; nor is it helpful to overestimate its costs to the partnership or to LAAP. A detailed budget justification attached to your final proposal should itemize the support you request from LAAP and those resources you expect to obtain from other sources. Remember that LAAP will provide not more than fifty percent of the total cost of a LAAP project. LAAP cannot purchase facilities or support construction and it rarely supports equipment purchase or student financial aid, but these costs may be included in your institutional contribution to the project.

Because LAAP partnerships should promote economies of scale in program development and delivery and because LAAP believes cost-effectiveness increases the likelihood that successful efforts will be continued beyond the period of the grant, and be replicated by others, budgets will be carefully scrutinized. But cost-effectiveness should not imply insufficient resources to accomplish the project? s goals and objectives. Costs should be allocated, and will be judged, in comparison to the scope of the project and its anticipated benefits.

It is important to provide evidence that the plans you propose have the support of those who will authorize them, those who will carry them out, and those who will be affected by them. At the preliminary proposal stage, it is enough to note such support in your narrative. Final proposals should include, in an appendix, letters of commitment and support from senior administrators of members of the partnership, and, if desired, national experts on the issues addressed in the proposal. Applicants are advised that the quality of letters of support is important, not their quantity.

The lead applicant and all partners must support the project both philosophically and financially. LAAP funds cannot cover more than fifty percent of total project costs (i.e. there must be at least a one to one match). We expect applicants to share indirect as well as direct costs. We do not specify a particular indirect cost rate. As a reference point, FIPSE/LAAP staff generally use the U.S. Department of Education training rate of eight percent of total direct costs as a basis for judgments about reasonable indirect costs.

LAAP grants will generally be used to support the start-up of new programs or activities that are intended to continue after the grant ends. Your final proposal should have a clear and continuing plan for long-term continuation of your project that includes explicit commitments from those who will be responsible for sustaining the activity.

SELECTION OF PROPOSALS

The order in which the proposals will be ranked for selection will be determined by the evaluation of their quality according to the selection criteria. Final decisions for funding will be made by:

- the information in each application;
- the rank ordering of the applications; and
- any other information relevant to a criterion, priority, or other requirement that applies to the selection of applications for new grants, including information concerning the applicant? s use of funds under a previous award under the same Federal program.

SUBMITTING YOUR PROPOSAL

The LAAP program has a two-stage submission and review process. To be eligible to submit a final proposal and to qualify for funding consideration, all applicants must submit a preliminary proposal on or before March 15, 2001.

By April 25, 2001, all preliminary proposals will be reviewed, and FIPSE will mail notifications to applicants invited to submit final proposals. Final proposals must be submitted on or before June 15, 2001.

The announced closing dates and procedures for guaranteeing timely submission will be strictly observed.

Applicants should also note that the closing date applies to both the date the proposal is mailed and the hand delivery date. A mailed application meets the requirements if it is mailed on or before the pertinent closing date and the required proof of mailing is provided. Proof of mailing may consist of one of the following: (a) a legible dated U.S. Postal Service postmark; (b) a legible receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service; (c) a dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier, or (d) any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary of Education.

If an application is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary will not accept either of the following as proof of mailing: (1) a private metered postmark, or (2) a mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service. Please use first class mail. All applicants will receive acknowledgment notices upon receipts of preliminary proposals and final proposals. If you do not receive an acknowledgment notice within six weeks of the closing date, please contact FIPSE using the address or phone number in the introduction to these guidelines. Please wait the full six weeks before contacting us for an acknowledgment.

MAILING ADDRESS FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PROPOSALS

LAAP PROGRAM
ATTN: 84. 339A
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APPLICATION CONTROL CENTER
ROOM 3633
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-4725

SUBMISSION PROCEDURES FOR PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS

Mailed Proposals: Proposals sent by mail must be postmarked no later than March 15, 2001. First class mail should be used. Use the above address.

Hand Delivered Proposals: Preliminary proposals will be accepted daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Washington, D.C. time except Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays, at the Application Control Center, General Services Administration Building, 7th & D Streets, SW, Washington, D.C. Preliminary proposals will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on March 15, 2001.

Number of Copies: All applicants must submit one (1) signed original and two (2) complete copies of the preliminary proposal. Each copy must be covered with Title Page, ED 40-504 (included with these guidelines) or a reasonable facsimile. *Applicants are also requested to submit three (3) additional copies of the Title page itself.*

Content: Preliminary proposals should be written clearly and concisely, and should include the following:

> **Title Page**: Use Form ED 40-736 or a suitable facsimile to cover each copy of the proposal. At the preliminary stage, you need not complete items 1 and 2. Be sure your proposal abstract (item 8) is clear and concrete, as it will be used at several points in the review. See the instructions on the back of the enclosed title page for additional information. Please list every member of the partnership in item 4.

Narrative: It should consist of *no more than seven double-spaced, numbered pages with standard 1" margins, or approximately 1,750 words, and in a font size no smaller than 11 point.* Please review the selection criteria in the *Guide to Proposal Development* above. Although no standard outline is required, you should:

- briefly describe the partnership, the problem you intend to address, and the objectives of your project;
- state how your partnership addresses the problem;
- explain how your partnership would improve upon present practice in distance and technology-based education nationally; and
- state how you plan to evaluate whether you have achieved your goals.

Budget: No detailed breakdowns or justifications are required at the preliminary stage, but you should carefully estimate major expenditures in each of the categories indicated on the enclosed budget page. Proposals that request equipment funds, student financial assistance monies, or high indirect costs are rarely competitive. LAAP cannot support construction costs, nor can it purchase facilities. Applicants must share at least fifty (50) percent of total LAAP project costs (i.e., a one to one match).   On the bottom of the enclosed budget page, please total the estimated cost share provided by all of the project partners.

Partner Identification Forms: You should include a lead partner identification form for the lead applicant/fiscal agent and one partner form for each of the other project partners. These partner forms should include a careful estimate by category of the cost share provided by each respective partner. However, at the preliminary proposal stage, no detailed breakdown of these cost share categories is necessary.

Appendices: We generally recommend that no appendices be included with preliminary proposals; however, it is occasionally essential to include a small amount (one or two pages) of information about the partners, problem, or strategy as an appendix. Unless this appendix is short, it will not be included in the review process. Please do not submit resumes at this stage.

Upon receiving your preliminary proposal the Application Control Center will mail you an acknowledgment that will include the reference number (PR/Award Number) that has been assigned to your proposal. It will begin with P339A01, followed by a four-digit number. *Always mention the complete PR/Award number in your communications with FIPSE/LAAP.*

SUBMISSION PROCEDURES FOR FINAL PROPOSALS

Mailed Proposals: Final proposals sent by mail must be postmarked no later than June 15, 2001.

Hand Delivered Proposals: Hand delivered final proposals will be accepted daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Washington, D.C. time except Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays, at the Application Control Center, 7th & D Streets, SW, Room 3633, General Services Administration Building, Washington, D.C.   Final proposals will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on June 15, 2001.

Number of Copies: All applicants must submit *one (1) signed original and two (2) complete copies* of the final proposal. Each proposal copy must be covered with a Title Page, Form ED-40-514, or a reasonable facsimile. *Applicants are also requested to submit three (3) additional copies of the Title Page itself.*

Content: Proposals should be concise and clearly written, and should include the following:

Title Page: Use Form ED 40-736 or a suitable facsimile to cover each proposal copy. Please include a brief abstract of your project in the space provided. Additional instructions are printed on the reverse side of the Title Page. Please list all members of the partnership in item 4.

Abstract: Attach a one-page double-spaced abstract following the Title Page (this is in addition to the abstract requested on the Title Page itself). The abstract should identify the problem or opportunity being addressed, the proposed project activities, and their intended outcomes. It should also include a concise summary of what is innovative about the project.

Proposal Narrative: Please review the Selection Criteria described in these guidelines. While FIPSE does not prescribe a standard outline for all applicants, *in no more than 25 double-spaced, numbered page with standard 1" margins,, or approximately 7,500 words, and in a font size no small than 11 point*, you should: (1) identify the issue or problem you are addressing and the project? s objectives; (2) describe the proposed strategies and how they improve existing practice; (3) describe your partnership? s capacity and commitment to the project; (4) indicate the name of the institution or organization who will be the partnership? s lead fiscal agent and what role this lead organization will play in relation to the other partners; and (5) discuss your plans for evaluation and dissemination. If someone other than the named project director was the principal writer of the proposal, please include his or her name, title and affiliation at the end of the narrative.

Budget Form: The top of the budget form should include the total requested funds in each of the categories indicated. On the bottom of the form, please identify the total cost share committed by all of the project partners, again using the categories indicated on the budget form.

Partner Identification Forms: You should include a lead partner identification form for the lead applicant/fiscal agent and one partner form for each of the other project partners. On each partner form, you should identify the total cost sharing commitment from that partner, using the budget categories indicated.

Budget Narrative: For <u>both</u> the budget request and the cost share, you should include a detailed spreadsheet breaking down and itemizing the categories represented on the budget form and partner forms. And there should be an accompanying budget narrative that explains how you calculated costs for each item and how these costs relate to project activities. Remember, the non-federal support for the project must total 50 percent of the total project costs – i.e., the partners collectively must match the amount requested from LAAP dollar for dollar.

Appendices: Please provide a brief summary of the background and experience of key project staff as they relate to the specific project activities you are proposing. Letters of support and commitment from appropriate officials at the sponsoring partnership and project partners are also necessary. Do not attach any other appendices or information unless they are directly relevant to your project. Appendices must be attached to all copies of the final proposal to be included in the review.

Assurances and Certifications: When your partnership representative signs the Title Page and Certifications form, the partnership certifies that it will comply with the assurances and certifications contained in these guidelines.

Additional Requirements (see below): The final proposal contents should also include some additional materials indicating compliance with federal regulations. These requirements are explained below.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

If you are invited to submit a final proposal, you will receive additional instructions about complying with the following regulations when submitting your application.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS (EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372)

This competition is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, and the regulations in 34 CFR 79. The objective is to foster a Federal and State intergovernmental coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance. Applicants are directed to the appropriate State single point of contact to comply with the State's procedures under this Executive Order. A list of these contacts is available at:

http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html

If you are invited to submit a final proposal, you receive further directions later about submitting a copy of your proposal to the appropriate contact in your State.

THE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT (GPRA)

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 is a straightforward statute that requires all Federal agencies to manage their activities with attention to the consequences of those activities. Each agency is to clearly state what intends to accomplish, identify the resources required, and periodically report their progress to the Congress. In doing so, it is expected that GPRA will contribute to improvements in accountability for the expenditures of public funds, improve Congressional decision-making through more objective information on the effectiveness of Federal programs, and promote a new government focus on results, service delivery, and customer satisfaction. If you are invited to submit a final proposal, we will provide you a list of the performance indicators that have been developed for the LAAP program (they will also be posted on the LAAP website), and, if funded, you will be asked to collect and report data from your project on these indicators.

SECTION 427 OF GEPA

Section 427 of the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity.

If you are invited to submit a final proposal, you will be required to provide a description of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers. It need not be lengthy, and you need only to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH

The Department of Education's regulations for the protection of human subjects, 34 CFR, Part 97, require that each institution engaged in the conduct of covered research activities have an approved Assurance of Compliance on file and provide Certification that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) designated in the Assurance has reviewed and approved the proposed research activities before they are initiated. If you are invited to submit a final proposal, you will be asked to provide assurances of compliance or information about your exemptions from applicable regulations. Further information about the U.S. Department of Education's Protection of Human Subjects in Research may be found on the web at:

http://ocfo.ed.gov/humansub.htm

Y2K REQUIREMENTS

Y2K and Accessibility for the Disabled: Systems that are being purchased, upgraded or modified to meet Y2K requirements must also be accessible to people with disabilities in order to meet existing obligations under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. Grantees may also be covered by the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 or the Technology Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988. The Department of Education has a set of requirements for Accessible Software Design and other resources that can be used to evaluate system accessibility. Accessibility needs to be a deciding factor whenever systems improvements are being made; the pressure of remediating the Y2K problem should not lead grantees to neglect this requirement.

Additional Y2K Information: The General Services Administration's Office of Information Technology maintains an Internet site http://www.itpolicy.gsa.gov which includes valuable information on Y2K requirements. Check under the heading "Year 2000 Directories." The Education Department's Requirements for Accessible Software Design are at:

http://ofco.ed.gov/coninfo/clibrary/software.htm

You may also want to visit the Department's Y2K web site at:

http://www.ed.gov/y2k

PAPERWORK BURDEN STATEMENT

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1840-0736. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 15 hours for the preliminary proposal and 30 hours for the final proposal per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: Patrick J. Sherrill, U.S. Department of Education, ROB-3, Room 5624, 7th and D Streets S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: LAAP Coordinator, FIPSE, 8th floor, 1990 K St NW, Washington, DC 20006-8544.

Form No.: ED 40-736
OMB NO.: 1840-0736
Form Expires: 5/31/2002

LEARNING ANYTIME ANYWHERE PARTNERSHIPS (LAAP)
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

TITLE PAGE

This Application should be sent to:
No. 84.339
U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Room 3633
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725

1. Application Number:

2. D-U-N-S Number:

3. Tax Identification Number:

4. Project Director (Name and Complete Mailing Address):

Telephone:________________________________
Fax:____________________________________
E-mail:

5. List of Partners:

6. Federal Funds Requested:

1st Year only:

2nd Year (if applicable):
3rd Year (if applicable):

4th Year (if applicable):

Total Amount:

7. Total Cost Share Provided:

8. Duration of Project:

Starting Date:

Ending Date:

Total No. of Months:

9. Proposal Title:

10. Brief Abstract of Proposal (DO NOT LEAVE THIS BLANK):

11. Legal Applicant (Name & Complete Mailing Address):

12. (Final Proposals only) Are there any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project period?

_______Yes

_______No

If yes, then please follow the instructions on following page.

13. Certification by Authorizing Official:

The applicant certifies to the best of his/her knowledge and belief that the data in this application are true and correct, that the filing of the application has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant, and that the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if assistance is approved.

Print Name

Title

Phone

Signature

Date

Instructions for Completing Title Page (Form ED 40-736)

Specific Instructions

Please Note: Complete Items 1,2, and the Congressional District in Item 10 only at the final proposal stage. However, do complete the rest of Item 10 at the preliminary proposal stage.

Item 1. Application Number: Enter the Proposal Reference Number assigned to your preliminary proposal.

Item 2. D-U-N-S Number: Beginning in FY 1998, the 9-digit D-U-N-S Number replaced the 12-digit Employer Identification Number (EIN) used in previous years. The D-U-N-S Number is assigned to organizations by Dun & Bradstreet. If you do not know your D-U-N-S Number, call the toll-free telephone number maintained by Dun & Bradstreet: 800-333-0505 (Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m. Eastern time).

Item 3: Tax Identification Number (TIN): Enter the tax identification number as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.

Item 4. Project Director: Enter the name and complete mailing address of the designated Project Director. If no one has been selected, so indicate and enter the name of the person who can be contacted to discuss the programmatic aspects of the project. NOTE: Name and address listed here will be used to mail proposal status notifications. Do not forget to include the telephone number. Both this address and the Legal Applicant address (Item 9) should be fully completed.

Item 5. Institutional Information: List each participating member of the partnership.

Item 6. Federal Funds Requested: Enter the amount of Federal funds being requested from FIPSE in the first year of the project. If applicable, enter the amount requested for subsequent years of funding. Under ?total? enter the cumulative amount requested for the life of the project.

Item 7. Total Cost Share Provided: Enter the total amount of matching funds for the duration of project (must equal at least 50% of the total cost of the project).

Item 8. Duration of Project: Enter the beginning date of the project (no earlier than September 1, 2001). Enter the ending date and the total number of months covered.

Item 9. Proposal Title: Self-explanatory.

Item 10. Brief Abstract of Proposal: Complete for both preliminary and final proposals. This should be concise and confined to the space provided, but in no case should you leave this space blank. For final proposals, also see instructions under ?submission procedures? requesting a separate one-page abstract.

Item 11. Legal Applicant: Enter the name and complete mailing address of the non-profit institution or organization which will serve as the legal applicant (fiscal agent). When more than one institution or agency is involved, enter the name of the one which will be responsible for budget control. Official notifications of grant awards are sent to this address. Remember to complete this section fully.

Item 12. Human Subjects. (Final Proposals Only) Check "Yes" **or** "No" If research activities involving human subjects are not planned at any time during the proposed project period, check "No." If research activities involving human subjects, whether or not exempt from Federal regulations for the protection of human subjects, **are** planned **at any time** during the proposed project period, either at the applicant organization or at any other performance site or collaborating institution, check **"Yes"** and complete the following:

a. If "Yes," Exemption (s)#: ______________________ OR b. Assurance of Compliance #: ______________________

c. IRB approval date: ______________________ _______ Full IRB or _______ Expedited Review

If **all** the research activities are designated to be exempt under the regulations, enter above, in item 12a, the exemption number(s) corresponding to one or more of the six exemption categories listed in **"Protection of Human Subjects in Research"** attached to this form. Provide sufficient information in the application to allow a determination that the designated exemptions in item 12a, are appropriate. **Provide this narrative information in an "Item 12/Protection of Human Subjects Attachment" and insert this attachment immediately following the title page. Skip the remaining parts of item 12.**

If **some or all** of the planned research activities involving human subjects are covered (nonexempt), skip item 12a and continue with the remaining parts of item 12, as noted below. In addition, follow the instructions in **"Protection of Human Subjects in Research** (available as part of ED 424 on the web at http://ocfo.ed.gov/humansub.htm) to prepare the six-point narrative about the nonexempt activities. **Provide this six-point narrative in an "Item 12/Protection of Human Subjects Attachment" and insert this attachment immediately following the title page.**

If the applicant organization has an approved Multiple Project Assurance of Compliance on file with the Grants Policy and Oversight Staff (GPOS), U.S. Department of Education, or with the Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR), National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, that covers the specific activity, enter the Assurance number in item 12b and the date of approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the proposed activities in item 12c. This date must be no earlier than one year before the receipt date for which the application is submitted and must include the four (4) digit year (e.g., 2000). Check the type of IRB review in the appropriate box. An IRB may use the expedited review procedure if it complies with the requirements of 34 CFR 97.110. If the IRB review is delayed beyond the submission of the application, enter **"Pending"** in item 12c. If your application is recommended/selected for funding, a follow-up certification of IRB approval from an official signing for the applicant organization must be sent to and received by the designated ED official within 30 days after a specific formal request from the designated ED official. **If the applicant organization does not have** on file with GPOS or OPRR **an approved Assurance of Compliance** that covers the proposed research activity, enter **"None"** in item 12b and skip 12c. In this case, the applicant organization, by the signature on the application, is declaring that it will comply with 34 CFR 97 within 30 days after a specific formal request from the designated ED official for the Assurance(s) and IRB certifications.

Item 13. Certification by Authorizing Official: Enter the name, title, and telephone number of the official who has the authority to commit the organization to accept Federal funding and to execute the proposed project. Submit the original ink-signed copy of the authorizing official?s signature.

BUDGET*

PROJECT COSTS REQUESTED FROM LAAP

A. Direct Costs:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
1. Salaries and Wages (Professional and Clerical)				
2. Employee Benefits				
3. Travel				
4. Equipment (Purchase)				
5. Materials and Supplies				
6. Consultants and Contracts				
7. Other (equipment rental, printing, etc.)				
B. Indirect Costs:				
TOTAL REQUESTED FROM LAAP:				

PROJECT COST SHARE PROVIDED BY ALL PARTNERS

A. Direct Costs:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
1. Salaries and Wages (Professional and Clerical)				
2. Employee Benefits				
3. Travel				
4. Equipment (Purchase)				
5. Materials and Supplies				
6. Consultants and Contracts				
7. Other (equipment rental, printing, etc.)				
B. Indirect Costs:				
TOTAL COST SHARE:				

*This form must be included with both preliminary and final proposals. For preliminary proposals, no further breakdown is necessary. For final proposals, you must include an itemized breakdown of these budget categories and a budget narrative explaining how you calculated each line item for both the FIPSE request and the total project cost share.

LEAD PARTNER IDENTIFICATION FORM

LEAD PARTNER INSTITUTION: ____

Project Director Name/Title:____

Project Director?s Mailing Address:____

____

____

____

Telephone: ____

E-mail:____

Fax:____

Type of Institution/Organization:____

COST SHARE PROVIDED BY LEAD PARTNER*	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
1. Salaries and Wages (Professional and Clerical)				
2. Employee Benefits				
3. Travel				
4. Equipment (Purchase)				
5. Materials and Supplies				
6. Consultants and Contracts				
7. Other (equipment rental, printing, etc.)				
8. Indirect Costs:				
TOTAL COST SHARE PROVIDED BY LEAD PARTNER				

*On this form, list only the cost share provided by the individual partner institution/organization. On the main budget form, you are asked to total the individual partners? respective cost shares. For the preliminary proposal, no additional breakdown is necessary. For the final proposal, the total cost share should be itemized and explained in a budget narrative.

Please include one of these forms for each of the partner institutions/organizations.

PARTNER IDENTIFICATION FORM

PARTNER INSTITUTION: ____

Contact Name/Title:____

Contact Mailing Address:____

____

____

____

Telephone: ____

E-mail:____

Fax:____

Type of Institution/Organization:____

COST SHARE PROVIDED BY PARTNER*	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
1. Salaries and Wages (Professional and Clerical)				
2. Employee Benefits				
3. Travel				
4. Equipment (Purchase)				
5. Materials and Supplies				
6. Consultants and Contracts				
7. Other (equipment rental, printing, etc.)				
8. Indirect Costs:				
TOTAL COST SHARE PROVIDED BY PARTNER				

*On this form, list only the cost share provided by the individual partner institution/organization. On the main budget form, you are asked to total the individual partners? respective cost shares. For the preliminary proposal, no additional breakdown is necessary. For the final proposal, the total cost share should be itemized and explained in a budget narrative.

Assurances

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies that it will comply with the regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, as they relate to the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this Federally assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been dully adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.

2. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) and in accordance with Title VI of the Act, no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant receives Federal financial assistance and will immediately take any measures necessary to effect this agreement.

3. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) prohibiting employment discrimination where (1) the primary purpose of a grant is to provide employment or (2) discriminatory employment practices will result in unequal treatment of persons who are or should be benefiting from the grant-aided activity.

4. It will comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 794, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

5. It will comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as mended, 20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

6. It will comply with the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

7. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and Federally-assisted programs.

8. It will comply with provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activity of employees.

9. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, as they apply to hospital and educational institution employees of State and local governments.

10. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.

11. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General through any authorized representative the access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.

12. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.

13. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.

14. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, P.L. 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976. Section 102(a) requires, on or after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.

15. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 469a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties

ED 424B

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, ?New Restrictions on Lobbying,? and 34 CFR Part 85, ?Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).? The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Education determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

---

1. **LOBBYING**

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at

34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, ?Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,? in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

---

2. **DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS**

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110--

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgement rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c)Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transaction (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

---

3. **DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)**

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610 -

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee?s workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about-

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee?s policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will-

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted-

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for

such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address. city, county, state, zip code)

Check **[ ]** if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610-

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND/OR PROJECT NAME
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

ED 80-0013

Use This Checklist to Assist You in Preparing Your Application Package

Preliminary and Final Proposals

[ ] Title page has been completed according to the instructions.

[ ] Title page has been signed and dated by an authorized official and the signed original has been included in package to mail.

[ ] Each proposal copy has been stapled or otherwise fastened (not in binders or folders) with a title page on top of *each* copy.

Include in Your Proposal Package:

<u>**Preliminary Proposal**</u>

[ ] **One** (**1**) **original plus two** (**2**) **copies. Each of the three copies includes the following:**
- [ ] a signed title page (with abstract)
- [ ] a proposal narrative (*7 double-spaced pages maximum*)
- [ ] a completed budget form
- [ ] Lead and partner identification forms/cost share worksheets (one for each partner)

[ ] **In addition to the above, 3 extra copies of the title page have been included.**

Remember: Preliminary proposals must be postmarked or hand delivered (by 4:30 p.m.) no later than March 15, 2001.

<u>**Final Proposal**</u>

[ ] (**1**) **original plus two (2) copies. Each of the three copies includes the following:**
- [ ] a signed title page
- [ ] a proposal abstract (one page maximum)
- [ ] a proposal narrative (25 double-spaced pages maximum)
- [ ] budget form
- [ ] lead and partner identification forms/cost share worksheets (one for each partner)
- [ ] budget narrative (explanations and breakdowns of LAAP request and cost share)
- [ ] appendix, including brief resumes for project director and other key staff
- [ ] signed assurances and certifications
- [ ] additional requirements, as explained in final proposal invitation from FIPSE

[ ] **In addition to the above, 3 extra copies of the title page have been included.**

Remember: Final proposals must be postmarked or hand delivered (by 4:30 p.m.) no later than June 15, 2001.

Mailing Address for Preliminary and Final Proposals:

LAAP
Attn: 84. 339 U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center - Room 3633
7th and D Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725