

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND STUDIES PROGRAM CFDA 84.017A. SCHEDULE
84.017A-1
CFDA # 84.017A
PR/Award # P017A090314
Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10263381**

OMB No. 1840-0795, Expiration Date: 08/31/2010
Closing Date: APR 23, 2009

****Table of Contents****

Forms

1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)	e1
2. Standard Budget Sheet (ED 524)	e5
3. SF 424B - Assurances Non-Construction Programs	e7
4. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities	e9
5. 427 GEPA	e10
Attachment - 1	e11
6. ED 80-0013 Certification	e12
7. Dept of Education Supplemental Information for SF-424	e13

Narratives

1. Project Narrative - (Abstract Narrative...)	e14
Attachment - 1	e15
2. Project Narrative - (Project Narrative...)	e16
Attachment - 1	e17
3. Project Narrative - (Other Narrative...)	e47
Attachment - 1	e48
Attachment - 2	e50
4. Budget Narrative - (Budget Narrative...)	e52
Attachment - 1	e53
Attachment - 2	e58

This application was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this application. Some pages/sections of this application may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Application's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Application PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
 The University of Toledo

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1(a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$ 73,060	\$ 75,252	\$ 77,509	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 225,821
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 19,839	\$ 20,673	\$ 21,560	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 62,072
3. Travel	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,600	\$ 1,600	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 8,800
4. Equipment	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. Supplies	\$ 14,354	\$ 7,600	\$ 2,700	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 24,654
6. Contractual	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
7. Construction	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
8. Other	\$ 5,100	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 17,100
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 115,953	\$ 113,125	\$ 109,369	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 338,447
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 52,759	\$ 51,472	\$ 49,763	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 153,994
11. Training Stipends	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	\$ 168,712	\$ 164,597	\$ 159,132	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 492,441

***Indirect Cost Information (To Be Completed by Your Business Office):**

If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

- (1) Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government? Yes No
- (2) If yes, please provide the following information:
 Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 7/1/2008 To: 6/30/2012 (mm/dd/yyyy)
 Approving Federal agency: ED Other (please specify): DHHS
- (3) For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:
 Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? or, Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
 The University of Toledo

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1(a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
3. Travel	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
4. Equipment	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. Supplies	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
6. Contractual	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
7. Construction	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
8. Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
11. Training Stipends	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

Project Narrative

Abstract Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1236-An Chung Cheng Abstract_fnl_2.pdf**

Maximizing the National Resource: Chinese as a Model for Heritage Language Development with Community Involvement

Abstract

This proposal seeks U.S. Department of Education funding for a three-year research project to conduct a comprehensive national survey of Chinese heritage schools in the United States regarding program profile, teachers, curriculum, available resources, instructional materials and technology used, teaching methods, and classroom practice.

Because it takes many years of dedicated studies by adult learners to achieve a working language proficiency level for jobs in both government agencies and business sectors, much attention has turned to the so-called “native speakers” or “heritage speakers.” Heritage language speakers of critical languages provide a potential resource to meet market demands and strategic interests in post 9/11 context. It is estimated that more than 70% of Chinese language instruction before college in the US has been provided by community-based Chinese heritage schools (CHS). However, their efforts have largely been unnoticed by mainstream educators, because these community-based schools are operated by parents and community members and are outside the formal educational system. On the other hand, the CHSs are generally recognized as the most organized and the most numerous of the heritage language systems in the United States. The Chinese teachers in Chinese community schools have been heavily recruited to teach in the K-12 school system due to the surge of interests in learning Chinese and the shortage of experienced Chinese teachers in the United States. Some public schools have started to grant credit hours to students who have studied in Chinese community schools.

The Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages, consisting of individuals and organizations who share a commitment to advancing language development for heritage language speakers in the US, is collecting heritage language program profiles in all languages in the United States. However, only 16 of more than 350 Chinese heritage schools are documented on the website (<http://www.cal.org/heritage/>). With rigorous survey procedures and follow-up interviews as well as focus group discussions, the proposed project will provide a comprehensive picture of CHSs in the United States. In addition, the project will make use of technology to enhance both the data collection process and the dissemination of results. The project will identify and evaluate instructional materials to help improve instructional capacity. The project will determine the needs for improved programs and instruction in materials and resources for Chinese heritage education in the United States. It will also provide both evaluative models and effective strategies for Chinese heritage schools to identify their strengths and weaknesses. The project website will serve both as a clearinghouse for resources and as a major center of interaction between administrators, teachers, policy makers, and parents interested in Chinese language education, particularly Chinese heritage education. The results of this project will allow for strategic planning and decision-making in heritage language education; an area of growing importance to national interest.

Project Narrative

Project Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1240-Cheng Project narrative_fnl 3.pdf**

MAXIMIZING THE NATIONAL RESOURCE: CHINESE AS A MODEL FOR HERITAGE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WITH COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

1. NEED FOR THE PROJECT

China is a rising global force with its fast growing economy and the largest population in the world. In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in advancing Chinese language learning from preschool parents to Pentagon officials in the United States. Needs for the learning and teaching of Mandarin Chinese have increased dramatically in K-12 formal education settings. In 2000, there were about 5,000 students studying Mandarin Chinese in U.S. K-12 public schools, according to the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages. In 2007, that number rose to between 30,000 and 50,000. The level of interest in establishing Chinese language programs in K-12 schools is rising rapidly. According to the Asia Society, a survey in 2004 found that 2,400 high schools are interested in offering the AP in Chinese language and culture. Most of these schools, however, do not currently offer Chinese. The Modern Language Association reports that at the college level, enrollment in Chinese-language classes in Fall 2006 has increased 51% since 2002.

On the other hand, English-speaking learners need more time to reach the same level of proficiency in Chinese than they would need if studying Indo-European languages that share linguistic features with English. (Malone, Rifkin, Christian, & Johnson, 2004; Omaggio Hadley, 2001). Because it takes many years of dedicated study by adult learners to achieve a working language proficiency level for jobs in both government agencies and business sectors, much attention has turned to the so-called “native speakers” or “heritage speakers.” (Peyton, Ranard, & McGinnis, 2001). Among various definitions, the term “heritage speakers” refers to those who speak a language at home other than English (Valdés, 2001). In the post-9/11 context, there is strategic interest and growing federal support for promoting the foreign language studies of

Arabic, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Pashto, Persian, Russian, Turkish, and Urdu (Capriccioso & Epstein, 2006). It has been argued that heritage language speakers provide a potential resource for the expansion of these languages (Brecht & Ingold, 2002).

Along with the increase of enrollments in the college foreign language classes, foreign language classrooms are no longer comprised only of typical English speaking students whose primary target language exposure is in the classroom. More heritage language speakers take their home language in foreign language classrooms. According to Wiley (2004), the number of heritage language learners in programs of less commonly taught languages has increased three-fold in the last decade alone, surpassing typical English speaking foreign language students at a ratio of about six to one. While the majority of K-12 public schools do not offer Chinese language courses in the US, most of the advanced learners of Chinese come from Chinese American communities. In May 2007, when the College Board offered Mandarin Advanced Placement exams for the first time, 3,261 high school students took the test. Among them, 90% were heritage Chinese speakers (Wright, 2008). It was estimated that more than 70% of enrollment in Chinese language instruction before college level in the US has been provided by community-based Chinese heritage schools (McGinnis, 2008). McGinnis suggests that the Chinese heritage sector has become the largest provider of Chinese language teaching in the United States, changing from its peripheral provider status of foreign language education three decades ago.

Research on heritage language education is an emerging new field. A few research institutions, including the Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Heritage Language Resource Center have conducted various projects regarding heritage language learners,

assessment, teaching strategies, programs, and curriculum designs. However, their research is generally oriented toward general aspects of all heritage language education in the U.S.

In the Chinese heritage sector, there are two major national organizations, the National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCACLS) and the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS). These two organizations are involved in developing Chinese heritage schools (CHS) in the U.S. The former is primarily connected to Taiwan, while the latter to mainland China. Some Chinese heritage community schools do not belong to either one of the above mentioned national organizations. In spite of these research centers and Chinese heritage school organizations, no research efforts are underway to examine the profiles of Chinese heritage language programs and curricula, the needs of these Chinese heritage learners, or the teachers and communities. As the formal education sector from K-12 has increased its offerings in Chinese language courses, more Chinese heritage speakers will enroll in K-12 Chinese language programs. Many public schools have accepted credits hours which students obtained through Chinese community schools (Lai, 2004). Teachers from Chinese heritage schools have been recruited heavily to teach in the Chinese programs of both private and public formal school systems due to the surge of interests in learning Chinese and the shortage of experienced Chinese teachers in the United States. Traditionally, students in the Chinese community schools are from Chinese heritage families. However, there have been increasing numbers of students from typical English-speaking families attending local Chinese community schools in recent years due to the lack of Chinese language programs in existing formal school systems (Wang, 2007). It is crucial to further our understanding of Chinese heritage program, curricula, as well as effective instructional materials and strategies for educating students in order to promote proficiency and competency in the Chinese language.

The Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages, consisting of individuals and organizations who share a commitment to advancing language development for heritage language speakers in the US, is collecting heritage language programs profiles in all languages in the United States. However, only 16 of more than 350 Chinese heritage schools are documented on their website (<http://www.cal.org/heritage/>). Organizations such as NCACLS and CSAUS have lists of their member schools but their lists are either not open to public or have not been updated for a while. The university applicant for this project has advantages over the national organizations of Chinese Schools (NCACLS and CSAUS) in its objectivity in conducting this research project and in its access to the rich academic resources and infrastructures of a research university in carrying out such a project.

Chinese heritage schools are generally funded by religious groups, local civic groups, and groups of parents, the majority of whom are suburbanites and educated professionals and scientists. School administrators and teachers are typically volunteers with little training and preparation in curricula and instruction in the Chinese language. The programs offered in Chinese community schools are generally of three types: weekend, after-school, and summer. Overall, these last only two to three hours per week and the classes include not only language but also culture and tutorial lessons in English, mathematics, and other subject assistance. Administrators and teachers in these schools are generally parent volunteers or graduate students, who often do not have sufficient training in second or foreign language teaching (Wang, 1996). These Chinese teachers often do not fully understand the different culture values and classroom management styles of American schools, to which the students in the Chinese community schools are accustomed (Schrier, 2009).

The CHS associated with the National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCACLS) have strongly favored teaching traditional characters and have generally adopted textbooks and materials designed by scholars in Taiwan. On the other hand, the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS), typically connected with People's Republic of China, generally use textbooks published in China (Chao, 1997). While the instructional materials produced overseas are often provided free or at a minimal cost, which is ideal for Chinese community-based schools on a tight budget, other problems are present. For example, the theme or subject matter of many lessons differs from the students' perspectives and daily experiences in North America. Other lessons are too elementary and are not suited to the age or mental development of Chinese American teenagers (Lai, 2004). Some of the exciting instructional materials created overseas may not help Chinese American students better understand Chinese culture as it exists in the American context. While additional materials available for Chinese language education exist, a systematic approach to evaluating appropriate materials for heritage Chinese learners suitable to various age groups to meet student need is much needed.

The primary goals of the proposed project are to provide information and resources in order to strengthen current Chinese community schools and to encourage their development where they do not exist; to encourage dialogue that results in resource sharing, research collaboration, and articulation between formal education systems and heritage community school systems, and to provide directions for future research on Chinese heritage language development in order to inform policy makers, school administrators, teacher trainers, and parents in utilizing and maximizing the national linguistic resource.

Therefore, the objectives of this research project are:

- 1a. To consolidate and develop an online searchable database of Chinese heritage language programs in Chinese community-based setting in the United States
- 1b. To form descriptive profiles of Chinese heritage schools and to categorize curriculum and program types
- 2a. To identify and consolidate popular teaching & learning resources and instructional materials for Chinese heritage learners in the U. S
- 2b. To determine the needs for improved programs and instruction in materials and resources for Chinese heritage education in the U.S.
- 3a. To build capacity of useful models for evaluating educational resources in Chinese heritage programs to inform decisions of parents, educators & decision makers
- 3b. To showcase best practices (e.g. program curricula, effective teaching strategies and parental involvement) in the acquisition and maintenance of the Chinese language by heritage speakers in the US by the end of the third year.

2. USEFULNESS OF EXPECTED RESULTS

The project will provide parents, educators and decision makers with easy access to information and resources that are relevant to Chinese heritage language education. It will produce an online collection of information regarding Chinese heritage language programs in community-based settings, instructional materials and resources for the education of Chinese heritage learners as well as successful strategies for the acquisition and maintenance of the Chinese language skills in the United States. In addition to being a resource center of Chinese heritage language education, the project website will allow educators to form a network to exchange ideas and pedagogical techniques with one another as well as provide information and useful suggestions to stakeholders.

The findings of the research project will be useful for Chinese school administrators, program directors, instructors, and parents of Chinese heritage learners and educators in Chinese language programs in K-12 settings as well, where Chinese heritage learners participate with domestic learners whose native language and exposure is primarily English.

Chinese heritage schools administrators: The results will provide the Chinese heritage teaching community with existing educational and community resources. The results of the evaluation of Chinese programs and curricula evaluation will provide program administrators with models, strategies and tools to inform decision-making.

Chinese heritage language and foreign language educators: The findings of this project will inform instructors and administrators about the usefulness of textbooks, instructional materials, online resources, and other pertinent teaching resources appropriate for the age groups of the Chinese heritage learners. While many heritage language teachers are often native Chinese parents and professionals in other disciplines, or graduate students who need teaching experience, they have little experience or training in the pedagogy of foreign languages. Furthermore, they are rarely connected to language resources. Given the situation in which teachers of Chinese community schools have become the pool of human resources for the K-12 formal school system, a dialogue between educators in both community-based schools and the K-12 settings is much needed. The proposed forum to be established on the project website will allow both heritage school teachers and foreign language educators to exchange ideas and share concerns, experiences and strategies in teaching Chinese language in both community-based and K-12 settings.

Parents: Research has shown that parental involvement is one of the key factors in the success of acquisition and maintenance of heritage languages. Parents with children speaking or

listening to the Chinese at home, and parents with children adopted from China will be able to access the public information on the project website to select an appropriate program in Chinese community schools, to obtain information and to participate in their children Chinese language education. In addition, in reaction to popular demands many Chinese community schools have offered courses for typical English-speaking students due to the lack of Chinese language programs offered in public school system, parents who are interested in education their children speaking Chinese will be able to locate Chinese schools suitable for their children as well.

Other heritage language programs and researchers: The results of this research project will provide a model for other heritage language programs in development (e.g., Japanese, Korean, or Arabic heritage schools), particularly when language professionals and government try to tap national resources for the development of advanced proficiency in ritual languages. The findings of the current research will also add to the emerging field of heritage language education in general.

3. DEVELOPMENT OF NEW KNOWLEDGE

The results of the current research project will include three major products as outlined below:

(1) Online directory of Chinese heritage schools (DOCHS)

The Directory of Chinese Heritage Schools (DOCHS) is a free, searchable database with information on Chinese community-based schools across the United States. The DOCHS contains information about program/school name, address, contact information, program goals, years funded, language instructed (language/dialogue and traditional, simplified or both written forms), class meeting time, approximate student enrollment, student age groups and links to individual school websites if available. The comprehensive list of the heritage language schools in the U.S. has not been available to the public. Also the demographic information about schools

associated with two major national organizations, National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCACLS), and Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS) and schools not belonging to either organization has not been put together in one place. This project aims at merging the data of these schools and making the information available to the public. Particularly, parents of Chinese HL children, parents adopting children from China, parents who cannot find Chinese language programs in local formal school system, teachers and administrators involved in Chinese HL education and Chinese language education from both community-based and K-12 settings, as well as policy makers will be interested in the directory.

(2) A communal hub of instructional materials for Chinese heritage education

The project website will also provide information on existing textbooks, CD-ROMs, software and audio-visual materials suitable for heritage learners with ratings and comments directly from researchers, teachers and parents. There are abundant instructional materials in Chinese in existing markets. Chinese teachers have used them interchangeably in both community schools and in formal K-12 schools. The website will create a forum for Chinese heritage teachers and teachers of Chinese as a foreign language to exchange opinions and post questions and suggestions not only on selecting materials but also on effective teaching strategies under situations pertinent to Chinese heritage language education.

(3) A major resources center for Chinese heritage education

The research on the needs assessment of Chinese heritage schools, teachers and learners and the development of evaluation tools for curriculum and instructional material assessment will address some of the challenges that Chinese heritage educators have faced such as finding effective approaches to motivate Chinese heritage speakers in the U.S., finding suitable instructional materials for these particular groups of learners, and increasing the quality of

language programs and classroom practice. The best practices of heritage language programs and teaching strategies for successful Chinese heritage education in the United States will be suggested. Given their establishment dating back to the beginning of the last century, Chinese heritage schools, with their wealth of experience, are in an advantageous position to cooperate with formal educational authorities in setting up Chinese language courses and programs. This type of collaboration has been undertaken and such individual efforts and experiences could be shared through the centralized location that this project provides. The findings of this project will advance our understanding of Chinese heritage education in the U.S. and heritage language education in general.

4. FORMULATION OF PROBLEMS AND KNOWLEDGE OF RELATED RESEARCH

There have been various definitions of heritage language learners from language proficiency, linguistic, pedagogical, and social cultural perspectives (Fishman, 1991; Scalera 2000; Valdés, 2001, Webb & Miller, 2000). In this study, we employ the definition by Hornberger and Wang (2008), in which Chinese heritage learners are defined as “individuals with familial or ancestral ties to a language other than English.” The focus is “on the identity and bi-literacy development of heritage language languages in the ecological systems they inhabit” (p 6).

Although Chinese heritage schools educate more than 70% of Chinese language learners before college in the U. S. (McGinnis, 2008), their efforts have largely been unnoticed by mainstream society (Wang, 2004) because these community-based schools are operated by parents and community members and are outside the formal education system. The curriculum of CHS is usually not connected to public education in programs, standards or content, although some formal schools have accepted credit hours for students who have studied in Chinese

community schools. Chinese community schools have been left alone to deal with many challenges ranging from tight budgets, limited resources, lack of quality teachers, to unmotivated students. Textbooks often do not adequately address the needs of heritage learners of Chinese, a distant language from the English dominant in society. Even Chinese school organizers criticize the ineffectiveness of heritage language education for their children. On the other hand, the CHSs are generally recognized as the most organized, as well as the most numerous, of all the heritage language systems in the U.S. (Peyton, Ranard, & McGinnis, 2001).

Previous research on Chinese heritage students has largely focused on literacy education (Jia & Aaronson, 2003; Li, 2006a), parental involvement (Cheng, 1999; Li, 2006 b), and cultural identity (Tse, 1998 2001; Kiang, 2008). Some have addressed the needs of Chinese heritage schools as a case study (Liu, 2006; Wang. X., 1996), reviewed the history and development of Chinese community-based schools (Lai, 2004; Wang, S. 2004, 2007), or addressed language policy. Few studies have investigated the profile of the Chinese language programs and teachers in CHS on a large scale as well as the needs of Chinese heritage education. No research has assessed the need and developed models/strategies to evaluate heritage language programs and instructional materials.

To maximize the untapped national resource of Chinese heritage speakers, improve Chinese heritage language education and expand Chinese capacity in the U.S., the following questions guide the research of this project.

1. What are the current profiles and capacities of Chinese heritage schools to educate Chinese heritage learners in their communities?
2. Which curricula have been developed in the current Chinese heritage language programs in the U.S.?

3. Which instructional materials and technology are available for Chinese heritage education?
4. What are the profiles of CHS teachers and their evaluation of the quality of Chinese heritage education in CHSs?
5. What key resources and strategies can be developed and disseminated for helping CHSs and teachers increase their capacities to education Chinese heritage learners?
6. How can capacity-building resources and strategies be improved for better serving the needs of Chinese heritage education?

5. SPECIFICITY OF STATEMENT OF PROCEDURES

To maximize quality of Chinese heritage education in communities-based schools, this project is proceeding through three phases of work over a three-year timeline. In phase one, profile building, we identify the demographic information and curriculum of Chinese heritage schools around the United States as well as their needs in improving educational quality. In phase two, resource evaluation, we identify the demands and uses of instructional materials and resources for Chinese heritage education to various age groups in the United States. In phase three, resource development, we produce strategies, models and tools that will help evaluate and develop instructional materials and resources, as well as Chinese heritage programs. The following table presents the project outline.

Objectives	Products	Methodology
1a. To consolidate and develop an online searchable database of Chinese heritage language programs in Chinese community-based setting in the United States by April 2010.	Directory of Chinese Heritage Programs in Community-Based Schools in the US	Conduct a national survey of CHS administrators about the Chinese heritage courses and resources in conjunction with the CSAUS, NCACLS, and Chinese associations in the U.S.
1b. To form descriptive profiles of Chinese heritage schools	A summary report of types of program and curriculum of the	Conduct a national survey to CHS administrators about the

and to categorize curriculum and program types by August 2010.	Chinese heritage schools in the US.	Chinese heritage courses and resources in conjunction with the CSAUS, NCACLS, and Chinese associations in the U.S.
2a. To identify and consolidate popular teaching & learning resources and instructional materials for Chinese heritage learners in the U. S by February 2011..	An online hub of teaching & learning resources used by and appropriate for Chinese heritage schools in the U.S.	Conduct a national survey of teachers in CHS about instructional materials used in their classrooms and effective teaching strategies.
2b. To determine the needs for improved instruction in materials and resources for Chinese heritage education in the U.S. by April 2011.	Survey results of needs assessment of heritage language programs and teaching resources	Following analysis of survey results, conduct follow-up interviews and focus-group discussions with CHS administrators and teachers
3a. To build capacity of useful models for evaluating educational resources in Chinese heritage programs to inform decisions of parents, educators & decision makers by December 2011.	Report on research on useful strategies, models and tools that will help educators evaluate Chinese heritage language programs and instructional materials to meet the needs of parents and learners. Conduct a review of the literature on heritage language education and on assessment of instructional materials in foreign languages.	Conduct a review of the literature on heritage language education and on assessment of instructional materials in foreign languages.
3b. To showcase best practices (e.g. program curricula, effective teaching strategies and parental involvement) in the acquisition and maintenance of the Chinese language by heritage speakers in the US by the end of the third year, August 2012.	Report: Understanding Chinese Heritage Language Schools: A Guide for Chinese Language Educators	With the developed models and strategies, the project will determine and report successful programs, instructional materials and teaching strategies.

6. ADEQUACY OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

The participants in the research project are the administrators and teachers of CHSs. We will send out surveys to all CHSs (approximately 350) and elicit responses from teachers of CHSs (targeted 1000) in the United States. The survey will include questionnaires in both paper and online formats and in both English and Chinese. The PI and her graduate students have created questionnaires and pilot tested them in 2008. The researchers will continue revising

surveys before a mass mailing is sent out and website is set up. The format of questionnaires is a hybrid of different types of questions (1) fill-in-blanks, (2) yes/no or multiple-choice questions, and open-ended questions. Following the initial survey, there will be follow-up telephone interviews and focus-group discussions to further investigate the views and opinions of survey respondents to form a qualitative data base.

To address the first research question regarding the profile and capacities of Chinese heritage schools to educate Chinese heritage learners in their communities and the second research question regarding program curriculum, the survey will be sent to CHS administrators to elicit basic information such as school name, address, contact person, program hours, and language/dialogue taught will be included. The survey will also collect other demographic information not existing in the records of CSAUS, NCACLS, or Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages such as student enrollment, student profile, number of teaching staff, program goals and missions, instructional materials and technology used, methodology and instructional strategies used, language skills emphasized, cultural topics or aspects taught, assessment of student learning outcome , student completion rate in the program, types of financial support received, perceived special challenges.

To address research question 3 regarding instructional materials and technology used and question 4 regarding CHS teacher profile and their evaluation of heritage education needs and quality, the survey will solicit responses from CHS teachers (approximately 1000) with assistance from CHS administrators. A Likert scale will be employed for participants to show their evaluation of the quality of Chinese heritage education, in addition to the hybrid survey format mentioned above. The questionnaire will elicit information such as teacher profile (age group, gender, highest degree received, purpose of teaching), instructional materials and

technology used in classroom, their preference for certain types of materials, teacher evaluating instructional materials used, and their evaluation of CHS education quality (including teaching materials, teaching approach, student motivation, parent support).

To address research questions 5 and 6, regarding the development of successful models, effective strategies, and useful resources, the researchers will first review literature on program models, teaching methods and strategies and then develop useful tools and procedures for heritage language educators to build instructional capacities. Based on the developed evaluation models, tools and strategies, the researchers will introduce them to selected CHSs and help identify best practices in terms of program, curriculum, and classroom practice and then revise the tools and strategies based on field tests. Finally, the project findings will be disseminated and published.

The analysis of collected survey data will employ both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative data analysis includes descriptive statistics of responses and their correlation with demographic information to illustrate trends and tendency. Qualitative data will be coded and categorized based on relevant topics and themes.

7. PLAN OF OPERATION

This project is designed to achieve a comprehensive and a system-wide survey of all Chinese heritage schools in the United States regarding their program profile, teacher profile, curriculum, available resources, instructional materials and technology used, teaching methods, and classroom practice. The project will also determine the needs for improved programs and instruction in materials and resources for Chinese heritage education in the U.S. The assessment models and strategies developed in the project will allow educators of Chinese heritage schools to identify the strengths and weaknesses of individual programs. The project will produce and

disseminate a variety of resources to help improve instructional capacity. The project website serves as a clearinghouse for resources and as the main point of interaction between administrators, teachers, policy makers, parents interested in Chinese heritage education.

A set of outcomes and project activities corresponding to the objectives were delineated.

The project objectives, activities and projected timeline are presented in the Project Overview below.

Objectives	Activities	Timeline
YEAR 1		9/1/09-08/31/10
1a. To consolidate and develop an online searchable database of Chinese heritage language programs in Chinese community-based setting in the United States	Create a comprehensive list of CHSs (approx. 350) with assistance from the CSAUS, NCACLS, and Chinese associations in the US.	9/1/09-12/31/09
	Develop questionnaire in English & Chinese for CHS demographic and descriptive profiles, pilot test survey tools (online & paper) and revise	
	Set up project website and the online survey to CHS	
	Mail out participation invitation & questionnaire to CHS administrators	
	Interviews and focus-sessions at ACTFL conferences and the CHSs in San Diego. 1st follow-up call for response in the survey & data entry	
	2nd follow-up call for response & follow-up interviews and focus-sessions in the region	01/01/10-05/31/10
	Survey enter, organize & code data	
	Data categorization & recoding when needed	
	Set up online director of CHSs	
1b. To form descriptive profiles of Chinese heritage schools and to categorize curriculum and program types by August 2010.	Summarize program types and curricula of CHSs Year-end external evaluation	06/31/10-08/31/10
Objectives	Activities	Timeline
YEAR 2		09/01/10-8/31/11

2a. To identify and consolidate popular teaching & learning resources and instructional materials for Chinese heritage learners in the U. S by February 2011.	Develop survey in English & Chinese to teachers in CHSs about instructional materials used and effective teaching strategies and pilot test the survey tool (online & paper)	9/01/10-10/01/10
	Distribute invitation of participation in the survey to teachers of CHSs (approx. 1000)	October 2010
	1st follow-up call for participation and run follow-up phone interviews & focus-sessions in the region	November 2010
	2nd follow-up call for participation & follow-up phone interviews and focus-group discussions at the conference of CSAUS.	December, 2010
	Enter, organize, code and analyze data	January, 2010
	Upload Online hub of Instructional materials and resources with public rating/comment functions	March, 2010
To determine the needs for improved programs and instruction in materials and resources for Chinese heritage education in the U.S.	Continues follow-up phone interviews and focus-group discussions in the region. Data categorization & recoding when needed	April-July, 2010
	Summary report of instructional materials and technology available and need Year-end external evaluation	Aug. 2010
Objectives	Activities	Timeline
YEAR 3		09/01/11-8/31/12
3a. To build capacity of useful models for evaluating educational resources in Chinese heritage programs to inform decisions of parents, educators & decision makers by December 2011.	Review literature regarding heritage language education and available program models, methods, and capacity building strategies in language education	
	Develop strategies and resources for curriculum development in CHL program	
	Organize, update website, online database	
	Develop strategies for instructional material evaluation and creation	
	Disseminate project results at the ACTFL convention	
	Summary report on the development and evaluation of CHL curriculum and instructional materials	Dec. 2011
3b. To showcase best practices (e.g. program curricula, effective teaching strategies and	Evaluate and identify model programs and curricula of CHS.	
	Evaluate and suggest effective instructional materials	

parental involvement) in the acquisition and maintenance of the Chinese language by heritage speakers in the US by the end of the third year	incorporating public rating/comments collected on project website	
	Report on effective teaching & learning strategies and methods for the acquisition and maintenance of Chinese heritage language Year-end External evaluation	
	Complete report: Understanding Chinese Heritage Language Schools: A Guide for Chinese Language Educators	08/31/2012

Project Management: The PI and co-PI will provide general project oversight and will ensure continued data collection, data entry and analysis. They will supervise the collaboration between research assistants and technical support staff at the University of Toledo. The PI, who will oversee the day-to-day operation of the project, is responsible for keeping all facets of the project on track, and supervises graduate research assistants and their collaboration with the technology technician from the Office of Information Technology. The Co-PI will ensure the quality of survey tools (paper and online questionnaire, interview questions, and questions for focus-group discussions), train graduate research assistants on the procedures of data collection and data entry, and be responsible for data analysis and interpretation of statistic results. The technology technician from the Information Technology Office will take the responsibility of developing the project website while a graduate research assistant will assist in the maintenance of the site. External evaluator will monitor the project and evaluate the effectiveness of the resources provided on the project website based on the number of hits on a particular resource and user comments.

The objectives of this project address Title VI, Part A, section 605 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, in such a way that the project studies and surveys to determine needs for increased or improved instruction in the Chinese heritage education in community-based settings

in the United States. The project also addresses national needs of high proficient speakers in critical languages by conducting research on more effective methods of providing instruction and achieving competency in Chinese heritage schools.

The findings of the projects will be available to the general public through the project website. Thus, it provides equal access treatment for eligible members of racial and ethnic minority groups, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly.

8. QUALITY OF PERSONNEL

An Chung Cheng, Associate Professor of Spanish at the University of Toledo, is the principle investigator for the project. Dr. Cheng received her Ph. D. at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in second language acquisition and teacher education. A native speaker of Chinese and fluent speakers of English and Spanish, has 14 years of experience in training foreign language teachers of Spanish, French, German, Japanese, and ESL and 23 years of experiences of teaching foreign languages. She has conducted a survey regarding student beliefs (approx. 800 students per semester) in the application of web-assisted courseware in FL classroom instruction in a five-year project at the University of Toledo. She is the author of two sets of web-based instructional materials for *Dímelo Tú* by Cengage Learning Inc. Dr. Cheng regularly reviews instructional materials for various major publishers such as McGraw-Hill, Prentice-Hall, Pearson, Cengage, and John Wiley & Sons. She has authored or co-authored numerous research articles on instructed second language acquisition by English-speaking and Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish. In addition to doing research on Chinese teacher acquisition and parent involvement in Chinese heritage schools, she and is currently on the Board of Director of the Chinese Center of Toledo (formerly Toledo Chinese School).

Gregory Stone, Associate Professor of Research and Measurement at the University of Toledo, is the co-principle investigator for the project. Dr. Stone received his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in Measurement, Evaluation and Statistical Analysis with 20 years of experience in evaluation and analytic experience. He has evaluated two major federally sponsored grants, is on the Board of Directors for the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (awarded an \$18 million Department of Education grant), and is the author of over 100 peer reviewed journal publications, books, and professional publications regarding evaluation, statistical analysis, survey development and psychometrics.

9. BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS

1. Personnel:

Dr. An Chung Cheng (PI), AY salary \$61,110, (associate professor, specializing in second language acquisition and teacher education, in the Department of Foreign Language at the University of Toledo), will be responsible for the coordination of activities, financial management, scheduling, staffing, designing questionnaires, planning and implementing assessment tools, and reporting project results. She will devote 33% of her time during the academic year and full time during the summer (3 months) for three years. We request 33.34% of her summer salary from DOE (\$20,368) since activities are year-round. Each dollar amount is increased by 3% yearly.

Dr. Gregory Stone (Co-PI), AY salary \$84,143, (associate professor, specializing in measurement and assessment, in the Department of Foundations of Education at the University of Toledo) will be responsible for the design of survey and evaluation tools, statistic analysis and evaluation of the project, and the report of the research results. Dr. Stone will devote 16.67% of his time during the academic year and full time during the summer (3 months) for three years.

We request \$14,027 from DOE toward the cost of released time. We request 20% of his summer salary from DOE (\$16,829) since activities are year-round. Each dollar amount is increased by 3% yearly.

Graduate research assistants (2 each term, F, SP, SU): Two graduate research assistants are requested to assist with (1) general project operations, (2) the maintenance of the project website and (3) data collection, data entry and analysis. The two graduate research assistant will be recruited from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Science (TESOL major). They will need to know both English and Chinese as well as be familiar with data input in Chinese with word processing. The budget requested for the graduate research assistant of College of Education includes the academic year salaries (\$7,726) and summer stipends (\$2,060) for the first year with a 3% increase in year 2 and 3. The budget requested for the graduate research assistant of College of Arts and Sciences includes the academic year salaries (\$8,446) and summer stipends (\$3,605) for the first year with a 3% increase in year 2 and 3.

2. Fringe benefits

The University of Toledo's fringe benefits are calculated at 31.2% for faculty (\$15,982 in yr 1) and 1.90% for graduate students (\$415 in yr 1). Graduate student medical insurance of \$3,442 is included in the request (10% annual escalation). The total year 1 DOE request for fringe benefits is \$19,839. These are the current university published rates.

3. Travel

We budgeted the travel expenses of PI or Co-PI each year to collect data (interviews and focus-group discussions) at US conferences (e.g. ACTFL and CSAUS) for Chinese and foreign language educators and to disseminate the project information and findings. We will also travel by car to the Chinese community schools in Ohio and the regional states such as Michigan,

Indiana, Illinois and Pennsylvania within 5 hours of driving distance to conduct interviews and focus-group discussions for approximately 3 trips (two persons each) each year. The estimates include one-night hotel stay (\$100 per person per night) and car mileage (\$330 max per trip) and per diem (\$30 per person per day). The estimate is \$2,000 per year for year 1 and year 2.

As the researcher attends national conferences, we will arrange interviews and focus-group discussions with administrators and instructors of Chinese heritage schools at the conference and the city of the conference sites. We plan to attend a three-day conference each year with estimated \$1,600 each trip, including hotel, flight, car and per diem.

4. Supplies:

- (1) Survey materials: These are necessary for conducting, developing, or implementing the project. The items include supplies such as papers for questionnaires and photocopying (\$500 each year), telephone (\$100 each month for 11 months), postage for survey mailing and reminders (\$500 year 1 and 2, \$100 year 3), and refreshments and book gift cards (incentive) for participants in interviews and focus-group discussions (including onsite visits and online conferences via Skype) (\$60 each person x 15 persons x 5 sessions per year = \$ 4,500 for year 1 and year 2). We also request \$1,000 of books, DVD, CD ROM, computer software and other audio visual teaching materials needed for instructional materials assessment each year.
- (2) We request hardware and software in year 1 only that enable dual platforms for Mac and Windows environments. The mobility of Apple MacBook will be used for data organization, coding, and analysis in two languages and for presentations, focus-group discussion as well as film editing (focus sessions and best classroom practice). We request two sets each for the following: MacBook Pro. (\$2,599 each), Parallels Desktop

4.0 for Mac (\$79.95 each), Microsoft Office 2008 for Mac (\$149.95 each), Apple MagSafe Airline Adapter (\$49.00 each), and Apple wireless Mighty Mouse (\$69.00 each). One digital video camcorder (\$800) and editing software, QuickTime 7 Pro (\$29.99 each) for two computers will be used in documenting focus-group discussions and the best classroom practices in Chinese. The total of hardware and software are \$6,754.

5. Other Costs:

- (1) We will purchase survey services from the two major national Chinese school organizations, NCACLS and CSAUS to reach out and contact Chinese schools and their members for data collection. (\$500 each, for a total of \$1,000, in year 1).
- (2) Consultants and external evaluator: The project will support the professional service of consultants (Dr. Shuhan C. Wang and Dr. Leigh Chiarelott) and an external evaluator (Dr. Scott McGinnis), well-known researchers in Chinese heritage language education. They will be paid a consulting fee of \$1,200/yr per person to assist with program evaluation and to help us modify the program to make it successful. The travel expenses for the external evaluator from Washington D.C. to Toledo (airfare, hotel, and per diem costs) are estimated at a total of \$900/yr. Dr. Shuhan Wang is Executive Director of Chinese Language Initiatives in Asia Society, author of several articles about heritage language education and Chinese language textbooks. She will serve as a consultant and work with the PI on assessment of instructional materials and evaluation of programs in Chinese Heritage schools. Dr. Leigh Chiarelott, Chair and Professor, Curriculum and Instruction Department at the University of Toledo, will serve as the curriculum consultant for the project. Dr. Chiarelott has nearly 40 years experience in education from the K12 level to the university level. He is the author of two books and 30 articles on curriculum and

teacher education and frequently consults with K-12 schools on curriculum design and professional development issues. For this project, he will work closely with the project director to identify key curriculum issues that emerge from the research and the implications of those issues for curriculum and instructional design. Dr. Scott McGinnis, to be served as external evaluator, is the Executive Director of the National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages, Associate for Less Commonly Taught Languages at the National Foreign Language Center in Washington, D.C. and faculty of Defense Language Institute–Washington Office. He has authored numerous journal articles and books on the teaching of Chinese language. Total: \$4,100 per year.

(3) Awards for best practices of videos of classroom teaching (3 awards, \$300 each) and Unit/lesson plans (\$5 awards, \$200 each). \$1,900 for year 2 and year 3. The best practices will be posted on the project website.

Total Direct Costs

Total direct costs requested from DOE are \$115,953 year one, \$113,125 year two, and \$ 109,369 year three, (cumulative \$338,447).

Indirect Costs

Indirect costs were calculated at 45.5% modified total direct costs; \$52,759 year one, \$51,472 year two, and \$49,763 year three, (cumulative \$ 153,993)

10. EVALUATION PLAN

Goal One: Census of Chinese Heritage Programs in community-based schools in the United States.

Goal One will be evaluated using a quantitative model.

There are approximately 350 Chinese Heritage Programs in the United States. Success will be considered as related to completeness of gathered information.

	1st Mailing	2nd Mailing	3rd Mailing	Total
Surveys Returned	60%	Additional 30%	Add as needed for stratification	90%
Geographic Stratification	Eastern U.S. 30% Southern U.S. 20% Midwest U.S. 20% Western U.S. 30% (incl Hawaii/Alaska)		A 3 rd mailing will be sent to those geographic regions that are underrepresented	Eastern U.S. 30% Southern U.S. 20% Mid West U.S. 20% Western U.S. 30% (incl Alaska/Alaska)
Completeness	90% of surveys should be returned complete	90% of surveys should be returned complete 100% of incomplete surveys now complete via follow-up phone call	90% of surveys should be returned complete 100% of incomplete surveys now complete via follow-up phone call	95% of surveys complete

Goal Two: Construction of an online database of teaching and learning resources used by and appropriate for Chinese Heritage Schools in the United States.

Goal Two will be evaluated using a quantitative model.

	End of Year One
Completeness	90% of online resource completed

Goal Three: Conduct needs assessment of Chinese Heritage School programs and teaching resources.

Goal Three will be evaluated using both quantitative and qualitative models.

Quantitative Evaluation (Prior to database development)

	1st Mailing	2nd Mailing	3rd Mailing	Total
Surveys Returned	60%	Additional 30%	Add as needed for stratification	90%
	90% of surveys	90% of surveys	90% of surveys	95% of surveys with

Completeness	should be returned with answers to items related to needs completed	should be returned with answers to items related to needs completed 100% of incomplete surveys now complete via follow-up phone call	should be returned with answers to items related to needs completed 100% of incomplete surveys now complete via follow-up phone call	answers to items related to needs completed
---------------------	---	---	---	---

Quantitative Evaluation (Post-database development)

	Immediately Post-Database Creation	Ongoing Online Survey*	End of Year Two	End of Year Three
Inclusion	90% inclusive of details from pre-construction survey	50% return rate	Defined plan for inclusion of 80% of details obtained from ongoing online survey in year one	80% of details obtained from ongoing online survey Defined plan for inclusion of 80% of details obtained from ongoing online survey in year two
Usefulness	Not applicable	40% report the site to be helpful or very helpful	60% report the site to be helpful or very helpful	80% report the site to be helpful or very helpful

* Users will be asked to create an account to use the service. Surveys will be sent to users at specific times each year inviting comments regarding use, completeness and needs of the users.

Qualitative Evaluation (Post-database development)

	Immediately Post-Database Creation	End of Year Two	End of Year Three
Focus Groups	Two focus groups will be convened. Groups will be shown the database and will discuss their immediate perceptions.	Two focus groups will be convened. Groups will be asked to discuss their use of the database and how the systems has met or not met their needs.	Two focus groups will be convened. Groups will be asked to discuss their use of the database and how the systems has met or not met their needs.

Goal Four: Construction of an online resource to assist CHS programs assess strategies, models, tools, and instructional materials to meet the needs of instructors, students, and parents.

Quantitative Evaluation (Prior to database development)

	1st Mailing	2nd Mailing	3rd Mailing	Total
Surveys Returned	60%	Additional 30%	Add as needed for stratification	90%
Completeness	90% of surveys should be returned with answers to items related to needs completed	90% of surveys should be returned with answers to items related to needs completed 100% of incomplete surveys now complete via follow-up phone call	90% of surveys should be returned with answers to items related to needs completed 100% of incomplete surveys now complete via follow-up phone call	95% of surveys with answers to items related to needs completed

Quantitative Evaluation (Post-database development)

	Ongoing	End of Year Two	End of Year Three
Number of Hits	Each page of the online resource will be tracked to determine number of hits. Pages with few hits will be considered unsuccessful and redesigned. Actual hit numbers to be determined.	Revised pages will be evaluated to determine whether page hits have been increased. Continued tracking to determine number of hits per page. Pages with few hits will be considered unsuccessful and redesigned. Actual hit numbers to be determined.	Revised pages will be evaluated to determine whether page hits have been increased. Continued tracking to determine number of hits per page. Pages with few hits will be considered unsuccessful and redesigned. Actual hit numbers to be determined.
Downloads	All materials of the online resource will be tracked to determine number of downloads. Materials downloaded less will be reviewed. Actual downloaded numbers to be determined.	All materials of the online resource will be tracked to determine number of downloads. Materials downloaded less will be reviewed. Actual downloaded numbers to be determined.	All materials of the online resource will be tracked to determine number of downloads. Materials downloaded less will be reviewed. Actual downloaded numbers to be determined.

Pedagogical Usefulness	Not applicable	Users will be asked to create an account to use the service. Surveys will be sent to users at specific times each year inviting comments regarding their teaching style and deployment of resources in the classroom. Curriculum experts at the University of Toledo will examine the returned survey results to assess pedagogical soundness and growth.	Users will be asked to create an account to use the service. Surveys will be sent to users at specific times each year inviting comments regarding their teaching style and deployment of resources in the classroom. Curriculum experts at the University of Toledo will examine the returned survey results to assess pedagogical soundness and growth.
-------------------------------	----------------	---	---

Qualitative Evaluation (Post-database development)

	Post-Database Creation	End of Year Two	End of Year Three
Focus Groups	Two focus groups will be convened. Groups will discuss pedagogical issues in the classroom and how language in the schools are taught.	The same focus groups will be convened. Groups will be asked to discuss how their pedagogy has changed, if at all, since using the resource.	The same focus groups will be convened. Groups will be asked to discuss how their pedagogy has continued to change, if at all, since using the resource.

11. ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES

The Office of Information Technology at the University of Toledo will provide full technical support to the project including the creation of database and development of the project website to be hosted at UT server. The Research & Computing Support Specialist, John Bell, will oversee the creation of a website in share point web environment with MS SQL database in both Chinese and English languages. The website will include functions like database, wiki, search capacity, RSS feed (notifying subscribers web update), survey, communication string data, and content data. The project PI, C-PI and graduate research assistants will collaborate with technicians and web specialists to design and develop the website for the project to meet its various needs for searchable directory, forum for educators as well as public resources and information. The technicians in Arts & Sciences College Computing Office will provide technical support as well throughout the project period. The project director and graduate

research assistants will continue maintaining and updating the Chinese Heritage Education website after the research project ends.

12. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 2

This research project conducts surveys and studies regarding the program, curriculum, teaching approaches, and instructional materials of the Chinese language education in the Chinese heritage schools across the United States. The study focuses on Chinese (Mandarin), one of the less commonly taught languages on the U.S. Department of Education's list.

References

- Brecht, R. D., & Ingold, C. W. (2002, May). Tapping a national resource: Heritage languages in the United States. ERIC Digest, EDO-FL-02-02.
- Capriccioso, R., & Epstein, D. (2006, January 6). Bush push on 'critical' foreign languages. Retrieved March 20, 2009 from <http://insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2006/01/06/foreign>
- Chao, T.H. (1997) Chinese heritage community language schools. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409744.
- Cheng, L.L. (1999) Sociocultural adjustment of Chinese-American students. In C. Park and M. Chi (eds.) *Asian-American Education: Prospects and Challenges* (p. 1–17). Westport: Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press;
- Hornberger, N., & Wang, S. C. (2008). Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. In D.M. Brinton, L.Kangan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 3-35). New York: Routledge .
- Jia, G., & Aaronson, D. (2003). A longitudinal study of Chinese children and adolescents learning English in the United States. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24, 131-161.
- Kiang, L. (2008). Ethnic Self-labeling in Young American Adults from *Chinese* Backgrounds. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31, 97 – 111.
- Lai, H. (2004). *Becoming Chinese American: A History of Communities and Institutions*. New York: Altamira Press.
- Li, G. (2006a). *Culturally contested pedagogy: Battles of literacy and schooling between mainstream teachers and Asian immigrant parents*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press
- Li, G. (2006b). The role of parents in heritage language maintenance and development: Case studies of Chinese immigrant children's home practices. In Kondo-Brown, K. (ed.), *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants*, (p. 15–32). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Liu, P. (2006). Community-based Chinese schools in Southern California: A survey of Teachers. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 19, 237-247.

- Malone, M., Rifkin, B., Christian, D., & Johnson, D. E. (2004). Attaining high levels of proficiency: Challenges for language education in the United States. *Journal for Distinguished Language Studies*, 2, 67-88.
- McGinnis, S. (2008). From mirror to compass: The Chinese heritage language education sector in the United States. In D.M. Brinton, L.Kangan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (p. 229-242). New York: Routledge.
- Peyton, J. K., Ranard, D. A., & McGinnis, S. (Eds.), (2001). *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.
- Scalera, D. (2000). Teacher beliefs and the heritage language learner: What will you teach your students/ In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller(Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices form the classroom* (p.71-82). Yonkers, NY: American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Schrier, L. (2009). Understanding the culture of American schools, and managing the successful Chinese language classroom. Everson & Xiao (Eds.), *Teaching Chinese as a foreign language* (pp. 227-249). Boston: Cheng & Tsui Company.
- Tse, L. (1998). Ethnic identity formation and its implication for heritage language development. In Krashen, D, Tse, L, & Je. McQuillan (Eds.) *Heritage Language Development* (p.15-30). Culver City, CA. : Language Education Associates.
- Tse, L. (2001). Resisting and reversing language shift: Heritage-language resilience among U.S. native biliterates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71, 676-708.
- Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In Peyton, J. K., Ranard, D., & McGinnis, S. (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (p. 37-77) McHenry, IL, and Washington, DC: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wiley, D. (2004). Collaborative planning for meeting national needs in the less commonly taught languages: Defining criteria for priorities in the languages of the world regions. e-LCTL Initiative: Michigan State University.
- Wright, J. L. (2008). Use of AP Chinese Language and Culture exam with heritage learners: Reports from the first round. Retrieved March 3, 2008 from http://nclrc.org/about_teaching/heritage_learners.html.
- Wang, S. C. (2004). Bi-literacy resource eco-System of intergenerational transmission of heritage language and culture: An ethnographic study of a Chinese community in the United States. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- Wang, S. C. (2007) Building Societal Capital: Chinese in the United States. *Language Policy*, 6(1), 27-52.
- Wang, X. (Ed.), (1996). *A view from within: A case study of Chinese heritage community language schools in the United States*, Monograph Series. The National Foreign Language Center.
- Webb, B. J., & Miller, B. L. (Eds.), (2000). *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom*. Yonkers. NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Project Narrative

Other Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1238-Cheng__2pageVita_April 09.pdf**

Attachment 2:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1239-StoneCV2page.pdf**

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME

An Chung Cheng

CONTACT ADDRESS

Department of Foreign Languages, MS 127, 2801 Bancroft Street, University of Toledo, Toledo, OH 43606
Phone: (419) 530-2146 (o); Fax: (419) 530-4954; E-mail: acheng@utoledo.edu

EDUCATION/TRAINING

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE	YEAR(S)	FIELD OF STUDY
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Ph.D.	1988-1995	Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio	M.A.	1985-1987	Latin American Studies
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio	M.A.	1986-1988	Spanish Pedagogy
Fu-Jen Catholic University, Taipei, Taiwan	B.A.	1981-1985	Spanish

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS:

- 2004-present Associate Professor, full graduate faculty, & Coordinator of Elementary and Intermediate Spanish Program, Department of Foreign Languages, University of Toledo, Ohio
- 1998-2004 Assistant Professor & Coordinator of Elementary and Intermediate Spanish Program, Department of Foreign Languages, University of Toledo, Ohio
- 1995-1998 Assistant Professor of Second Language Acquisition, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Southern Mississippi
Assistant Director, Master of Arts in the Teaching of Languages Program, University of Southern Mississippi
- 1995 Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:

- Member of Board of Directors, the Chinese Center of Toledo (Formally Toledo Chinese School), 2007-2009, 2009-2011
- Member of Board of Directors, the Ohio Chinese American Professional Association, 2002-2004
- McGraw-Hill Word Language Training and Advisory Board, 2008-present

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES:

Research interests: second/third language acquisition, input processing, grammar instruction, heritage language education, discourse analysis, and application of technology in language teaching

Selected Publications:

- Cheng, An Chung. (2009). Web-based instructional materials for *Dímelo tú: A Complete Course*, 6th ed. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Cheng, An Chung, Lu, Hui-Chuan, & Giannakouros, Panayotis. (2008). The Uses of Spanish Copulas by Chinese-Speaking Learners in a Free Writing Task. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 3, 301-317.
- Lu, Hei-Chuan & Cheng, An Chung (2007). Método de Procesamiento y Adquisición de la Selección de Verbos Copulativos por los Aprendices Taiwaneses. *Encuentros en Catay*, 269-287.
- Cheng, An Chung & Lu, Hei-Chuan. (2007) Form and meaning connections in foreign language acquisition: A case of form with semantic-aspectual values, *Journal of Humanities Research*, 3, 191-126
- Cheng, An Chung & Mojica-Díaz, Clara. (2006). A discourse approach to oral proficiency assessment in Spanish advanced learners studying abroad. In Casado Velarde, M., González Ruiz, R. and Romero Gualda, M.^a V. (Eds.), *Análisis del Discurso: Lengua, Cultura, Valores* (pp. 943-956). Madrid: Arco-Libros.
- Cheng, An Chung and Mojica-Díaz, Clara (2006). The Effects of formal instruction and study abroad on improving proficiency: The case of the Spanish subjunctive. *Applied Language Learning*, 16, 17-36.
- Cheng, An Chung. (2005). Web-based instructional materials for *Dimelo tu: A Complete Course*, 5th ed. Boston, MA: Thomson Heinle.
- Cheng, An Chung. (2004). Processing instruction and Spanish *ser* and *estar*: Forms with semantic-aspectual values.” In B. VanPatten, (Ed.) *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research and Commentary* (pp. 119-141). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc.
- Cheng, An Chung. (2003). The assessment of foreign languages in the U.S.: Evolution and perspectives.” *New Waves - Educational Research & Development*, 8(3): 6-13.
- Cheng, An Chung. (2002). The effects of processing instruction on the acquisition of *ser* and *estar*, *Hispania* 85, 2, 308-323.
- Cheng, An Chung. (2001). Assessing Language Ability in the Foreign Language Classroom: From Content Standards to Performance. *Proceedings of Annual International Conference of Chinese American Educational Research and Development Association (CAERDA)* (p. 117-123).
- Cheng, An Chung. (1999). Portfolio Assessment in Foreign Language Teacher Education, *Proceedings of Conference on Teacher Education and Teacher Evaluation*, (p. 237-252). National Kaohsiung Normal University Press, Taiwan.

Selected Conference Presentations:

- Cheng, A. C. (2007). Chinese language acquisition and maintenance by heritage language speakers and Chinese American immigrants in the United States. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of Chinese American Educational Research and Development Association, Chicago, IL.
- Cheng, A. C. (2003). Teaching grammar with structured input in Chinese. Paper presented at the annual East Asian LLEEP Conference, East Asian Studies Center, Ohio State University.

Selected Grant:

Recipient of research grant, the National Science Council, Executive Yuan, Taiwan, on “Corpus-based Study of Copula SER/ESTAR+ADJ in Spanish: Construction and Application of CATE-CIC and CPEC,” with Hui-Chuan Lu, August 2007-September 2008. (NT\$ 403,867=US\$12,238)

Education

Ph.D. (1995)	The University of Chicago	Measurement, Evaluation and Statistical Analysis
M.A. (1989)	Loyola University of Chicago	Psychology
B.A. (1986)	Shimer College	Liberal Arts

Employment

2008 – Present	Associate Professor, Research and Measurement University of Toledo, College of Education
2002 – Present	Assistant Professor, Research and Measurement University of Toledo, College of Education
1994 – Present	Managing Partner MetriKs Amérique LLC (formerly MetriKs Consulting Ltd.) Psychometric, Statistical, Evaluative, Survey Research, Expert Legal Testimony
2001 – 2002	Senior Management Analyst Testing Unit, Medical Quality Assurance State of Florida, Department of Health
1996 – 2001	Associate Executive Director Director of Testing and Measurement Dental Assisting National Board, Inc. (Chicago, Illinois)
1994 – 1996	Director of Test Evaluation and Research The National Certification Corporation for the Obstetric, Gynecologic and Neonatal Nursing Specialties (Chicago, Illinois)
1992 – 1994	Project Manager American Society of Clinical Pathologists (Chicago, Illinois)
1988 – 1992	Research Associate Chicago Child Care Society (Chicago, Illinois)

Professional and Community Engagement and Service Projects**The American Board for Certifying Teacher Excellence, Washington, D.C.**

Member, Board of Directors	2006 – Present
Chair, Research Committee	2006 – Present

BGSU/UT Office of Research Collaboration

Member, Board of Directors	2006 – 2009
Chair of Faculty Mentoring Committee	2007 – 2009

Journal of Applied Measurement, Richard Smith, Editor

Manuscript Reviewer	2001 – Present
Editorial Board	2006 – Present

Expertise in Instrumentation Development

The University of Leeds (United Kingdom)	2006 – Present
The University of Sheffield (United Kingdom)	2006 – Present

Selected Professional Presentations

- Stone, G. & Zhang, X. (2007). Influences on faculty grading at university: A multi-faceted Rasch analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Pacific Rim Objective Measurement Symposium, Hong Kong, June.
- Cahill, J., Stiles, W., Barkham, M., Agnew-Davies, R., & Stone, G. (2007). Short ARMs: Two short forms of the Agnew Relationship Measure. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Society for Psychotherapy Research, June.
- Beltyukova, S., Stone, G., Duran, E., Ballone-Duran, L., Haney, J., & Heddle, M. (2007). Using magnitude estimation scaling in measuring test efficacy and predicting test performance. Paper presented at the Hawaii International Conference on Education.

- Fox, C., Belyukova, S., & **Stone, G.** (2006). Analyzing how informants utilize rating scale options on the therapeutic work involvement scales. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Society for Psychotherapy Research, June.
- Stone, G. (2006). Best Assessment Practices. Paper presented at the Center for Teaching and Learning Faculty/Teaching Assistant Luncheon Seminars, November.
- Stone, G. (2003). Practical Solutions for Task Analyses. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Organization for Competency Assurance, Orlando, Florida, November.
- Belyukova, S., Fox, C. & **Stone, G.** (2003). Assessment of Student Satisfaction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, Tampa, Florida.

Selected Publications

- Elliott, R., Belyukova, S., Gunderson, J, Fox, C and **Stone, G.** (2007). Deconstructing Therapy Outcome Measurement with Rasch Analysis: The SCL-90-R. Psychological Assessment.
- Ladner, M. & **Stone, G.** (2007). A Test of Credibility: NAEP versus TerraNova Test Score Results in Arizona. Policy brief commissioned by the Goldwater Institute, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Zhang, X. & **Stone, G.** (2006). Faculty perceptions about grading university students: A pilot study using multi-faceted Rasch analysis. Proceedings from the 2006 Pacific Rim Objective Measurement Conference, Hong Kong, June.
- Belyukova, S., **Stone, G.** and Fox, C. (2004). Equating student satisfaction measures. Journal of Applied Measurement, 4, (2).
- Stone, G. (1996). A Survey of California Dental Patients: Safety and Licensure of Dental Assistants. Commissioned report prepared for the California Association of Dental Assisting Teachers. San Francisco, California.
- Stone, G. & Durley, C.C. (1996). Certified Dental Assistant Examination Validation. Chicago: Dental Assisting National Board, Inc.
- Stone, G. (1995). Making Meaning. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 310.

Selected Partially Compensated Activities

Teacher Education and Grant Evaluation. (2004). Project ASTER III. Bowling Green State University, Dr. Emilo Duran Project Director.

Grant Evaluator. (2003-2004). American Legacy Foundation Tobacco Cessation Grant Program. The University of Toledo School of Nursing., Dr. Celeste Baldwin, Project Director.

Budget Narrative

Budget Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1234-Cheng_Budget narrtive_fnl 2.pdf**

Attachment 2:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1235-Cheng-USDOED-4-21-09.pdf**

BUDGET NARRATIVE

1. Personnel:

Dr. An Chung Cheng (PI), AY salary \$61,110, (associate professor, specializing in second language acquisition and teacher education, in the Department of Foreign Language at the University of Toledo), will be responsible for the coordination of activities, financial management, scheduling, staffing, designing questionnaires, planning and implementing assessment tools, and reporting project results. She will devote 33% of her time during the academic year and full time during the summer (3 months) for three years. We request 33.34% of her summer salary from DOE (\$20,368) since activities are year-round. Each dollar amount is increased by 3% yearly.

Dr. Gregory Stone (Co-PI), AY salary \$84,143, (associate professor, specializing in measurement and assessment, in the Department of Foundations of Education at the University of Toledo) will be responsible for the design of survey and evaluation tools, statistic analysis and evaluation of the project, and the report of the research results. Dr. Stone will devote 16.67% of his time during the academic year and full time during the summer (3 months) for three years. We request \$14,027 from DOE toward the cost of released time. We request 20% of his summer salary from DOE (\$16,829) since activities are year-round. Each dollar amount is increased by 3% yearly.

Graduate research assistants (2 each term, F, SP, SU): Two graduate research assistants are requested to assist with (1) general project operations, (2) the maintenance of the project website and (3) data collection, data entry and analysis. The two graduate research assistant will be recruited from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Science (TESOL major). They will need to know both English and Chinese as well

as be familiar with data input in Chinese with word processing. The budget requested for the graduate research assistant of College of Education includes the academic year salaries (\$7,726) and summer stipends (\$2,060) for the first year with a 3% increase in year 2 and 3. The budget requested for the graduate research assistant of College of Arts and Sciences includes the academic year salaries (\$8,446) and summer stipends (\$3,605) for the first year with a 3% increase in year 2 and 3.

2. Fringe benefits

The University of Toledo's fringe benefits are calculated at 31.2% for faculty (\$15,982 in yr 1) and 1.90% for graduate students (\$415 in yr 1). Graduate student medical insurance of \$3,442 is included in the request (10% annual escalation). The total year 1 DOE request for fringe benefits is \$19,839. These are the current university published rates.

3. Travel

We budgeted the travel expenses of PI or Co-PI each year to collect data (interviews and focus-group discussions) at US conferences (e.g. ACTFL and CSAUS) for Chinese and foreign language educators and to disseminate the project information and findings. We will also travel by car to the Chinese community schools in Ohio and the regional states such as Michigan, Indiana, Illinois and Pennsylvania within 5 hours of driving distance to conduct interviews and focus-group discussions for approximately 3 trips (two persons each) each year. The estimates include one-night hotel stay (\$100 per person per night) and car mileage (\$330 max per trip) and per diem (\$30 per person per day). The estimate is \$2,000 per year for year 1 and year 2.

As the researcher attends national conferences, we will arrange interviews and focus-group discussions with administrators and instructors of Chinese heritage schools at the conference and the city of the conference sites. We plan to attend a three-day conference each year with estimated \$1,600 each trip, including hotel, flight, car and per diem.

4. Supplies*:

- (1) Survey materials: These are necessary for conducting, developing, or implementing the project. The items include supplies such as papers for questionnaires and photocopying (\$500 each year), telephone (\$100 each month for 11 months), postage for survey mailing and reminders (\$500 year 1 and 2, \$100 year 3), and refreshments and book gift cards (incentive) for participants in interviews and focus-group discussions (including onsite visits and online conferences via Skype) (\$60 each person x 15 persons x 5 sessions per year = \$ 4,500 for year 1 and year 2). We also request \$1,000 of books, DVD, CD ROM, computer software and other audio visual teaching materials needed for instructional materials assessment each year.
- (2) We request hardware and software in year 1 only that enable dual platforms for Mac and Windows environments. The mobility of Apple MacBook will be used for data organization, coding, and analysis in two languages and for presentations, focus-group discussion as well as film editing (focus sessions and best classroom practice). We request two sets each for the following: MacBook Pro. (\$2,599 each), Parallels Desktop 4.0 for Mac (\$79.95 each), Microsoft Office 2008 for Mac (\$149.95 each), Apple MagSafe Airline Adapter (\$49.00 each), and Apple

wireless Mighty Mouse (\$69.00 each). One digital video camcorder (\$800) and editing software, QuickTime 7 Pro (\$29.99 each) for two computers will be used in documenting focus-group discussions and the best classroom practices in Chinese. The total of hardware and software are \$6,754.

5. Other Costs:

- (1) We will purchase survey services from the two major national Chinese school organizations, NCACLS and CSAUS to reach out and contact Chinese schools and their members for data collection. (\$500 each, for a total of \$1,000, in year 1).
- (2) Consultants and external evaluator: The project will support the professional service of consultants (Dr. Shuhan C. Wang and Dr. Leigh Chiarelott) and an external evaluator (Dr. Scott McGinnis), well-known researchers in Chinese heritage language education. They will be paid a consulting fee of \$1,200/yr per person to assist with program evaluation and to help us modify the program to make it successful. The travel expenses for the external evaluator from Washington D.C. to Toledo (airfare, hotel, and per diem costs) are estimated at a total of \$900/yr. Dr. Shuhan Wang is Executive Director of Chinese Language Initiatives in Asia Society, author of several articles about heritage language education and Chinese language textbooks. She will serve as a consultant and work with the PI on assessment of instructional materials and evaluation of programs in Chinese Heritage schools. Dr. Leigh Chiarelott, Chair and Professor, Curriculum and Instruction Department at the University of Toledo, will serve as the curriculum consultant for the project. Dr. Chiarelott has nearly 40 years experience in education from the K12 level to the university level. He is the

author of two books and 30 articles on curriculum and teacher education and frequently consults with K-12 schools on curriculum design and professional development issues. For this project, he will work closely with the P.I.'s to identify key curriculum issues that emerge from the research and the implications of those issues for curriculum and instructional design. Dr. Scott McGinnis, to be served as external evaluator, is the Executive Director of the National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages, Associate for Less Commonly Taught Languages at the National Foreign Language Center in Washington, D.C. and faculty of Defense Language Institute–Washington Office. He has authored numerous journal articles and books on the teaching of Chinese language. Total: \$4,100 per year.

- (3) Awards for best practices of videos of classroom teaching (3 awards, \$300 each) and Unit/lesson plans (\$5 awards, \$200 each). \$1,900 for year 2 and year 3. The best practices will be posted on the project website.

Total Direct Costs

Total direct costs requested from DOE are \$115,953 year one, \$113,125 year two, and \$109,369 year three, (cumulative \$338,447).

Indirect Costs

Indirect costs were calculated at 45.5% modified total direct costs; \$52,759 year one, \$51,472 year two, and \$49,763 year three, (cumulative \$ 153,993)

The University of Toledo

3-Year Proposal Budget

Sponsoring Agency :
Principal Investigator :
Enter Project Period:

U.S. Dept of Education
An Chung Cheng
09/01/09 thru 08/31/12

Project Title: Maximizing the National Resource: Chinese as a Model for Heritage Language Development with Community Involvement
Program Name: International Research and Studies Program
(01) Research, Surveys and Studies CFDA 84.017A

				Spons 1	Other	UT 1		Spons 2	Other	UT 2		Spons 3	Other	UT 3		Spons Cumulative	Other	UT Cumulative	Combined CUMULATIVE
A. Salaries																			
Senior Personnel																			
			% Effort	Salary															
PI	An Chung Cheng	AY Effort	33.33%	\$ 61,110		20,368				20,979				21,608				62,955	62,955
	9 mo	AY Released	0.00%	\$ 61,110	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Summer	33.33%	\$ 61,110	20,368	-		20,979	-	-		21,608	-	-		62,955	-	-	62,955
Co-I 1	Gregory Stone	AY Effort	0.00%	\$ -		-				-				-					
	9 mo	AY Released	16.67%	\$ 84,143	14,027	-		14,447	-	-		14,880	-	-		43,354	-	-	43,354
		Summer	20.00%	\$ 84,143	16,829	-		17,333	-	-		17,853	-	-		52,015	-	-	52,015
		Senior Personnel Subtotal :			51,223	-	20,368		52,759	-	20,979		54,341	-	21,608	158,323	-	62,955	221,278
B. Other Personnel																			
			% Time	Ann'l Sal.															
	Post Doc Assoc(s)		0.00%	\$0	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Technical Support		0.00%	\$0	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Administrative		0.00%	\$0	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Students	# Sems	Edu	English															
Ed MS/AS English MS	Grad Rsrch Asst(s) Fall	2	3863	\$4,223	8,086	-		8,329	-	-		8,579	-	-		24,994	-	-	24,994
Ed MS/AS English MS	Grad Rsrch Asst(s) Spr	2	3863	\$4,223	8,086	-		8,329	-	-		8,579	-	-		24,994	-	-	24,994
Ed MS/AS English MS	Grad Rsrch Asst(s) Sum	2	2060	\$3,605	5,665	-		5,835	-	-		6,010	-	-		17,510	-	-	17,510
	Undergrad Students		0	\$0	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Students Not Enrolled		0	\$0	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Other Personnel Subtotal :			21,837	-	-		22,493	-	-		23,168	-	-	67,498	-	-	67,498
		Salaries Subtotal :			73,060	-	20,368		75,252	-	20,979		77,509	-	21,608	225,821	-	62,955	288,776
C. Fringe Benefits																			
			Year 1																
	PI/Dir		31.20%		6,355	-	6,355	6,545	-	6,545		6,742	-	6,742		19,642	-	19,642	39,284
	Co-I 1		31.20%		9,627	-	-	9,915	-	-		10,213	-	-		29,755	-	-	29,755
	Post Doc/Technical		31.20%		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Administrative		31.20%		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Graduate Students (enr.)		1.90%		415	-	-	427	-	-		440	-	-		1,282	-	-	1,282
fa/sp/su	Instr. Fees		\$5,729		-	-	34,374	-	-	37,811		-	-	41,592		-	-	113,777	113,777
fa sp	Medical Insurance	\$631	1,090		3,442	-	-	3,786	-	-		4,165	-	-		11,393	-	-	11,393
	Eng. Fees (optional)		\$0		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	General Fees (optional)		\$0		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Undergrad Students (enr.)		1.90%		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Students Not Enrolled		15.90%		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Fringe Benefits Subtotal :			19,839	-	40,729		20,673	-	44,356		21,560	-	48,334	62,072	-	133,419	195,491
		Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits :			92,899	-	61,097		95,925	-	65,335		99,069	-	69,942	287,893	-	196,374	484,267
D. Equipment																			
	Non-Capital				-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Non-Capital	(list)			-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	*Capital				-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	*Capital	(list)			-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Total Equipment :			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E. Travel																			
	Domestic	Chinese Schools in the region			2,000	-	-	2,000	-	-			-	-		4,000	-	-	4,000
	Domestic	Conferences			1,600	-	-	1,600	-	-		1,600	-	-		4,800	-	-	4,800
					3,600	-	-	3,600	-	-		1,600	-	-		8,800	-	-	8,800
		Total Travel :			3,600	-	-		3,600	-	-		1,600	-	-	8,800	-	-	8,800
G. Other Direct Costs																			
	Survey Supplies*				7,600	-	-	7,600	-	-		2,700	-	-		17,900	-	-	17,900
	Publications				-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Consultant and Evaluator Services				4,100	-	-	4,100	-	-		4,100	-	-		12,300	-	-	12,300
	Purchased Services - Data Collection				1,000	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		1,000	-	-	1,000
	Tuition (Not subject to F&A)				-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-

Computer, accessories, and software*	6,754	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,754	-	-	6,754
Awards of Best Practice*	-	-	-	1,900	-	-	1,900	-	3,800	-	-	3,800
Other Direct Costs without Subcontracts	19,454	-	-	13,600	-	-	8,700	-	41,754	-	-	41,754
Subcontracts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1) Subc. 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2) Subc. 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3) Subc. 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Other Direct Costs (Sect. G only):	19,454	-	-	13,600	-	-	8,700	-	41,754	-	-	41,754
Subcontract Base For F&A (max \$25K per subcontract)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MTDC:	115,953	61,097		113,125	65,335		109,369	69,942	338,447	-	196,374	534,821
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS:	115,953	61,097		113,125	65,335		109,369	69,942	338,447	-	196,374	534,821
Facilities & Admin. (F&A/Indirect) Costs Calculation:												
	Sponsor F&A Rate	UT F&A Rate										
Special F&A rate (subj. to approval!)	0.0%	N/A										
F&A (on MTDC excl. subcontracts):	45.5%	45.50%	52,759	27,799	51,472	29,727	49,763	31,824			89,350	89,350
Underrecovery of F&A												
Subcontract<\$25,000 1)	45.5%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subcontract<\$25,000 2)	45.5%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subcontract<\$25,000 3)	45.5%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL F&A:			52,759	27,799	51,472	29,727	49,763	31,824	153,993	-	89,350	243,344
TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST:	168,712	0	88,896		164,597	0	95,062		159,132	0	101,766	492,441
												285,724
												778,165