



USAID | INDIA
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

RFA-386-13-000002, Amendment #1
Amendment Date: April 18, 2013

USAID/India In-STEP Program

The RFA is amended to:

(I) Incorporate the following changes in Section I - Program Description:

1. Remove the administrator training component. All 110 (estimated) participants will be teacher educators.
2. The SOE shall be expected to cover incidental expenses for the participants while they are in the U.S., in addition to lodging, meals, and transport.
3. Include the names of Indian states from which the participants will be selected, which are: Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tripura, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal

The revised Program Description incorporating the above changes is provided in Annexure II of this amendment.

(II) Incorporate the following changes in Section IV – Technical Application Format:

1. Delete all references to “Administrators”
2. Prescribe 3 to 5 Key Personnel instead of 3

and;

(III) Include the Questions and Answers as listed in Annexure 1.

Annexure 1

Questions and Answers

Q1. Would the program funding cover the cost of air fares and visa for the trainees?

A1. Yes, the program funding covers the cost of air fares for travel to and from the U.S. and visas for the trainees.

Q2. Apart from having a school of education, are there particular characteristics that you are looking for in the institutions applying for the grant?

A2. Apart from the general information already included in the RFA, there are no additional particular characteristics that we are looking for in the institutions.

Q3. The RFA mentions that the SOE will develop a curriculum along with experts from MHRD. Will this happen sometime in August? What would be the timeline?

A3. We expect the award to be made in mid-July and that curriculum will be developed once the award has been made. However, MHRD has already developed a 2-year model elementary teacher education curriculum and the National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education (NCFTE). The In-STEP program should be broadly in line with these, in addition to incorporating relevant materials from the U.S. SOE. Below are the links to the model curriculum and the NCFTE:

<http://www.teindia.nic.in/js/Re envisioned two year ETE Programme 12 May.pdf>

http://www.ncte-india.org/publicnotice/NCFTE_2010.pdf

We would also suggest that applicants review the MHRD teacher education website for more information about the Indian education system and specifically, teacher training in India. In particular, please see the following links:

MHRD Teacher Education Website:

<http://www.teindia.nic.in/Default.aspx>

Joint Review Missions: Reports 2013 found at:

<http://www.teindia.nic.in/jrm.aspx>

Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators found at:

<http://www.teindia.nic.in/voices.aspx>

Q4. The RFA mentions that the SOE needs to provide laptops and internet access to the candidates. The college has a strong infrastructure to support internet access. Would the

laptops be an allowable expense under the grant funding?

A4. Yes, the laptops, which need to be provided only for the duration of the course, are an allowable expense.

Q5. Is the awardee expected to provide health insurance to participants while they are in the US?

A5. Yes, the awardee will need to provide health insurance for the entire time that participants are in the U.S.

Q6. Are the college's student fees an allowable expense? These fees would allow participants to use non-academic facilities such as the college's swimming pool and exercise rooms.

A6. If required by the SOE.

Q7. The RFA states that the first group would arrive about Sept. 15, 2013 and the second would arrive about Sept. 15, 2014, which makes for about 1.5 years total. However, the RFA states that it should be a 2.5 year award. Please confirm that 2.5 years is correct and state when the correct date would be for the project to end.

A7. The 2.5 years is the correct time period for the project end date. In addition to the course requirement, the SOE will need to complete the monitoring and evaluation requirements and any other project wrap-up.

Q8. Is the target audience elementary school teachers (K- 8 teachers) only, or are secondary school educators also included?

A8. The vast majority of participants will be teacher educators responsible for training elementary school teachers, grades 1-8. However, there may be a small number of teacher educators who also train teachers of grades 9-10.

Q9. Since the RFA mentions inclusive education, will some of the participants be special education teachers or general education teachers working with students with disabilities?

A9. A small number of teachers may work with students with disabilities.

Q10. Page 14 of the RFA talks about a visit by US experts for mid-course analysis to determine whether the training benefited the stakeholders. Will this be accomplished by bringing a randomly selected group of teacher educators to a central place to evaluate their implementation of what they have learned, or will we need to conduct field visits to randomly selected states to observe actual implementation?

A10. For the mid-course analysis, US SOE faculty should anticipate traveling to visit some of the participants at their teacher education institutes to observe actual

implementation and to discuss their experiences. The faculty should also anticipate meeting with state officials and teacher education experts.

Q11. Will we need to budget for the travel of all participants?

A11. Yes.

Q12. How many administrators do you anticipate will join the group? The RFA mentions 50 – 60 teacher educators.

A12. The RFA has been amended to eliminate the administrator participants. All of the participants will be teacher educators.

Q13. How many proposals are you expecting?

A13. Unfortunately, we cannot provide procurement sensitive information.

Q14. We understand that the budget needs to include round-trip airfare between India/USA. In order to do an accurate budget, we need to know if the participants will be expected to make their way (on their budget) to a major airport, like the Indira Gandhi International Airport of New Delhi or Calicut International Airport of Calicut?

A14. All of the participants' travel to the U.S. SOE will need to be budgeted, including the Indian leg.

Q15. Please tell us about room arrangements. Can same-gender people share rooms? Is there a preference for type of housing for the? For example, is it preferable that they have cooking facilities (as opposed to the dining hall)?

A15. Yes, same gender people can share rooms. All meals should be provided to the participants, rather than simply providing cooking facilities.

Q16. Has anybody ever hosted the IN-STEP Program before? If so, who? And, will this institution be submitting a proposal again? If so, will this institution have an advantage as an incumbent?

A16. This is the first time we are implementing this program. As such, there are no incumbent contractors or recipients.

Q17. I am correct that there is no cost-sharing requirement, right?

A17. There is no cost-sharing requirement and it is not part of the evaluation criteria.

Q18. Who handles the visas? And what type of visa do they enter with?

A18. The participants enter on a J1 visa. The consular section grants the visa; USAID/India facilitates and coordinates the process with assistance from the awardee (may be through a sub-awardee) who furnishes all necessary documentation and support to USAID for the purpose.

Q19. Do the participants have medical insurance or should that be part of the budget?

A19. Health insurance for the participants should be part of the budget. Please see page 41 of the RFA for additional information.

Q20. Is there a restriction regarding how much of the percentage can go to personnel?

A20. No, there is no restriction regarding the percentage of the budget that can go to personnel.

Q21. Is there an estimate regarding how much of the budget should be earmarked for an evaluation? Formal evaluations often are earmarked for 15% of a grant's budget.

A21. The recipient is expected to include as part of their proposal and proposed budget an illustrative performance monitoring and evaluation plan (PMEP), as discussed on pages 33-36 of the RFA. However, the recipient is not expected to conduct an impact evaluation of the project. As noted on page 35 of the RFA, at the mid-term and the end of the program, USAID will undertake an independent performance and impact evaluation of the program. This will be paid for from separate funds.

Q22. What English language ability will the teacher educators possess? Is there a base TOFEL score?

A22. There is no base TOFEL score. Participants are expected to have low to medium-level English, and it would be beneficial to both participants and SOE faculty to have some Hindi language assistants available to ensure a full understanding of the course.

Q23. How will academic and leadership qualifications of the participants be assured?

A23. MHRD has assured that they will ensure that participants have academic and leadership qualifications as per parameters listed in the RFA (page 11). Efforts will also be made to ensure that the majority of the participants are in leadership positions or are in line for a leadership role. Only those with a track record of achievement will be selected.

Q24. Will the needs assessment and benchmark survey take place exclusively during Workshop I, or will these be additional responsibilities for the faculty during the trip to India? Are the needs assessment and benchmark survey the only responsibilities of the faculty during Workshop I? (The “also” is somewhat ambiguous.)

A24. There are several purposes for the SOE faculty trip to India. These include gaining familiarity with the Indian education system and the specific challenges faced by the

participant teacher educators, conducting a needs assessment and benchmark survey, and conducting a pre-departure orientation for the participant teacher educators. These will be achieved by conducting visits to relevant institutions and by participating in a two-part workshop. Please see pages 11-12 for additional information.

Q25. The RFP talks about “free” shuttle service. We are a very walkable community...distances are measured in BLOCKS, not miles. Is walking appropriate?

A25. Yes.

Q26. The RFA states that “participants should be able to access and use these [virtual] systems during the course and upon their return to India.” Will we be provided insights into the types and kinds of technology to which the participants have access?

A26. In India, participants will have access to basic computers with broad band access and mobile phones.

Q27. How strongly “encouraged” are the partnerships between the GOI and private sector?

A27. We would like to see the relationship between the GOI and the SOE sustained beyond the lifetime of this project, and believe that the private sector could be instrumental in helping to fund further collaboration. The applications will be evaluated based on the criteria set forth in Section V of the RFA.

Q28. How long are the teacher educators in the US? The document repeated says 3-5 months. This seems crucial to pin down for budgetary considerations. We have three-term semesters...so a program that runs September – December (3 months) seems like it would fit the rhythm of our institution. Are three month programs viewed equally as strong as 5 month programs?

A28. Yes.

Q29. When do the administrators arrive? Is there only one group of 10? Are they provided with the same accommodations, etc., as the teacher educators?

A29. The RFA has been amended to eliminate the administrator participants. All of the participants will be teacher educators.

Q30. How many “key personnel” are allowed? “Not to exceed 3”? Yet p. 11 lists 3-4. Again, this impacts the budget.

A30. Three to five key personnel are allowed. Please note that the reference on page 11 to 3-4 faculty members refers to faculty who would come to India before the arrival in the U.S. of the first group of teacher educators to learn more about the India education system and to provide an orientation for the teacher educators. These faculty members

are not necessarily the key personnel for the program. The SOE may choose to involve personnel over and above the key personnel to carry out various responsibilities during the implementation of the program.

Q31. Selection of Teacher Educator and Administrator Participants (page 11), while we understand that these selections will be made by MHRD, in order to better design a curriculum, it will help us to know a bit more about the teacher educators and administrators.

(a) In particular we would like to know their educational background and types of institutions they will come from (especially for administrators will they be from the BRC, CRC, DIETs or other institutions?)

(b) Also based on the RFA, we are unclear about the number of administrators we may expect per visit.

A31(a). Participants will come from SCERTS, DIETS, CTEs, and IASEs. They will have various education backgrounds: B.Ed, M.Ed, or Ph.Ds and will have extensive experience of teaching pre-service and in-service teachers.

(b). The RFA has been revised to eliminate the administrator participants. All of the participants will be teacher educators.

Q32. If we have two co-directors, are we able to identify two more people as key personnel. (Page 22, (b) Key Personnel)

A32. Yes, there can be three to five key personnel.

Q33. Can the SOE budget modest stipend to the course participants for incidentals? (note on the bottom of the page 13)

A33. The SOE needs to make specific arrangements for lodging, meals, the use of laptops, and transportation to and from the university, if applicable. The SOE should also budget an additional amount for incidentals, and the RFA has been revised to reflect the necessity for applicants to include this expense in their budgets. In short, the SOE is responsible for all participant expenses, save personal ones, for the duration of their stay in the U.S.

Q34. Are we expected to provide a certain level of support from the budget that goes directly to identified Indian institutions? If yes, what percentage should we expect? Additionally, how will disbursement of funds and logistics (i.e. travel, pre-departure arrangements, paperwork etc.) on the ground in India be handled? Can we identify a local Indian based and/or a US based institution that has experience and expertise in this area as partner to assist with the logistics?

A34. All funds will be routed through the awardee. The SOE is responsible for travel expenses, pre-departure arrangements, paperwork, etc., but can subcontract this work to a local partner or other entity. The SOE may wish to consult with MHRD about the best options for this aspect of the project. Please see page 22 of the RFA for more information.

Q35. We recently hosted an international educator academic residency teacher training program that included teachers from India, Nepal and Bangladesh – is it possible to involve them in pre-departure and project support efforts?

A35. As stated in the RFA, the SOE is welcome to subcontract the logistical work in India to another entity. Please see page 22 of the RFA for more information.

Q36. Our University has extensive experience in international teacher education programs, curriculum development, education reforms efforts including in developing nations (Afghanistan, South Africa, Poland, Ukraine, Morocco, Russia) and experience/expertise in India, but not specific to teacher education. How important would this specific teacher education experience in India be in the selection of the award?

A36. Applications will be evaluated based on the criteria set forth in Sections IV and V of the RFA.

Q37. When we read the FRA-386-13-000002 we all felt the guidelines were comprehensive and well-articulated. However, on a careful read faculty requests clarity on the grades levels of program purpose, objectives, and design of this RFA. In the introduction the RFA refers to K-12 school teacher development while in the delineated curricular guidelines and course work the RFA refers to K-8 teachers and omits high school.

A confirmation would help us to focus on the grades levels required to address in the RFA submission.

A37. The vast majority of participants will be teacher educators responsible for training elementary school teachers, grades 1-8. However, there may be a small number of teacher educators who also train teachers of grades 9-10.

Q38. Our university is interested in submitting an application for USAID India grant (RFA-386-13-000002). We have one question to be clarified: shall we provide customized training for K-12 OR K-8 school teachers from India?

A38. The vast majority of participants will be teacher educators responsible for training elementary school teachers, grades 1-8. However, there may be a small number of teacher educators who also train teachers of grades 9-10.

1. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION (REVISED)

A. PROGRAM PURPOSE

Through this RFA, USAID/India seeks a U.S. School of Education (SOE) to implement a three to five month customized teacher training program for approximately 110 teacher educators from India. The first group of 50 plus teacher educators would arrive in the U.S. on or around September 15, 2013 and the second group on or around September 15, 2014. The purpose of the proposed project, the India – Support for Teacher Education Program (In-STEP), is to build the capacity of Indian teacher educators by exposing them to the talent, methodologies, and expertise offered by U.S. Schools of Education (SOEs). It is expected that these teacher educators will take the practices and methodologies learned in the U.S. and apply them to the Indian context.

U.S. SOEs are active stakeholders in the U.S. school system, engaged in activities ranging from K-12 curriculum development, classroom practices, materials development, assessment, teacher training, and continuing professional development of K-12 teachers. Teacher educators from India can learn from their U.S. counterparts how teacher education can and should lead to concrete improvements in K-12 education, and how school teachers can be effectively mentored. As the teacher educators go on to train school teachers in India, both at the pre-service and in-service levels, their new skills will help improve curriculum and materials development, teaching practices of teachers, and student assessment, and ultimately lead to improved learning among students in schools.

B. BACKGROUND

India's National Policy on Education 1986 (NPE) recommended improvement in the status and professional competence of teachers as the cornerstone of educational reconstruction. It envisaged teacher education as a continuous process with pre-service and in-service training being its inseparable components. It emphasized the significance and need for a decentralized system for the professional preparation of teachers and led to the establishment of the District Institutes of Teacher Education (DIETs) under the national government's Scheme for Restructuring and Re-organization of Teacher Education 1987.

In recent times, positive developments in the area of school education, such as the formulation of the National Curriculum Framework 2005 (NCF)—which emphasizes a constructivist approach to teaching and learning and advocates connecting knowledge to life outside the school—and enforcement of the Right to Education Act 2009 (RtE Act)—which guarantees the right to eight years of free and compulsory quality education to all children through the provision of specified minimum infrastructure, qualified teachers, and a fear-free, encouraging environment—have led the Government of India (GOI) to plan for robust reforms in its school and teacher education systems.

In 2009, the GOI-funded autonomous institution, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), introduced the National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education (NCFTE), which was developed with inputs and close engagement from universities and institutions such as the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). This framework has been prepared in the backdrop of the NCF and advocates for: (a) reflective practice to be the central aim of teacher education; (b) provision of opportunities for self-learning and reflection to trainee teachers; (c) assimilation and articulation of new ideas; and (d) provision of opportunities to trainee teachers to observe and engage with children and communicate with and relate to children.

Over the last few years, the GOI engaged with a wide range of development partners and leading NGOs to critically examine various aspects of teacher education, development, and management through a series of conferences, and, in 2012, revised its original Scheme for Restructuring and Re-organization of Teacher Education. The revised scheme emphasizes the need for contextualized solutions for different categories of states that have specific sets of issues in teacher education. It also advocates for forging strong links between teacher education and higher education, such as developing institutional arrangements with university departments of education, and developing professionalism and capacity building of teacher educators through faculty development programs and exposure visits. The new USAID In-STEP activity will complement the efforts of the GOI to reform its teacher education system.

C. PROGRAM SUMMARY

Through the RtE Act, India has committed to providing quality education to all children in the country. The existence of large numbers of untrained teachers in the school system, coupled with the provisions of the RtE Act, such as the prescription of a pupil teacher ratio of 1:30, the prescribed standards for teacher qualification, and the emphasis on child-centered teaching and learning, have created an unprecedented demand for high quality initial teacher education and teacher professional development. Currently, the quality of teacher education both at the pre-service and continuous professional development levels is uneven and tilted towards traditional, theoretical methods and needs re-orientation in line with current frameworks. There is also a clear need to address quantity and quality. A third critical dimension is the need to focus on equity. A teaching approach that recognizes and promotes contextualization, inclusion, multiculturalism, education as a child's right, etc., is currently weak in the Indian school system.

The challenge before India is to recognize the role of teacher educators in transforming school education in India, and help build their capacity to do this effectively so that they can prepare high caliber teachers. However, currently teacher educator preparation programs are largely theoretical and provide little opportunity to engage in reflective practice. The Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) of the GOI has embarked upon an ambitious initiative for a comprehensive re-structuring of the teacher education system. The re-structuring focuses on integrating teacher education with

overall education development in the states, and recognizes that capacity-building of teacher educators is essential for the transformation being planned to achieve a measurable enhancement in the performance of teachers and students. In-STEP will support MHRD's endeavor by building the capacity of teacher educators through their participation in a customized, needs-based training course offered by a U.S. university, developed in consultation with Indian experts.

The primary objective of In-STEP is to improve the professional capacity of teacher educators as a means of improving the quality of current and future school teachers. The capacity of the Indian teacher educators is expected to be strengthened through a three to five month long customized capacity building program designed by the U.S. School(s) of Education in consultation with their Indian counterparts. Woven into this course will be an exposure to the U.S. SOEs' own teacher preparation, school engagement, classroom pedagogies, material development, and research. As part of this customized, needs-based training, Indian teacher educators will prepare a long essay which sets forth a clear proposal for reform of a specific area of teacher education in his/her State and will receive mentoring from the U.S. SOE on the development of this essay. In addition, they will undergo a core course in teacher education, observe school and teacher education practices, participate in colloquia, and study teaching-learning materials and other learning resources used by the U.S. SOE.

As the eastern and north-eastern Indian states have the highest numbers of untrained teachers in the system, the highest need for more teachers in light of the RtE Act, and the least technical and financial resources, In-STEP will focus on these. The final selection of states will be done by MHRD. In-STEP will limit its reform focus to government-funded teacher education institutions as the government has direct control over their management. It is expected, however, that through the State Councils for Research and Training or SCERTs (the state level government-funded nodal agencies which are responsible for the development and implementation of curriculum for pre-service teacher education courses across government and private institutions), the reforms will spread and positively impact private teacher training institutions as well.

D. TECHNICAL APPROACH

(1) Situational Analysis

School education in India faces many challenges, some of which are:

- Teaching continues to be rote-based, with little emphasis on comprehension.
- The constructivist approach emphasized by the NCF 2005 is yet to find traction in schools.
- Teachers and teacher educators are not well-oriented towards rights-based approaches, contextualization, teaching-learning pedagogies and child development theories.
- The RtE Act emphasizes child-centered teaching in a fear-free environment, but teachers do not know how to operationalize this concept in the classroom.

- The teachers' own schooling experience is of rote-based learning, and they need re-orientation.

There are large inter-state variations in the percentage of teachers without requisite qualifications, vacancy of teacher posts, and additional requirements of teachers under the RtE Act and the capacity of teacher education institutions to provide professionally sound teacher education. The eastern states, such as Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal, have very high numbers of untrained teachers and teacher vacancies, inadequate capacity to provide effective teacher preparation, and the greatest need for additional teachers as required by the RtE Act. Based on the above, the MHRD sees a clear need to prioritize reform efforts that focus on eastern and north-eastern states.

Private teacher training institutions have multiplied in India in the last decade or so. As of March 2009, while there were only 529 functional DIETs¹, 104 Colleges of Teacher Education (CTEs), and 31 Institutes of Advanced Studies in Education (IASEs)² - in all, 664 government-funded institutions - there were well over 11,000 private teacher education institutions.³ All teacher education in the country is accredited and controlled by the NCTE, but the NCTE has extremely limited technical capacity, and has itself come under criticism and scrutiny for corruption and for allowing sub-standard private institutions to be established. Although the GOI is currently engaged in a massive exercise of re-organizing and strengthening the NCTE, and the status of accreditation of teacher education institutions is expected to improve, this will likely take at least a couple of years. The interest of the GOI at this stage is in supporting the teacher education institutions that are both funded and managed by the government itself. The In-STEP activity will therefore directly focus only on government-funded institutions in participating states by working with and building capacity of their faculty.

(2) The Rationale

Why the Primary Focus on Teacher Educators?

- Teacher educators are the key human resource in the education system; the quality of their preparation is an appropriate starting point for reforms.
- Teacher educators are directly responsible for teacher quality; they are the first resource with whom trainee teachers come into contact, and they play a critical role in the continuous professional development of teachers.
- Teacher educators have the highest levels of qualifications in the system, and are professionally expected to lead and catalyze change, especially in the socio-cultural and pedagogic domains of education.
- Quality, contextualization, rights-based approach, and inclusion have to begin with teacher educators, through their own development, empowerment, orientation, and exposure to quality schools and teacher education systems, approaches and methodologies.

¹ DIETs prepare teachers for elementary education

² CTEs prepare Secondary School teachers and IASEs prepare teacher educators

³ National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education, 2009

Why a U.S. School of Education (SOE)?

The GOI has had a long history of collaboration with U.S. higher education institutions in various sectors such as science, technology, management and agriculture. In-STEP would be GOI's first collaborative reform initiative in the teacher education sector.

The U.S. is an ideal partner from which India can learn. Both countries follow the democratic system of governance with a federal structure and both are geographically large, with large, diverse populations. The U.S. has a long history of civil rights based public schooling and universal education that India is currently attempting. The U.S. SOEs are closely and systematically involved in teacher preparation, continuous professional development of teachers, school reforms, and school-based teacher education, research, and materials development. The peer reviewed system of accreditation of SOEs, and the large networks of organizations for teacher development and research offer tremendous opportunities for learning. The training of Indian teacher educators by the U.S. SOEs will provide an opportunity to the former to experience the many facets of teacher-school-university linkages. This, along with mentoring from the SOE faculty, is expected to trigger ideas that will inform their essay detailing a proposal for reform that is part of this activity.

3) Program Description

(i) Objectives

The primary objective of In-STEP is to improve the professional capacity of teacher educators as a means of improving the quality of current and future teachers. Through a three to five month customized training program for teacher educators offered in the U.S. and designed by faculty from U.S. SOE in consultation with their Indian counterparts, the capacity of teacher educators will be enhanced. The implementing partner will be responsible for several steps, including consultation, planning, and design, which will precede the commencement of the course. The U.S. SOE will consult with the MHRD during this process and throughout the program. The teacher educators will attend the course in two batches of about fifty each with one batch beginning the course in September 2013 and the second in September 2014. As part of the training program, each teacher educator will also prepare a long essay which sets forth a clear proposal for reform of a specific area of teacher education in his/her State. This proposal will be developed and refined with support from the U.S. SOE. These proposals will be presented to MHRD, which will encourage the respective States to implement them. The Indian teacher educators are expected to implement their new skills and knowledge in their classrooms, resulting in better-trained, higher quality teachers who have the capacity to address many of the challenges facing school education in India, and help improve student learning outcomes.

Through In-STEP, it is expected that an effective model will be developed that MHRD will be able to replicate in various states and teacher education institutions in India, combining its own resources and the resources leveraged from private sector

stakeholders.

(ii) Steps Involved

a. Selection of Teacher Educator Participants from India

MHRD will select an estimated 110 participants from among the teacher educators in IASEs, SCERTs, and DIETs, staff from Block Resource Centers (BRCs) and Cluster Resource Centers (CRCs)⁴. These participants will come from the following eastern and northeastern states: Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tripura, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and West Bengal. This mix of participants, as well as covering a larger number of DIETS in the selected states, will allow for intensive and focused reform in the states. MHRD will select teacher educators through a rigorous process using three main criteria, in addition to their having the minimum qualification prescribed by NCTE:

- Academic: core competency in a discipline, ability to conceptualize and abstract from experiences and readings, capacity for reflective action.
- Leadership: engagement with schools, teachers, students and communities.
- Basic fluency in written and spoken English, ability to use the internet, and good written and oral communication skills.

MHRD has indicated that at least 50% of the candidates will be women. In addition, teacher educators from the marginalized communities of India, such as the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, minorities, and persons with disabilities, will be proportionally represented.

While the U.S. SOE will have no active role in the selection process, it is important that the U.S. SOE is aware that USAID has an understanding with MHRD that the participants selected by MHRD will have the requisite academic, leadership, and communication skills, as defined above, i.e., the best of the available pool of teacher educators.

b. Visit by select faculty from the U.S. SOE and Teacher Educator Orientation

Select faculty (3-4 members) of the implementing U.S. SOE will visit India for about ten days to two weeks to familiarize themselves with the Indian teacher education systems and conduct a needs assessment and benchmark survey of the teacher educators. They will achieve this by visiting relevant institutions and participating in a workshop with the selected teacher educators and Indian experts—eminent teacher educators, educational researchers, and policymakers. In addition, during this same trip, the select faculty will provide an orientation workshop to the teacher educators to prepare them for their visit to the U.S.

⁴ BRCs and CRCs are entities comprising expert teachers that provide on-site academic support to school teachers.

Workshop 1: The selected Indian educators and Indian education experts will familiarize the U.S. SOE with the Indian teacher education system, including the challenges and opportunities particular to the Indian teacher education system. The selected teacher educators will discuss the issues and challenges they have encountered with respect to pre-service and in-service teacher training, as well as the teacher education reform areas around which they plan to conduct deeper inquiry while in the U.S. The U.S. SOE will also conduct a needs assessment and benchmark survey of the teacher educators.

Workshop 2: The select faculty of the implementing U.S. SOE and Indian experts will jointly conduct an orientation for the selected teacher educators. This workshop will provide an overview of the U.S. system and the thrust of the reforms in India. While the Indian experts will orient teacher educators about the overall contemporary issues in India, and the thrust of the 12th Five Year Plan of India in the area of teacher education, faculty from the U.S. SOE will orient the selected teacher educators to the education system in the U.S., the facilities and support that the participants will be provided with, life and culture in the U.S., the course modules, assessment criteria, and other details. The teacher educators will discuss their expectations and explain the socio-cultural milieu from which they come.

MHRD will set up a Steering Committee comprising Indian experts and policy makers. With help from the Steering Committee, MHRD will design the workshop, select the Indian experts who will lend their expert services at the workshop, facilitate the workshop proceedings, and organize interaction of the U.S. SOE Faculty with Indian experts to deepen their understanding of the Indian education and teacher education systems and practices.

c. Development of a suitable curriculum

The U.S. SOE faculty, together with the Indian experts identified by MHRD, will develop the curriculum and training modules for a three to five month course, customized to the needs of the selected teacher educators. The curriculum for the teacher educator course will include: (i) one core course in elementary teacher education in any of the following: language education, science and mathematics education, education curriculum and instruction, psychology, sociology, or learning research, or other relevant course; and (ii) visit to K-8 schools to observe classrooms, participation in research colloquia, seminars, and workshops, classroom observations of in-service and pre-service teacher education, shadowing teacher educators, study of learning resources in use, and study of assessment techniques of schools and SOEs.

The U.S. SOE will ensure that the concepts of constructivism and inclusion are incorporated into the program. The program could include participation in existing activities where appropriate and incorporating relevant portions of existing short term, off-the-shelf courses already available with the U.S. SOE as well as specially created modules. The visiting faculty, in consultation with Indian experts, will also develop guidelines for the long essay reform proposal that each of the participant teacher educators will prepare (please see section ‘e’ below for details regarding the desired

characteristics of the reform proposals).

The MHRD's Steering Committee will select the Indian academics and practitioners who will work with the U.S. SOE to develop the curriculum and its evaluation.

d. Course for Teacher Educators

Broadly, the three to five month course in the U.S. SOE will comprise:

- One core course in elementary teacher education (language education, science and mathematics education, curriculum and instruction, psychology, sociology, or learning research, or other relevant course).
- Study visit to K-8 schools, including to those attached to the School of Education.
- Participation in workshops related to school level reform initiatives that the SOE is a part.
- Participation in research colloquia of the SOE.
- Observation of pre-service teacher education classrooms.
- Observation of in-service teacher education classrooms.
- Shadowing of teacher trainees and teacher educators.
- Study of materials used by teachers, trainee teachers, and teacher educators.
- Study of assessment mechanisms in teacher and school education.
- Development of a long essay which sets forth a clear proposal for reform of a specific area of teacher education in his/her State.

The U.S. SOE, in consultation with USAID, MHRD, and Indian teacher educators, will develop standards/norms of demonstrated knowledge and skills that each of the Indian participants will be expected to acquire through the course, and will assess each participant on the basis of these standards.

Note: The U.S. SOE will make comfortable but modest stay arrangements (on-campus or near campus such that free shuttle services can be availed) for the two groups of participants and food arrangements (all meals) for the duration of their stay. Additionally, the SOE will cover incidental expenses for the participants while they are in the U.S. The U.S. SOE will also provide an orientation on computer skills to the participants, e.g., an introduction to power point presentations, the internet, various search engines, and other information technology mechanisms commonly used in U.S. universities such as Skype. The U.S. SOE will also be responsible for provision of laptops for the duration of the course, setting up designated websites for the teams, video-conferencing, and facilitating for the participants the use of other virtual systems commonly used by the U.S. SOE. The participants should be able to access and use these systems during the course and upon their return to India.

e. Criteria for the Long Essay Reform Proposal

Each of the Indian educators will prepare a draft reform proposal before departing to the U.S. for the course. These proposals will contribute to the GOI mandate of strengthening the Indian education system, as well as the overall objective of In-STEP, namely, "to strengthen capacity of Indian teacher educators to enable them to improve teacher quality and eventually student learning outcomes." These proposals to reform a specific area of

the teacher education system in India must be developed taking the following into consideration:

- Cost-effectiveness of the reform proposal
- Potential for replication of the reform proposal
- Sustainability of the proposed reform initiative
- Partnerships proposed: Each proposal should propose partnerships to strengthen the impact of the initiative. These could be partnerships with individual groups or institutions, community, Panchayati Raj (local self-government), Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), which is the GOI initiative on school education for all, schools, women and youth groups, NGOs, private organizations, foundations, business leaders, and social entrepreneurs.
- Expected Impact: Each reform proposal will need to clearly define the expected impact of the proposed work in terms of magnitude, reach, quantity, and quality.

While reform proposals must be rigorous and robust, care must also be taken to ensure that there are no unrealistic goals set forth in the long essays. Each participant teacher educator will then refine the reform proposal and develop it into a long essay with mentoring and guidance from the faculty of the U.S. SOE. Upon the teacher educators' return, the MHRD will encourage the respective States to implement the reform proposals.

f. Visit by the U.S. experts for mid-course analysis

One or two relevant faculty from the U.S. SOE will undertake one visit of not more than five days to analyze how the training they offered to the Indian teacher educators is benefitting the stakeholders, what gaps exist, and how the training can be improved for the second batch of teacher educators.

g. Leveraging of Resources and Program Sustainability

Although the program is funded for only two years, it is expected that the impact on the Indian education system will be long-term. MHRD will ensure that among the teacher educators are professionals from the Institute of Advanced Study in Education or other institutes of higher learning of each participating State in order to help foster a center of teaching excellence in each of those States.

In addition, the program is encouraged to develop a mechanism for long-term partnership between the U.S. SOE, the GOI, and Indian teacher training institutions, such as the establishment Education Chairs, to foster further collaboration, research, and exchanges between U.S. and Indian educators. However, funding for such a partnership is outside the scope of this activity.

Finally, the program is encouraged to forge partnerships with and leverage resources from various players, and especially from the private sector. Identification and development of public private partnerships in U.S. and in India that would contribute to the long-term sustainability and expansion or "scaling-up" of program elements are encouraged from the very beginning of the program.

(iii) Expected results from the program:

By the end of the program, it is expected that the participating teacher educators will have substantially improved their professional capacities, which will benefit current and future teachers, and will have developed a teacher education reform proposal that can be implemented in their respective States.

In-STEP will form part of MHRD's ambitious initiative for a comprehensive restructuring of the teacher education system. MHRD has developed robust indicators to gauge the success of all of its teacher education reform programs. Examples of MHRD indicators into which the USAID-funded program will contribute are:

- How many faculty members at the DIET/CTE/IASE/SCERT were deputed for conferences, went on study leave, and undertook exposure visits?
- What has been the most "talked-about" process improvement in the year within the DIET/CTE/IASE/SCERT?
- Has there been positive feedback on the Diploma in Education program by student teachers? Are there records of the same?
- Percentage of DIET students who cleared the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET)

USAID Illustrative indicators for In-STEP include:

- Number of teacher educators (by gender) trained under In-STEP
 - Number of long essay reform plans developed
 - Percentage of teacher educators passing the post training assessment
- Number of reform proposals championed by MHRD for implementation by states