Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Telephone: 412-268-2434
Email: huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu
Web site: www.huntbotanical.org

The Hunt Institute is committed to making its collections accessible for research. We are pleased to offer this digitized item.

Usage guidelines
We have provided this low-resolution, digitized version for research purposes. To inquire about publishing any images from this item, please contact the Institute.

Statement on harmful and offensive content
The Hunt Institute Archives contains hundreds of thousands of pages of historical content, writing and images, created by thousands of individuals connected to the botanical sciences. Due to the wide range of time and social context in which these materials were created, some of the collections contain material that reflect outdated, biased, offensive and possibly violent views, opinions and actions. The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation does not endorse the views expressed in these materials, which are inconsistent with our dedication to creating an inclusive, accessible and anti-discriminatory research environment. Archival records are historical documents, and the Hunt Institute keeps such records unaltered to maintain their integrity and to foster accountability for the actions and views of the collections' creators.

Many of the historical collections in the Hunt Institute Archives contain personal correspondence, notes, recollections and opinions, which may contain language, ideas or stereotypes that are offensive or harmful to others. These collections are maintained as records of the individuals involved and do not reflect the views or values of the Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation or those of Carnegie Mellon University.

About the Institute
The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation, a research division of Carnegie Mellon University, specializes in the history of botany and all aspects of plant science and serves the international scientific community through research and documentation. To this end, the Institute acquires and maintains authoritative collections of books, plant images, manuscripts, portraits and data files, and provides publications and other modes of information service. The Institute meets the reference needs of botanists, biologists, historians, conservationists, librarians, bibliographers and the public at large, especially those concerned with any aspect of the North American flora.

Hunt Institute was dedicated in 1961 as the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, an international center for bibliographical research and service in the interests of botany and horticulture, as well as a center for the study of all aspects of the history of the plant sciences. By 1971 the Library's activities had so diversified that the name was changed to Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation. Growth in collections and research projects led to the establishment of four programmatic departments: Archives, Art, Bibliography and the Library.

Ticket for:

Welcome to the friendly skies of United

Please show this wallet to the stewardess as you board your United flight.

DCA UA D USED

Gate 18
4 10 pm

Issued By SOLD SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT ON PASSENGER'S COUPON

UNITED AIR LINES INC

UA PASSENGER TICKET AND BAGGAGE CHECK PASSENGER'S COUPON

800597137
DATE AND PLACE OF ISSUE

If the passenger's journey involves an ultimate destination or stop in a country other than the country of departure, the Warsaw Convention may be applicable and the Convention governs and in most cases limits the liability of carriers for death or personal injury and in respect of loss of or damage to baggage.

NAME OF PASSENGER NOT TRANSFERABLE
DR D ROGERS

JUN 25 69

NOT GOOD FOR PASSAGE	FARE BASIS	ALLOW	CARRIER	FLIGHT/CLASS	DATE	TIME	STATUS
FROM VOID							
TO DENVER	Y		UA	166Y	7/09	935A	OK
TO WASH DULLES	-		V	O	I	D	-
TO WASH NATL	Y		UA	461Y	7/12	430P	OK
TO DENVER							

FARE 180.00
TAX TE
TOTAL 180.00

CARRIER CODE 016

ENDORSEMENTS
T/A A9,378,526

FORM AND SERIAL NUMBER
800597137 4

PRINTED IN U.S.A. TI-RE1 REV. 12/68

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Washington D.C. 20550

Panelists Attending Education Division Meetings

HOW TO CLAIM REIMBURSEMENT

The enclosed preprinted voucher should be used to claim reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with participation in this meeting. (A sample copy is also enclosed.) As you know, in most cases, transportation, lodging and meals provided during working hours will be paid directly to the carrier and the hotel, respectively, by the Foundation. However, YOU MUST CHECK OUT OF THE HOTEL AND PAY ALL EXPENSES ON YOUR BILL EXCEPT THE COST OF LODGING. Lodging costs in excess of those directly connected with attendance at this meeting will be calculated and billed to you directly by the Foundation. Costs referred to include early arrival or delayed departure for personal reasons, subsistence costs incurred because of an excess of travel time -- average prescribed miles per day, 300-500 - when traveling by car, and costs for family members accompanying the panelist. The Foundation cannot guarantee a special hotel rate for additional days.

All other allowable subsistence expenses, not in excess of $8 per day, will be reimbursed by check within 7 days of receipt of the completed voucher by NSF. These expenses should be itemized on the voucher.

You will find two luncheon tickets in your packet, each a different color. A member of the Travel Service Section Staff will collect, after you are seated at the luncheon table, the blue one for the first day's meal and the yellow for the second.

If travel was accomplished by private automobile, please consult a representative of the Travel Service Section at the information desk regarding method of claiming reimbursement. Also, transportation reservations may be confirmed or revised and questions about reimbursement answered at the information desk.

Vouchers may be submitted to the Travel Service Section staff members on the last day of the meeting if anticipated expenses do NOT include items other than transportation costs (limousine, taxicabs, etc.). If, however, anticipated expenses include other expenses, such as a meal, you must retain the voucher until travel is completed and mail it then to:

Travel Service Section
Administrative Services Office
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550

(Addressed envelope in packet)

SCHEDULE OF EXPENSES AND AMOUNTS CLAIMED

PREVIOUS TEMPORARY DUTY (*Complete these blocks only if in travel status immediately prior to period covered by this voucher and if administratively required*)

DEPARTURE FROM OFFICIAL STATION (DATE)	(HOUR)	TEMPORARY DUTY STATION LAST DAY OF PRECEDING VOUCHER PERIOD (LOCATION)	(DATE OF ARRIVAL)

SAMPLE

DATE 1966	NATURE OF EXPENSE	AUTHORIZED MILEAGE RATE ------ ¢ SPEEDOMETER READINGS	AUTHORIZED MILEAGE RATE ------ ¢ NO. OF MILES	AMOUNT CLAIMED Not to exceed $8. per day MILEAGE	SUBSISTENCE	OTHER
7/5	Taxi - Home to Terminal					2 00
	Limousine - Terminal to Airport					1 50
	Lv. Los Angeles - 1:00 PM					
	Arr. Washington, D.C. - 8:30 P.M.					
	Taxi - Airport to Hotel					2 00
	Meals:					
	(Breakfast —— Lunch —— Dinner 4.00)				4 —	
	Misc. Expenses				3 —	
					7 00	
7/6	Meals:					
	(Breakfast 1.30 Lunch —— Dinner 3.70)				5 00	
	Misc. Expenses				3 00	
					8 00	
7/7	Meals:					
	(Breakfast 1.45 Lunch 3.55 Dinner ——)				5 00	
	Misc. Expenses				3 00	
					8 00	
	Taxi - Hotel to Airport					2 00
	Lv. Washington, D.C. 5:00 P.M.					
	Arr. Los Angeles - 7:12 P.M.					
	Limousine - Airport to Terminal					1 50
	Taxi - Terminal to Home					2 00
		13.75				
		16.60				
	Grand total to face of voucher (Subtotals, to be carried forward if necessary) →	30.35	$34.00		$23 00	$11 00

Fill in for meals you pay for.

048—10—78638-1 U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550

S C H E D U L E

PANEL MEETING

July 10-12, 1969

College Teacher Programs

Statler Hilton Hotel

Washington, D. C.

THURSDAY, July 10	
7:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.	Representatives of NSF Travel Service Section at table outside Federal Room to assist panelists
8:00 P.M. - 9:00 P.M.	Orientation Meeting - Federal Room
FRIDAY, July 11	
9:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.	Meetings in 15 panel rooms
10:30 A.M.	Coffee and tea served in the Federal Room
12:30 P.M.	Luncheon served in the Federal Room
3:15 P.M.	Coffee and tea served in the Federal Room
SATURDAY, July 12	
9:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.	Meetings in Panel Rooms
10:30 A.M.	Coffee and tea served in the Federal Room
12:30 P.M.	Luncheon served in the Federal Room

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550

July 9, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO : Members of Panels Meeting to Evaluate Proposals in the College Teacher Programs

FROM : Program Director, College Teacher Programs

SUBJECT: Evaluation Procedure

Introductory

Panelists will evaluate proposals that have been submitted in the following five College Teacher Programs:

Research Participation for College Teachers
Academic Year Institutes for College Teachers
Summer Institutes for College Teachers
Short Courses for College Teachers
In-Service Seminars for College Teachers

The National Science Foundation has from its beginnings been concerned with the quality of the preparation of college teachers. It has tried various ways of helping them to improve their competence, and among these the five programs listed above have become established as programs in which individual projects can be highly effective if well planned and well staffed. Program formats are such as to allow for a wide variety of projects, and for creative planning by proposers. Generally speaking, restrictions that are imposed have to do only with financial arrangements and with the way participants are to be treated. It is desirable that panelists be familiar with each program in order to assay fairly the manner in which in a given case it is proposed to exploit whatever potential benefits to participants are made possible within the format provided by the Foundation. It is accordingly requested that you read with some care the brief descriptions of the five programs given in the Guide for Preparation of Proposals and Operation of Projects.

General Procedure

Each panelist will be given his individual copies of the proposals and asked to evaluate each one independently, assigning to each a rating from 1 to 10 points interpretable as in the accompanying "Scoring Guide." The numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 are to be the ones ordinarily assigned, with an odd number used only in the borderline case. The panelist should understand the exact reason for this procedure, which is just this, that he is being asked to divide proposals into five quality groups, and that by assigning the above even numbers to these five major quality groups

we have opened the door to his use of the odd numbers in place of using plus and minus signs.

Each proposal will be read by two panels, and each panel will have 4 members. After all panelists on a given panel have studied the first half dozen proposals and made tentative evaluations, they will wish to compare their ratings and discuss the criteria they are applying. Thereafter any given proposal should be discussed as soon as all four panelists have given it sufficient individual attention to make independent evaluations. Following the discussion revised ratings will be recorded by each panelist and by the chairman. This second rating assigned by each panelist should represent his own individual judgment in the light of all the evidence available, and need not agree with the ratings of the other panel members nor with his own original rating. The chairman will record all individual scores, as well as the sums, together with pertinent comments or special recommendations from the panel as a whole. Comments from individual panelists are especially valuable for the guidance of the Program Staff in the later development of the nationwide Program. Panelists are therefore urged to record comments on their individual rating sheets, to point out what would be special strengths or weaknesses of the project being proposed.

After a given proposal has been discussed and the individual numerical scores and their total have been recorded, the panel will assign to each proposal a consensus grade. The consensus grades are defined as follows:

H - Highly Meritorious, eminently worthy of support

M - Meritorious, generally a sound proposal, to be regarded as supportable if funds are available

D - Of Doubtful Merit, support not recommended

It is only in the partial sense just described that a panel acts as a jury to produce a common verdict. The two panels that read a given proposal will not be requested to meet together to arrive at a common consensus grade or to reconcile divergent numerical ratings. But when members of one panel are in possession of special knowledge that has an obviously significant bearing on the merits of the proposal, the panel chairman will take steps to make sure that the facts are clearly stated in the panel consensus report.

It follows from the above that the program staff receives a double evaluation of each proposal: a pair of consensus grades in one of the combinations HH, HM, MM, HD, MD, and DD, plus an average of the numerical scores awarded by the various panelists who read the proposal. The first will be used to give the gross structure and the second to give the fine structure to a set of combined ratings ranking proposals in order of merit, and it follows that the first is weightier than the second in determining the success or failure of a proposal. An HH 8.2 will outrank an HM 8.4, for example, in spite of the higher average numerical score of the latter combination.

Special Note to Panel Chairmen: (1) After a given proposal has been evaluated by the panel the chairman should place the (yellow) Consensus Report Sheet on top of the four (green) Proposal Evaluation Sheets and secure the lot with a paper clip. (2) When all proposals assigned to the panel have been evaluated, the chairman is to secure the entire bundle of groups of Evaluation and Consensus Sheets with rubber bands and bring the whole set to the member of the professional staff in the commons room who is collecting these.

The evaluation procedure is arranged to eliminate as much as possible stochastic, as distinct from essential, vagaries in panel performances. The Foundation encourages essential variations in the behavior of panelists, such as those stemming from the fact that each tries to represent fairly his individual background, convictions as a responsible and experienced member of the nation's scientific community, and shrewdness in sizing up proposals. Each proposer is encouraged to present his case in a manner that possesses integrity for him, in terms of the special virtues of available staff and special potential of the proposed location, available laboratories, special potential of the plan of the project, etc. To give each proposer a fair chance to put "his best foot forward" he is given (see Page 8 of Brochure E 68-U-6) the list of six factors called to the attention of panelists by each proposal evaluation sheet, and invited to address himself to correlative topics presented in the same order and with the same numbering in the proposal narrative.

In very rare instances it may happen that a proposal to be read is from an institution to which one of the panelists is attached. In such a case the panelist in question must excuse himself from participation in the discussion, and in fact leave the panel room while this discussion is going on even though the proposal comes from a department other than the one with which he is affiliated. The panelists are in no case to permit non-panelists with personal interests in specific proposals to enter the panel room while they are engaged in their deliberations.

Criteria for Evaluation

Basically, the question is how good the proposal is for the group of participants for which it is intended, and what the likelihood is that stated objectives will be met. Into the answer to these two questions go a consideration of many factors. The following are some, but by no means all:

1. Merit of the proposed program as a mechanism for improving the competence of the participants to be selected: This is largely a subjective judgment. The program should be one which has, in the time allotted, a reasonable chance of significantly increasing the appropriate subject-matter mastery of the enrolled faculty, and of improving their overall ability as members of a teaching and/or research group.

2. Ability of the institution to attain the goals listed in the proposal: It is hoped that at least one member of each panel might have some specific knowledge about the nature of each proposed host institution. Information regarding facilities, which should be a part of each proposal, may be helpful in determining whether the proposed program can be carried out effectively. Where definite information is not immediately available to the panel, the NSF staff may be helpful in furnishing information known to them when this can be done in an objective manner.

3. Evidence of Institutional interest: Even a well planned program cannot have maximum success unless the proper facilities, equipment, and educational climate are provided at the designated instructional center. The sympathetic cooperation of the institution's administration in this work can be very helpful.

4. Type of recognition available to participants: The provisions that have been made for recognition of a teacher's participation in an NSF program may give an indication of the interest that the host institution has in meeting the needs of participants. However, there is no Foundation requirement that either credit or degrees be made available to participants. If offered, any credit or degree should of course be appropriate to the studies provided.

5. Competence of staff: Prospective staff members should be scientists, well trained and strongly motivated in their areas of science. If they are to supervise research participation projects they should currently be engaged in research of high quality. Documentary information attesting to this should be included as part of the curriculum vitae of the director and supervisors.

6. Criteria for selection of participants: Selection procedures should provide for choosing those participants who can benefit the most as a result of their participation. In general, a certain degree of homogeneity of the participant group adds materially to the success of these programs. While homogeneity of the participant group with respect to subject-matter background, interests, and problem is desirable, this definitely does not mean that participants should be chosen from a single locality unless there are special circumstances in which a program for participants from a particular region is advantageous.

Items which should not influence ratings

Panelists are asked to evaluate each proposal on its merit, recognizing that there is wide room for diversity.

Geographical location and the fact that NSF-sponsored programs have (or have not) previously been held at a given college or university are items that should not influence the ratings given by panelists. However, the Program Staff will welcome comments in any case where panel members feel that they can provide particularly pertinent statements.

Budget items should not influence ratings. If individual budget items are too high (or too low), the Foundation can renegotiate with the host institution concerning these. However, comments and recommendations from the panels can be very helpful.

Subsequent selection by the National Science Foundation

The Foundation will review the ratings assigned by the panels, along with any pertinent comments. In general, grants will be made to support proposals that are rated highest by the panels, and denied to those rated lowest. Selection from the proposals assigned intermediate ratings will take into consideration the panel ratings, disciplines involved, geographical distribution, the type of teachers for whom the program is designed, and factors related to costs.

Accompanying this memorandum are sample copies of the Scoring Guide, Proposal Evaluation Sheet and Consensus Report Sheet. Panelists are expected to keep confidential all discussions of the various proposals. Serious embarrassment has resulted in cases where panelists have failed to keep these matters confidential. All copies of each proposal must be returned unmarked at the end of the panel session on the last day of the meeting.

We appreciate very much your willingness to serve on this panel. Your comments on the method of panel operation will be welcomed. Kindly note the "Panelist Nomination Forms" included with the attachments to this memorandum (Please ask for additional copies if you wish to make more than two nominations).

Reinhard L. Korgen

Reinhard L. Korgen

Attachments:
Scoring Guide
Proposal Evaluation Sheet
Consensus Report Sheet
Two (2) Panelist Nomination Forms

COLLEGE TEACHER PROGRAMS

SCORING GUIDE

Meaning of Numerical Scores

NOTE: Please use the even numbers unless you feel the proposal is definitely borderline between two of the five categories.

10) 9) An outstanding proposal. Recommended without reservation.

8) 7) A meritorious proposal. Highly recommended. Recommended with or without suggested minor changes, and subject to consideration in terms of geography, disciplines, etc.

6) 5) A satisfactory proposal to be supported if funds are available. Although quality not quite as high as some, the proposal could be recommended if modified by suggested changes (i.e., size, duration, participant selection) or meritorious in some disciplines only. Indicate reasons on Evaluation Sheet.

4) 3) A below-average proposal. Probably not acceptable; some elements raise doubt as to quality. Indicate reasons on Evaluation Sheet.

2) 1) A proposal which does not merit support under any conditions. Indicate reasons on Evaluation Sheet.

Meaning of Consensus Grade

H - Highly Meritorious, eminently worthy of support

M - Meritorious, generally a sound proposal, to be regarded as supportable if funds are available

D - Of Doubtful Merit, support not recommended

PROPOSAL NUMBER

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SHEET

SCORE (10 HIGH, 1 LOW)

DIRECTOR : _____

INSTITUTION : _____

	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	UNABLE TO JUDGE
1. Scientific merit of proposed program.				
2. Educational merit of proposed program.				
3. Competence of staff to supervise the work.				
4. Appropriateness of program for the type of participants specified, and for development of competence in the indivdual participant.				
5. Procedure and criteria for selection of participants.				
6. Adequacy of facilities available for the proposed activity.				

COMMENTS: (Especially desirable for proposals receiving low scores)

PANELIST (PLEASE PRINT LAST NAME)

NSF Form 332, June 1968

CONSENSUS REPORT

CHAIRMAN:

PANEL :

Director : _____

Institution : _____

CONSENSUS GRADE *

PANELIST'S INITIALS						TOTAL
INDIVIDUAL PANELIST'S RATINGS (10 HIGH, 1 LOW)						

General Recommendations and Comments (especially desirable):

*H - HIGHLY MERITORIOUS
M - MERITORIOUS
D - OF DOUBTFUL MERIT

NSF Form 334, June 1968

CTP PANEL MEETING

July 10-12, 1969

Nomination for Consideration as Panelist

Name (with title, if any, such as Department Chairman):

_____

Department: _____

Institution: _____

Special Area(s) within his discipline or related disciplines:

Indication of special past or present responsibilities and interests outside of teaching and research in his or her subject (for example, reference to activities having to do with wide-scale curricular reform in science):

Additional Remarks (if any):

Signature of Nominator: _____

PANELS

College Teacher Programs
Statler Hilton Hotel
Washington, D. C.
July 10-12, 1969

PANEL 1, Room _____

*GUYSELMAN, Dr. J. Bruce	Albion College	Biology
LINCICOME, Dr. David R.	Howard University	Biology
MARONEY, Dr. Samuel P.	University of Virginia	Biology
WARD, Dr. Richard T.	Colorado State University	Biology

PANEL 2, Room 628

*POTTER, Dr. Loren D.	University of New Mexico	Biology
ANDERSON, Dr. Guy R.	University of Idaho	Biology
KANNOWSKI, Dr. Paul B.	University of North Dakota	Biology
ROGERS, Dr. David J.	University of Colorado	Biology

PANEL 3, Room _____

*BRASTED, Dr. Robert C.	University of Minnesota	Chemistry
ATKINSON, Dr. Gordon	University of Maryland	Chemistry
BLACK, Dr. Rodney E.	University of Kentucky	Chemistry
HAIGHT, Dr. Gilbert	University of Illinois	Chemistry

PANEL 4, Room _____

*HAMBLETON, Dr. William W.	University of Kansas	Geology
GILKERSON, Dr. William R.	University of South Carolina	Chemistry
HOWELL, Dr. Benjamin F.	Pennsylvania State University	Geology
RAMETTE, Dr. Richard W.	Carleton College	Chemistry

PANEL 5, Room _____

*FRY, Dr. Arthur	University of Arkansas	Chemistry
KUELLMER, Dean Frederick J.	New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology	Geology
OSBERG, Dr. Philip H.	University of Maine	Geology
ROCK, Dr. Elizabeth J.	Wellesley College	Chemistry

PANEL 6, Room

*KALLSEN, Dr. Henry A.	University of Alabama	Engineering
CROMWELL, Dr. Leslie	California State College at Los Angeles	Engineering
MATEER, Dr. Richard S.	University of Kentucky	Engineering
SLOTTA, Dr. Larry S.	Oregon State University	Engineering

PANEL 7, Room

*STEPHENSON, Dr. Robert E.	University of Utah	Engineering
CONTI, Dr. James J.	Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Engineering
MARTENS, Dr. Hinrich R.	State University of New York at Buffalo	Engineering
VEY, Dr. Eben	Illinois Institute of Technology	Engineering

PANEL 8, Room

*THOMPSON, Dean Arthur T.	Boston University	Engineering
AULT, Dr. Addison	Cornell College	Computer Science
BLACKWELL, Dr. William A.	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Engineering
PARTER, Dr. Seymour V.	University of Wisconsin	Computer Science

PANEL 9, Room

*HARRIS, Dr. C. Fremont	Oklahoma State University	Physics
FRENCH, Dr. Anthony P.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Physics
GOBLE, Dr. Alfred T.	Union College	Physics
NOLLE, Dr. A. Wilson	University of Texas at Austin	Physics

PANEL 10, Room

*APPLETON, Dr. George L.	American Institute of Physics	Physics
BRADLEY, Dr. George E.	Western Michigan University	Physics
HAYNES, Dr. Sherwood K.	Michigan State University	Physics
PRIESTLEY, Dr. Herbert	Knox College	Physics

PANEL 11, Room

*HUMMEL, Dr. James A.	University of Maryland	Mathematics
LOEWEN, Dr. Kenneth L.	University of Oklahoma	Mathematics
McBRIEN, Dr. Vincent O.	Holy Cross College	Mathematics
MEMORY, Dr. Jasper D.	North Carolina State University, Raleigh	Physics

PANEL 12, Room

*RITCHIE, Dr. Robert W.	University of Washington	Mathematics
GREENLER, Dr. Robert	University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee	Physics
NERING, Dr. Evar D.	Arizona State University	Mathematics
PIPER, Dr. W. Stephen	Purdue University	Mathematics

PANEL 13, Room

*STERLING, Dr. Daniel J.	Colorado College	Mathematics
BOTTS, Dr. Truman A.	Conference Board of Mathematical Sciences	Mathematics
BROWN, Dr. Richard H.	Washington College	Mathematics
HEMMINGSON, Dr. Erik	Syracuse University	Mathematics

PANEL 14, Room

*CAMPBELL, Dr. Robert	University of Oregon	Economics
BEARDSLEY, Dr. Richard K.	University of Michigan	Anthropology
FOSTER, Dr. Margery S.	Rutgers University	Economics
SCARBOROUGH, Dr. Barron B.	Florida State University	Psychology

PANEL 15, Room

*SIBLEY, Dr. Elbridge	Social Science Research Council	Sociology
LOUNSBURY, Dr. John F.	Eastern Michigan University	Geography
PAGE, Dr. Janice M.	American University	Psychology
WILEY, Dr. Jay W.	Purdue University	Economics

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550

S C H E D U L E

PANEL MEETING

July 10-12, 1969

College Teacher Programs

Statler Hilton Hotel

Washington, D. C.

THURSDAY, July 10

7:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.	Representatives of NSF Travel Service Section at table outside Federal Room to assist panelists
8:00 P.M. - 9:00 P.M.	Orientation Meeting - Federal Room

FRIDAY, July 11

9:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.	Meetings in 15 panel rooms
10:30 A.M.	Coffee and tea served in the Federal Room
12:30 P.M.	Luncheon served in the Federal Room
3:15 P.M.	Coffee and tea served in the Federal Room

SATURDAY, July 12

9:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.	Meetings in Panel Rooms
10:30 A.M.	Coffee and tea served in the Federal Room
12:30 P.M.	Luncheon served in the Federal Room

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

College Teacher Program Panel Meeting

Statler-Hilton Hotel
Washington, D. C.
July 10-12, 1969

ANDERSON, Dr. Guy R., Department of Bacteriology, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83843

APPLETON, Dr. George L., American Institute of Physics, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11790

ATKINSON, Dr. Gordon, Department of Chemistry, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20740

AULT, Dr. Addison, Department of Chemistry, Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314

BEARDSLEY, Dr. Richard K., Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

BLACK, Dr. Rodney E., Department of Chemistry, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506

BLACKWELL, Professor William A., Department of Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

BOTTS, Dr. Truman A., Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, 834 Joseph Henry Building, 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20037

BRADLEY, Dr. George E., Department of Physics, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007

BRASTED, Dr. Robert C., Department of Chemistry, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

BROWN, Dr. Richard H., Department of Mathematics, Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland 21620

CAMPBELL, Dr. Robert, Department of Economics, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403

CONTI, Professor James J., Department of Chemical Engineering, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, New York 11201

CROMWELL, Dr. Leslie, Department of Interdisciplinary Engineering, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90032

FOSTER, Dr. Margery S., Department of Economics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

FRENCH, Dr. Anthony P., Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

FRY, Dr. Arthur, Department of Chemistry, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

GILKERSON, Dr. William R., Department of Chemistry, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208

GOBLE, Dr. Alfred T., Department of Physics, Union College, Schenectady, New York 12308

GREENLER, Dr. Robert, Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

GUYSELMAN, Dr. J. Bruce, Department of Biology, Albion College, Albion, Michigan 49224

HAIGHT, Dr. Gilbert, Department of Chemistry, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801

HAMBLETON, Dr. William W., Department of Geology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044

HARRIS, Dr. C. Fremont, Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075

HAYNES, Dr. Sherwood K., Department of Physics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823

HEMMINGSEN, Dr. Erik, Department of Mathematics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210

HOWELL, Dr. Benjamin F., Jr., Department of Geology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

HUMMEL, Dr. James A., Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742

KALLSEN, Dr. Henry A., Department of Engineering, University of Alabama, University, Alabama 35486

KANNOWSKI, Dr. Paul B., Department of Biology, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

KUELLMER, Dean Frederick J., Department of Geosciences, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, New Mexico 87801

LINCICOME, Dr. David R., Department of Zoology, Howard University, Washington, D. C. 20001

LOEWEN, Dr. Kenneth L., Department of Mathematics, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069

LOUNSBURY, Dr. John F., Commission on College Geography, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

McBRIEN, Dr. Vincent O., Department of Mathematics, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts 01610

MARONEY, Dr. Samuel P., Jr., Department of Biology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

MARTENS, Dr. Hinrich R., Department of Electrical and Mechanical Engineering, State University of New York, Buffalo, New York 14214

MATEER, Dr. Richard S., Department of Engineering, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506

MEMORY, Dr. J. D., School of Physical Sciences and Applied Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

NERING, Dr. Evar D., Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281

NOLLE, Professor A. Wilson, Department of Physics, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712

OSBERG, Dr. Philip H., Department of Geology, University of Maine, Orono, Maine 04473

PAGE, Dr. Janice M., Department of Psychology, American University, Washington, D. C. 20016

PARTER, Dr. Seymour V., Department of Computer Science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

PIPER, Dr. W. Stephen, Division of Mathematical Science, Purdue Univeristy, Lafayette, Indiana 47907

POTTER, Dr. Loren D., Department of Biology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

PRIESTLEY, Dr. Herbert, Department of Physics, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois 61401

RAMETTE, Dr. Richard W., Department of Chemistry, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota 55057

RITCHIE, Professor Robert W., Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105

ROCK, Dr. Elizabeth J., Department of Chemistry, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181

ROGERS, Dr. David J., Department of Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302

SCARBOROUGH, Dr. Barron B., Department of Psychology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

SIBLEY, Dr. Elbridge, Executive Director, Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10017

SLOTTA, Dr. Larry S., Civil Engineering Department, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331

STEPHENSON, Dr. Robert E., Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

STERLING, Dr. Daniel J., Department of Mathematics, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

THOMPSON, Dean Arthur T., College of Engineering, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

VEY, Dr. Eben, Department of Civil Engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois 60616

WARD, Dr. Richard T., Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

WILEY, Dr. Jay W., Director of Graduate Studies and Research Administration, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana 47907

DIVISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN SCIENCE

COLLEGE TEACHER PROGRAMS

DIRECTORY

RESEARCH PARTICIPATION
SUMMER INSTITUTES
SHORT COURSES
ACADEMIC YEAR INSTITUTES
IN-SERVICE SEMINARS

1969-1970

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

E 68-U-9

DIVISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN SCIENCE

COLLEGE TEACHER PROGRAMS

GUIDE FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS AND OPERATION OF PROJECTS

Academic Year Institutes
Summer Institutes
Short Courses
Research Participation Projects
In-Service Seminars

Proposal Closing Date: June ~~July~~ 1

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

E 68-U-6