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ABSTRACT

As the racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity of the society increases, American campuses are experiencing more race-, culture-, and gender-based conflicts. Few students are equipped to handle such conflicts in ways that are productive rather than destructive. Training in dispute resolution skills can effectively reduce problems due to increased diversity. This proposal requests funding to make two interactive videodiscs that will teach dispute resolution skills to young adults. These videodiscs will add a wholly new mode of instructor preparation, class presentation, practice, and review to conflict resolution education in colleges and universities, will facilitate inclusion of conflict resolution in a variety course settings, and will also serve as a learning resource available in libraries.

The first disc will teach five basic skills: initiating a process to stop escalation of a conflict situation and begin a discussion; listening actively and fully; expressing feelings and defining interests; negotiating issues in complex situations; and brainstorming innovative solutions. These skills are demonstrated and tested through videos of conflicts frequently encountered by young people: jealousy in a relationship, coordination of a group project, negotiating an extension with a professor, and so on. The second disc will focus on applying the basic skills in more complex conflicts, those that characterize today's campuses, especially race, culture, and gender-based conflicts.

We have completed much of the planning process for the first videodisc, including design of the instructional content for the interactive software and drafting of scripts for the conflict scenarios that will be filmed for imprinting on the disc. We will test our materials in a course on Conflict, Culture, and Dispute Resolution this Summer and Fall. We have also formed an advisory committee to review the instructional content and scripts.

We will need $138,730 to complete the research and planning; to produce, thoroughly field test, and evaluate both videodiscs; and to develop accompanying materials.
The Problem

As the racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity of the society increases, American campuses are becoming more diverse. One result is that campuses are experiencing more culture-, race- and gender-based conflicts. Yet according to many administrators, college and university students are becoming less tolerant, sensitive, courteous, and idealistic, and less open to new kinds of people and experiences. Very few are equipped to handle even simple conflicts in ways that are productive rather than destructive. In this context, seemingly minor interpersonal and inter-group disputes can—and do—escalate into major conflicts, disrupting the climate for learning and discouraging the open communication that is a prerequisite for developing respect among diverse people. Racial, ethnic, and cultural minorities feel segregated or harassed and accusations of racism and sexism are commonplace, despite administrative policies and programs designed to prevent these very problems. At the heart of the situation is a lack of clear communication and understanding between and among students and the groups with which they identify. In particular, very many students cannot identify their conflicts, understand them, or appreciate the possibilities and benefits of resolving them through peaceful discussion.

The problems of unmanaged conflict escalation and the increase of conflicts due to diversity have been addressed by society in a number of ways. The development that is of primary interest here is often referred to as the Conflict Resolution, or Alternative Dispute Resolution Movement. The terms conflict resolution, dispute resolution, or ADR refer to a set of skills and techniques that have proven highly effective in reducing the destructiveness of conflict. A widely taught constellation of dispute resolution skills referred to here as the "win-win" problem solving approach was described by Roger Fisher and William Ury in their book *Getting to Yes* (Boston, 1981). "Conflict management" means addressing conflicts in a given context before they appear and escalate, through conflict resolution training and setting up systems for mediation, arbitration, or other techniques that can prevent or resolve the problems. As an alternative to litigation—society's traditional approach to resolving most types of disputes—dispute resolution is usually quicker, less expensive, more private, and less stressful. Dispute resolution in formal contexts uses an impartial, specially trained "third party neutral" who has no involvement with the dispute. This person guides the dialogue and either issues a decision (arbitration) or assists the

---

1 "Conflict" is used as a general term covering the whole spectrum from individual psychological turmoil to international war. "Dispute" refers to a specific disagreement between two or more parties, the type of conflict we can most easily represent and teach people to resolve.
parties in reaching a mutually agreeable settlement (mediation). At the level of one-on-one disputes, one or both parties with dispute resolution training can work to transform the conflict situation into a process of collaborative problem solving.

The dispute resolution process is one that lets people know they are being heard, draws out the parties' primary concerns, finds and focuses attention on their common needs and mutual interests, and produces new ways of looking at problems and new approaches for solving them, often finding profits for both parties. The process teaches people to think carefully and constructively about their problems, to tap their own creativity and focus it on mutual rather than on selfish interests. In short, conflict resolution skills and systems help people avoid unproductive contests of strength. By working together, they find solutions that benefit all.

The great benefits of dispute resolution result from values and assumptions that underlie it, namely: that agreements reached through consensus help to preserve and improve relationships, that dealing with the underlying problems in a dispute is beneficial to the parties, and that giving people active roles and control in resolving their disputes is good because a sense of empowerment and participation renders the outcomes more robust.²

For our multi-cultural society and our schools to make significant headway in managing conflict, dispute resolution techniques must be more widely taught and used. Already in recent years, their use has blossomed in many social sectors, including schools, businesses, government, divorce courts, and communities. The National Institute for Dispute Resolution estimates that there are some 700 or 800 Community Justice Centers now in existence. An amazing 90 to 95% of cases mediated at community justice centers reach agreements, and follow-up studies show that the agreements hold up very well even a year later. The National Association for Mediation in Education estimates that well over 2000 conflict resolution programs have already been set up in primary and secondary schools, many of them in collaboration with the community centers. The programs range from workshops and courses that explore communication and violence prevention to training programs for student mediators who handle disputes among students and other members of school communities.

² This section draws on the National Institute for Dispute Resolution's 1991-1992 Grants Program Announcement, "Defining Dispute Resolution."
Mediation programs are also being formed on a growing number of college campuses, although a survey of mediation programs at the post-secondary level (carried out by Bill Warters and Tim Hedeen of Syracuse University, updated in April 1991) found only 35 programs. Even if the true number is double this, it is still quite low. These programs provide mediation services for conflicts (often not limited to student conflicts), and they have generally been evaluated as very successful and beneficial by their institutions. In particular, they provide a model for decision making based on fairness rather than power, and they foster mutual respect and cooperation in all areas of campus life. Most of the benefits of these programs are still indirect, however, for they are not providing a significant number of college students with the opportunity to learn about dispute resolution and acquire the skills directly. The only students who are trained are the actual mediators, and the only students exposed to dispute resolution are those involved in the salient conflicts that happen to be brought to the mediation table—not a high percentage. Only 8 of the programs reported any academic component, and our own informal surveys at conferences suggest that perhaps no more than a dozen actual courses dealing with the topic are taught at the college level nationwide.3 Systematic campus-wide training programs are non-existent.

College students have a great need for conflict management skills. They are entering new environments, learning to make autonomous decisions, beginning careers filled with new kinds of people and relationships.

Conflict is essentially a fact of life for most students. They experience the daily problems of living and working together. They experience interactions with people who are different from themselves and perhaps different in race, culture, sexual preference, ethnicity, and/or religion from people they have known before: fears rooted in their stereotypes and fears of confronting those stereotypes may surface. They face personality conflicts and conflicts stemming from testing boundaries and learning the real meaning of independence and personal and group responsibility. In all these categories, students learn how to handle conflict from the institution and from their peers. Since few 18 year olds have developed good conflict resolution skills, using each other as models of how to manage and solve conflicts is often ineffective. As a result, the ways an institution handles conflict must serve not only to maintain rules and order, but also to teach conflict resolution.4

3 Canadian colleges and universities are ahead in this area, according to a Canadian Bar Association Task Force report (Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Canadian Perspective, 1989), though "the exact nature and extent of this ADR education is not known." Cf. also Teaching Conflict Resolution in Canada: A Syllabi Sampler for Universities (The Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution, 1991).

Approaches to conflict learned during these formative years are ingrained by use and spread to each new relationship that young people form as well as to the new generation they engender. Hence, teaching dispute resolution skills to young people is one of the most efficient systemic ways to improve the quality of their lives and the communities in which they participate. Indeed, in primary and secondary schools where students are taught how to manage conflict and resolve disputes, schools report a variety of benefits, including improvements in student retention rates and school climate.5

Several factors are required to bring conflict resolution training and education to our colleges and universities. Trainers must be brought in, faculty, administration, and students must be informed about the techniques and their efficacy. Venues and course models must be developed, and perhaps most important, high quality instructional materials must be made available. At the moment, the most inclusive libraries of dispute resolution training materials are filled with curricula for adults and children, but a major gap exists at the post-secondary level. Trainers agree that one of the most important features of training materials, and particularly case materials, is direct relevance to the group being trained—for training of fourth graders, materials dwell on playground conflicts, for staff trainings, on workplace conflicts. The National Association for Mediation in Education was able to provide only one publication aimed at colleges (see footnote 4), and no curricular materials.

The primary objective of the project described here is to promote the use of dispute resolution techniques, attitudes, and skills among young adults. We want to promote dispute resolution training for college and university students by producing high quality training materials in a new format that is simple to use, flexible, and fun. Such materials are a necessary condition for widespread dissemination of dispute resolution techniques among postsecondary students, educators, and institutions.

5 See, e.g., Julie Lam, The Impact of Conflict Resolution Programs on Schools: A Review and Synthesis of the Evidence, 2nd Edition, 1989 (N.A.M.E.: Amherst, Mass.); NYT, 12/26/90, p.B7. More formal evaluations of such programs are beginning to appear in the literature, for example, The Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management is completing a study assessing the impact of such programs based on data from 17 schools in Ohio.
Conflict management skills cannot be transmitted by pamphlets. In order for the skills to be usable, they must be cogently presented, seen in action repeatedly, and practiced. Teachers need high-quality materials to help them make the topic compelling. We propose to create the first set of interactive videodiscs on conflict management for college students, with computerized tutorials that present vivid conflict scenarios involving young people and salient campus issues. The first disc will present the five basic dispute resolution skills, training students in the use of win-win problem solving as they observe young people involved in common, prosaic conflicts: sharing responsibilities in a group project, negotiating an extension with a professor, handling jealousy and disagreements in a relationship, and so on. The video material on Disc I is designed to engage students without threatening them. Students using this disc will learn how to recognize danger signals of escalating disputes, how to initiate a process for resolving a dispute, how to elicit the parties' conflicting points of view and get at important underlying issues, and how to encourage brainstorming to find solutions that satisfy everyone involved. They will learn through having techniques described, seeing video demonstrations of techniques performed both correctly and incorrectly, replaying video clips for moment-by-moment analysis of skill performance, doing exercises involving new video conflict situations, and answering questions that pinpoint which aspects of the material require additional work.

A second disc is planned to advance training into more difficult conflict areas: characteristic cultural-, ethnic-, race-, religion-, lifestyle- and gender-based conflicts that afflict today's campuses. Equipped with basic process skills of listening, self-expression, negotiation, and innovation, students can interact with participants in complex and disturbing situations such as accusations of racism and sexism and clashes over values and cultural norms for behavior. They will be encouraged to explore the attitudes they bring to such situations and to compare them with attitudes that are implicit in the practice of dispute resolution, and that help to foster open communication across differences. Such experiential learning is crucial for developing insight, understanding, and competence around the conflicts students increasingly encounter both inside and outside their college classrooms.

The products of this project will include:

- Disc I: Fight or Flight? Dispute Resolution Skills, a videodisc and instructional software package that teaches five basic dispute resolution skills
• Disc II: Us or Them? Diversity and Dispute Resolution, a videodisc and instructional software package that explores attitudes, values, and communication in ethnic-, race-, and gender-based disputes
• Instruction manuals/teacher handbooks that include course outlines, modularized to fit time frames ranging from a 3-hour unit to a full semester course
• Student handbooks.

The materials accompanying the videodiscs will be designed to maximize their usefulness by showing how to integrate them in a wide variety of teaching contexts, from weekend training workshops for student leaders to campus-wide symposia on current problems, from a minority studies program to a business ethics course. The next section describes the numerous potential uses of the project's products in greater detail.

Use and Utility

In considering the merits of this new educational tool, it is important to keep in mind that it is not intended to replace existing tools, let alone the teachers and trainers who use them. Rather, it adds a resource to the standard repertoire of methods and tools employed in teaching dispute resolution:

• Texts: Learning by reading—portable, can be done outside class, useful for vocabulary and concept learning and reference. Requires good reading skills and motivation, provides no practice.

• Lectures: Learning by listening—flexible, focus controlled by teacher, success can be roughly gauged with questions. Useful for introducing subjects. In class only; requires listening/notetaking skills, provides no practice.

• Role playing: Learning by doing—active, engaging practice. In class only; difficult to control and focus; may be difficult to reflect on (especially for participants). Difficult to evaluate, may engender interpersonal problems (shyness, unwillingness to criticize peers, etc.)

• Linear videos: Learning by watching—engaging, focused, can be done outside class. Passive, no practice.

• Interactive videodiscs: Learning by reading, listening, watching and doing—enjoyable, focused but still flexible, i.e., individualized, engaging yet permits reflective detachment. Can be done outside class or used in concert with lectures and role plays. Provides practice, records performance, and facilitates evaluation.

Besides providing a richer, more active learning experience than simply reading a book, hearing a lecture, or watching a standard linear film, videodiscs are a very cost-efficient
way to make engaging individualized instruction available to many students. The disc assures consistent quality of presentation of the core material, but is adaptable to different settings, teaching styles, and courses. While it does not replace trainers, students and faculty can continue to use it after trainers have gone, providing review and practice situations that are enriched with the human elements of conflict, that focus unerringly on the crucial points of complex cases, and that engage the users as vicarious participants in the cases in much the same way as traditional role playing. At the same time, the users retain the kind of reflective detachment and control that enable observers to analyze situations, especially volatile ones, more objectively than participants.

The videodiscs will be used primarily by college students, their instructors, and other members of campus communities in a variety of academic and extra-curricular settings. (Older high school students will also benefit from exposure to these training scenarios.) Besides courses dealing primarily with conflict resolution or conflict management (such as that taught by the principal investigators at Carnegie Mellon, a model of which will be distributed with the discs), the discs will be presented as units in numerous related fields. They will contain scenarios and instructional materials relevant to ethics, business ethics, communications, interpersonal and social psychology, social issues courses dealing with violence and multiculturalism, Minority Studies, Womens' Studies, and so on. Prior to course use, the discs will help train and prepare faculty members and conflict resolution professionals who are called on to work with young people. During courses, the disc can be used both to enliven class presentations and as assignments for groups of students (or individuals) to prepare for or review class material and to practice collaborating.

Their presence in a library or software collection will make either of these discs a general extracurricular resource for all members of a college or university community. Here are just some examples of the many uses and venues envisioned for the products of this project.

- A faculty member previews one or both videodiscs and reads the instructor handbooks, including suggested course outlines, as part of his/her preparation to teach a class or workshop related to conflict (conflict management; violence prevention, etc.—see above). The videodiscs provide animated illustration of both techniques and characteristic conflicts for preparing one's own pedagogical plan. (At Carnegie Mellon, faculty will also be offered workshops to train them as trainers.)

- The faculty member employs video situations from the discs in his or her classroom to dramatize lecture material, to generate class discussions, as briefing materials for role plays, or to demonstrate collaborative problem solving processes. All that is needed for this level of usage is a videodisc
player accessed through a hand held key pad and a TV monitor. We will provide an index for the videodiscs that can be used to prepare presentations. Many remote control key pads are programmable, so the presentation is simply a matter of walking through the selections. The advantage of a videodisc over tape is that segments may be instantly accessed in response to questions.

- The faculty member assigns students to use the videodiscs outside of class, either in small groups—often an effective way for students to think about issues, because it affords an extra level of collaborative interaction—or individually. Assignments can be scripted to test understanding of skills, to introduce or review material covered in class, or to observe group dynamics; or they can be exploratory to allow students to interrogate the material on their own recognizance.

- A trainer preparing to train students extra-curricularly uses the disc to help him or her tailor the training to young people, exploring case materials and types of conflicts relevant to the age and makeup of the particular group.

- The trainer employs the disc in training campus groups: student mediators, faculty, administrators, or staff. (Harty has been using pilot video material in just this way at CMU.) For lengthy trainings, the discs can be used in class presentations, role-plays or discussions (as above), or for brief trainings, the trainer may refer trainees to the discs for additional practice and review.

- A student, faculty member, or counselor researching dispute resolution, cultural conflict, or typical campus issues is directed to the discs by a faculty member, librarian, or catalogue.

- A counselor recommends a videodisc as a resource to a student, staff or faculty member who asks for help in handling a particular conflict situation.

- A campus-wide symposium on issues related to diversity presents scenarios on Disc II to illustrate the types of issues facing the community.

State of the Field

Dispute resolution instructional materials aimed at college students are few in number, and most are intended for use in training mediators rather than for general courses on conflict, campus conflicts, or conflict management. Publications dealing with problems caused by cultural diversity are available (e.g., Howard Gadlin, "Racial and Ethnic Conflict on Campus," and K.1.Karleson, "From a Predominantly White Campus to a Culturally Diverse Campus," both in The Fourth R, 5/25/90), and will be useful in our research for Disc II. For that research we can also draw upon the faculty and student advisory committee for Carnegie Mellon's Minority Studies Program. Another important resource will be a program established in 1989 at Haverford College to address conflicts involving accusations of racism, sexism, homophobia, and other diversity issues.
During a prior planning phase of this videodisc project (funded in part by the National Institute for Dispute Resolution), research was undertaken to find related projects in other parts of the country. There is not, unfortunately, a central registry or library of videodiscs, but according to all the sources we have consulted no one has made a tutorial in win-win problem solving, let alone one targeted for young adults.6

Our research turned up existing videodiscs in a few specialized areas of conflict resolution and/or person-to-person interaction, in particular, one entitled Marital Fracture made by Roz Gerstein at MIT, one on international conflict developed by Lincoln Bloomfield at MIT, and one on adolescents and suicide for medical professionals. Many training discs have been produced by industry—for software engineers, airline clerks, bank tellers, salespeople—demonstrating the efficacy of this medium for training interpersonal skills. The two most closely related projects are a disc on mediation for law students currently under development at the Educational Technology Department of Harvard Law School (visited by Harty in August 1991) and a student project at Miami University of Ohio in which students are creating a disc about their experiences with crosscultural communication and racism.

It is worth noting that even if other videodisc projects are under development in this field, the possibilities have hardly begun to be tapped. To give some indication of the numerous specialized possibilities for videodiscs in this field, we mention the following:

- A disc for mediation orientation, to rehearse people in the process before mediation sessions.
- A disc illustrating techniques for third-party interventions such as mediation.
- Discs that focus more exclusively on individual skills such as active listening.
- A disc dramatizing problems that tend to defeat dispute resolution efforts.
- A disc dramatizing power imbalances and empowerment techniques.
- A disc on using conflict management techniques to address public policy issues.
- A training disc for meeting-facilitation techniques.

6 These sources include all of the following: inquiries to the Conflict Resolution Center International, a clearinghouse and resource center in the field; inquiries of high school librarians in Pennsylvania and New York; inquiry to George Mason University Center for Conflict Analysis and Resolution; consultation with Russell Gant, a leading videodisc designer who is familiar with the field; a word-of-mouth search among contacts in the conflict resolution field.
The Technology

Interactive videodiscs combine the power of film recorded on laser-readable discs with the control and flexibility afforded by interactive computer software. They permit students seated at a personal computer or workstation equipped with a videodisc player and monitor to work through a program of information, demonstrations, and exercises in any assigned or desired sequence, in private if so desired, and at their own pace. Students can try various responses in model situations and experience a variety of outcomes. They receive immediate feedback even in the absence of a faculty member, and their responses can be stored or printed for later review by themselves or an instructor. The video material provides frequent changes of pace and vivid situations with all the elements of human emotion, body language, and immediacy that no textbook can provide—but without the embarrassment that often accompanies errors made in the acquisition of new interpersonal skills through role playing. The ability to include the "human element", sensitivity to which is crucial for skilled conflict resolution, makes the videodisc a natural tool for teaching this topic. The technology, far from presenting obstacles to acquisition of interpersonal skills, can expose students to many more examples of the target behaviors performed in realistic contexts than any other mode of classroom work or homework.

In teaching conflict resolution skills on campus, we have found that every audience, staff as well as students, responds enthusiastically to video demonstrations and exercises, making it clear that video is a teaching resource that should be exploited far more than it is. But we have also learned that training with standard linear video is very difficult to do interactively, due to limitations in VCR technology. Pausing tapes repeatedly stretches and soon damages them. However VCRs tend to jump ahead, sometimes several crucial seconds, when stopped and started. This exacerbates the worst problem, which is the inability to quickly locate a given point on a tape without time-consuming iterations of the rewind--stop--play--oops!--fast forward--play--oops!--rewind--play--Oh, there it is! routine. The videodisc player with either a computer or a hand-held key pad completely eliminates this problem. Unlike a videotape, a videodisc affords instant access to any frame or segment.

Videodisc production can be expensive (though far less expensive when the video is done in-house—as we plan—than by commercial contractor), but businesses have found them to be extremely cost-effective as training tools. Moreover, the option of avoiding such
technology because of hardware costs is not a viable one for schools that must prepare students to enter a modern, high-technology economy. That is why videodisc technology is fully developed and already available on many college campuses, both in computer clusters and in instructional technology inventories for classroom use. In the next three to five years we can expect schools increasingly to acquire the technology. Appropriate, high-quality learning materials will be needed to exploit the growing installed base, and conflict management constitutes an important component for educational software libraries. The control software for the discs initially will be programmed in Hypercard 2.0 for Macintosches to ensure wide accessibility. A single Macintosh and videodisc player can service a score of students.

As desk-top multi-media continues to become more accessible, faculty will be able to develop their own interactive multimedia courseware with increasing ease. The model and scripts provided by our software will be adaptable for use with video of a faculty member's own choosing. Any 30 minutes of video can be pressed on a videodisc for less than $300, and, increasingly, video will be able to be captured digitally, using new products such as QuickTime. With video-capture software, video material will be able to be transferred from a videotape or videodisc medium to digital storage on computer or compact disks. This project's location at Carnegie Mellon's Center for Design of Educational Computing (CDEC) ensures that it will be continuously upgraded to take advantage of such developments. For example, CDEC is developing its own HyperCard-like tool that allows applications to run without change on Macintosh, DOS, and Unix-based operating systems, thus greatly expanding the available installed base for these applications.

The Participants

Carnegie Mellon University provides a wealth of expertise and equipment required for the effective design and production of these videodiscs: hardware, software, video technology, computer graphics, instructional design, and even applied ethics. The project is based at the Center for Design of Educational Computing (CDEC) and Center for Advancement of Applied Ethics (CAAE), in both of which Preston Covey is Director, Martha Harty is a Research Associate, and Adam Gross is a student programmer.

CDEC is a leading center in the production of interactive videodiscs, particularly in the area of ethics. Two videodiscs produced by CDEC, A Right to Die? and Art or Forgery? have won the Best Humanities Software Award in the EDUCOM/NCRPTAL Higher Education
Software Awards Program, in 1989 and 1990, respectively (Please see Appendix D for more information about A Right to Die?). Both of these discs are used in classrooms on this campus and are distributed by independent software publishers. These videodisc packages continue to be upgraded for use with evolving hardware and software (including CDEC's own commercially available programming language cT, developed for creating programs that are portable across many types of platforms). A Right to Die? has recently been the object of two evaluation studies (one is a completed dissertation, the other is being prepared for publication) that assess the effects of affect and different presentation media on moral reasoning and that will inform the design of our project's evaluation plan.

The question that is probably most frequently addressed to members of Carnegie Mellon's Center for Advancement of Applied Ethics is this: "What is applied ethics?" The director's favorite example is the practice of conflict resolution. For most participants in the conflict resolution movement, this is a novel way of understanding what they do; yet attempts to empower people and to give them the tools for interacting and communicating so that the conflicts in which they become involved can be productive are indeed implementations of some of our most fundamental values. The process of conflict resolution itself entails inquiry into the underlying interests and values at stake as well as the norms that govern the process. The research and educational projects of the Center for the Advancement of Applied Ethics focus on practical methods for managing moral mazes, sorting out underlying value conflicts, identifying with the interests of others, and appreciating opposing perspectives on complex social issues. Dispute resolution is an important testbed for ethics in action.

Carnegie Mellon's Instructional Technology Center, under the direction of Ralph Vituccio, provides our filmmaking resources. Experienced filmmakers and editors with many high-quality film credits have already demonstrated their commitment to the project by shooting and editing trial conflict scenarios for the partial prototype made during the planning phase, and by making the enclosed 9-minute informational tape about our project. Our research has shown that charges for producing top quality video material using ITC run about 35% lower than comparable commercial productions.

In addition to these members of the production team, Marina Piscolish has agreed to design and carry out the evaluation. Piscolish was recruited for this task because of her extensive experience with evaluation of educational programs for the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education (including conflict management and the creation of tools where none were
available) and because she is local but the bulk of her work is independent of the project (see Project Impact and Evaluation below for more information about evaluation design, and Appendix A for details on Piscolish).

Another independent source of critical review for the videodisc designs and prototypes will be the Advisory Committee, which currently consists of the following:

- Daniel Bernstein, author and producer of the most closely related existing videodiscs (on negotiation and mediation for law students) at the Educational Technology Department at Harvard Law School and President of Beacon Expert Systems;
- Deidre Levdansky, Director of the Pittsburgh Mediation Center and developer of numerous conflict resolution programs for schools in the area;
- Scott Stevens, Senior Computer Scientist and Project Director of the Advanced Learning Technologies Project at Carnegie Mellon's Software Engineering Institute, has directed numerous interactive video projects and developed software tools and environments for videodisc production at MindBank, Inc., and George Mason University, where he directed the Instructional Technology Center.

In sum, an alliance of expertise and resources has been formed that combines knowledge of dispute resolution, applied ethics, youth programming, filmmaking, educational computing, instructional design, and program evaluation.

Project Impact and Evaluation

The proposed project promises to have a significant impact on the lives of young people who use our videodisc and to facilitate new conflict resolution training programs in our colleges. We can expect to see long-term benefits that fall into four general categories:

- Many more college faculty will pursue their interest in dispute resolution and will introduce their students to it in classes, extra-curricular workshops, and campus-wide symposia.
- Many more students will learn about conflict, will be trained in the use of dispute resolution skills, and will examine their values and attitudes with respect to cultural diversity and conflict outcomes.
- Many more campuses will adopt dispute resolution models for resolving conflicts,
thereby reducing the severity of conflicts due to cultural diversity, improving
campus climates, and empowering their students to be better decision makers and
conflict resolvers.

• Better research on dispute resolution skills training, particularly on evaluation of
behavioral and attitudinal changes, will become possible as a result of the
availability of computerized training materials, which provide a new window
for observation and data collection.

Scientific evaluation of these impacts is a complex undertaking. Good literature on the
evaluation of educational computing is itself thin, and instruments for testing dispute
resolution skills (never mind the efficacy of any technologies for developing such skills)
simply do not exist. We will have to design our own evaluation tools, extrapolating from
canonical strategies in analogous cases. For example, the effectiveness of CDEC's A Right
to Die? videodisc is currently being evaluated using instruments designed to assess the role
of users' affective responses to the material in their perception and ranking of the issues in
a case of euthanasia, such as how their ability or inability to empathize with various
stakeholders in the case affects their ranking of the salient issues — a question that is
relevant to the evaluation of our Disc II.

Impact on Training of Teachers

The videodiscs will be very useful in preparing faculty members to teach classes about
conflict management, and in preparing conflict resolution professionals to train young
mediators. We believe that the cost and time required for adequately preparing someone to
teach conflict management will be reduced by the availability of this resource, because
modeling of skills is worth hours of reading or listening in terms of skill transfer. Besides
providing more graphic modeling of the approach and its techniques, the discs will give
teachers dramatic illustrations of young people's points of view in a variety of conflict
situations. The availability of the discs and workshops on classroom use will enhance the
likelihood of faculty decisions to integrate the topic in a variety of apt courses. (Prime "apt"
candidates are new courses for Carnegie Mellon's recently announced Minority Studies
program, whose faculty and students will be invited to help us research and script material
on campus conflicts and diversity for Disc II.) In particular, we think faculty will
appreciate the superior cost-effectiveness of learning and teaching a dispute resolution unit
with videodiscs over alternatives such as tracking down a professional trainer and
scheduling and paying for a training session that may turn out to be too brief.
Quantifying this impact will begin with a survey of faculty interest in the topic of dispute resolution, including the appeal of various presentation strategies such as importing professional trainers, distributing curricular materials, or using videodiscs. This survey will provide a pool of faculty interested in the discs and in training workshops as well as an indication of the differential appeal of videodiscs over standard methods for pursuing an interest in the topic. This data will be useful both for dissemination and for our efforts to make a comparison study of traditional training and videodisc training.

Once the videodiscs are completed, faculty exposure and usage can be tracked by recording the usage of distributed copies. At Carnegie Mellon we will offer faculty workshops, offer to demonstrate use of the videodisc in classes, and ask faculty members to inform us about when and how they use the discs. We will do the same for the staff and counselors of our Human Resources Department, which is planning a timely campus program of diversity training for faculty, staff, and students. Use of the discs as a learning resource available in our library will be tracked from the circulation records by a survey of users. For other institutions, a registration card and usage log for faculty can be included with every package, with periodic surveys to follow up with purchasers. We believe a distributor will be amenable to carrying out this part of the evaluation, which is essentially a useful market survey.

Impact on Student Learning

The videodiscs represent a new medium for teaching dispute resolution skills, and as such, offer distinctive learning opportunities, adding to the traditional repertoire of lectures, texts, role plays, and linear videos. Students who do not respond well to material taught by traditional methods—due, for example, to attention deficits or shyness—should find this tool enjoyable and effective. Students who would absorb the material by almost any method will enjoy a new active opportunity for improving their skills and understanding; all learning theory favors active learning mechanisms over more passive methods. We expect that many more students will acquire dispute resolution skills as a result of distribution and use of these videodiscs, and the benefits will be improvements in their relations with one another and the world around them—including teachers, employers, parents, and co-workers. At our own campus, there is a growing emphasis on resources that facilitate autonomous and extracurricular learning at the discretion or initiative of the students; the well publicized availability of the videodiscs in the library would also serve this cause.
Two evaluation strategies are suggested by these expected impacts, namely, an evaluation of whether the discs do indeed facilitate learning of the intended skills and attitudes and tracking how many students actually use them and how they are affected. Marina Piscolish will be responsible for overseeing design and implementation of the first type of evaluation, which will have four parts. First, key decisions made during the planning phases will be documented for the benefit of later reevaluation, future projects, and other developers. (Such a study was done on A Right to Die? for a dissertation at Columbia University's Teachers College.) Second, when prototypes are ready, formative data will be gathered on student (and faculty) perceptions of appeal, clarity, usefulness, and efficacy of the videodisc programs and materials. This information will be used for the first round of revisions, and will also be available to help with interpretation of data on learning impact. Third, impact data will be gathered through pre- and post-tests using video conflict scenarios similar to those employed in the videodiscs. The tests will be incorporated as part of the discs themselves. Upon opening Disc I, Fight or Flight?, for example, students will view a brief video segment and will be asked to answer several questions, including choosing the responses they would give in the situation depicted. Then, upon completing the videodisc tutorial, they will be presented with an analogous video scenario and again asked for their responses. This strategy will be used for groups as well as individuals. Various concerns about test-retest reliability and about the analogousness of the two test scenarios will have to examined, but the comparison of pre- and post-disc responses will give some indication of the impact of the disc. Follow-up testing carried out several weeks or months later would provide a very rough indication of retention and transfer.

Fourth and finally, depending on faculty responses to the interest survey, we may be able to devise a comparison study using professional dispute resolution trainers (perhaps Harty and Piscolish) and the same pre- and post-tests used for impact evaluation. Here we are envisioning applying two different training methods in two sections of a large course such as Introductory Psychology. Many factors will affect the implementation and usefulness of such a project, and the possibilities will have to be explored in more detail before we can commit to this aspect of the evaluation; this is part of the evaluation research required in a field (dispute resolution) that lacks established evaluation instruments and strategies.

Our research of the dispute resolution training field has not revealed any study or method for evaluating skill transfer to real-life situations. Our use of follow-up interrogation of our own freshman students' skill retention and attitudes over their tenure as students at Carnegie Mellon will be a first attempt at longitudinal assessment.
Impact as a Dissemination Vehicle

We believe that the existence and novelty of these videotapes will facilitate the dissemination of conflict resolution programs—both mediation services and curricula—to more and more campuses. Although we can keep track of colleges and universities that acquire the discs, it will be difficult to evaluate the contribution of the discs to the establishment of programs, since many other factors are working in the same direction (rising diversity, good reports from existing programs, student initiatives, and so on). Down the road, when this campus or other campuses begin to establish training programs that reach a significant proportion of students and other members of the campus community, pre- and post-tests of campus climate or "ethos" may well become possible.

Impact as a Research Vehicle

Computerizing educational material opens new research horizons by providing the means to collect data from many subjects who receive identical instruction. Scientific studies of questions such as what students get out of given presentations, which methods yield highest improvements in recall or performance, and about short term and long term effects of teaching a given set of skills—though beyond the purview of this project—will be facilitated by the use of videotape training, especially in prospective studies with control groups. (The deliberate use of student control groups is ethically and logistically problematic; but as populations trained with and without access to the videotapes develop, there will be opportunities to make comparison studies of the efficacy of training with the discs.) The discs will provide a window on the students in the process of learning, with the means to record their reactions and reflections for added insights into what works well and what does not. Protocol research models pioneered at Carnegie Mellon have already afforded new perspectives on learning processes in many domains, facilitated by direct observation of the students' processing in real time rather than retrospective assessment of outcomes alone. In the long run, this aspect of the project could actually make contributions to the field of evaluation of educational computing as well as enabling some documentation of the payoffs from teaching dispute resolution skills.
**Budget/Workplan**

In making an interactive videodisc the first step is to define the learning objectives, design the program of instruction, and script the film segments that will provide the content of the finished disc. With the assistance of a planning grant from the National Institute for Dispute Resolution, much of this work has been completed for a prototype of Disc I. (Unfortunately, the NIDR Innovation Fund program, under which the planning of this project was partially funded, was completed and discontinued in June of 1991.) Last summer a pilot demonstration check disc was produced to facilitate our early program design and enable production of a videotape demonstration of our project (enclosed). The Advisory Committee was established to review scripts and instructional materials; these materials will be further tested by use in a course to be piloted at Carnegie Mellon this Summer and taught in the Fall semesters of 1992 and 1993 by Martha Harty and Preston Covey as a Freshman Honors Seminar.

What remains to be done is the actual production of the prototype for Disc I, formative evaluation, beta testing, impact evaluation, and revision of Disc I, and the writing of the handbooks and manual. Disc II must be researched, planned, prototyped, tested, evaluated, and revised, but it will be built on the same interface design as Disc I. (Please see the Budget Narrative in Appendix B for details.) We take our starting date as September 1992, and the project will run for two years plus one semester, costing $138,730. Details of the work are provided under the appropriate cost categories in the Budget Narrative.

**Dissemination**

Many possibilities exist for distribution of the finished products. This is an area that is now evolving, making it difficult to project what the optimal choice will be by 1994. We will explore both specialized commercial publishers of electronic and educational materials (such as The National Audiovisual Center, distributor of The Suicidal Adolescent videodisc) and distributors of dispute resolution materials, such as Jossey-Bass (San Francisco), which already publishes software. Advertising plans will be a major consideration in choosing a distributor. CDEC currently has distribution contracts for previous discs with Falcon Software and Intellimation.

Postsecondary videodisc markets other than industrial training are small, and it is not likely that revenues from this project will be great. Our past distribution agreements have allotted
the University and the Center for Design of Educational Computing even shares of the royalties afforded by the vendor. CDEC reserves such revenues in a discretionary fund used to help promising new ventures develop to the point where they receive external support. This is precisely how the current project got off the ground. Royalties received by CDEC will be reserved for two purposes: first, to fund dissemination efforts for the dispute resolution videodiscs as well as programmatic applications on campus; second, to support follow-up efforts, both software upgrades for compatibility with evolving hardware (for example, reimplementations in the cT language to afford compatibility across a variety of platforms, including digital video environments, as we have done with A Right to Die?) as well as new conflict resolution videodisc materials in the earliest stages of development. We hope that the proposed videodiscs will be just the first in a series dealing with a wider array of topical conflicts or with more specialized topics, depending on the needs of the programs and users that the first videodiscs help to inspire.

In order to publicize the videodiscs and disseminate the concepts they embody we plan, first, to raise awareness on campus through media coverage, the diversity training program for staff, faculty and students being developed by our Human Resources Department (for which Harty has already taught staff workshops), and provision of specific faculty training and in-class demonstrations, targeting (but not confining ourselves to) faculty who indicate interest through our survey and faculty in our new Minority Studies program. Once results of this initial campus effort are in, we will expand our dissemination efforts, demonstrating the discs at relevant conferences on education, educational software, and conflict resolution, offering workshops for key faculty at other campuses interested in learning to use the discs in training, and discussing the design and uses of the discs in professional publications in the relevant fields.

**Conclusion**

The proposed project promises to have significant impact on the lives of young people who use our videodisc, to facilitate wider appreciation and adoption of dispute resolution training programs for youth among our colleges, universities, and even high schools, and, thereby, to help improve the quality of life on campuses as well as promote a new important domain of postsecondary learning and research. Dissemination of dispute resolution skills at the postsecondary level requires, as a necessary condition, exemplary and disseminable instructional materials. The sheer lack of such materials is sufficient cause
for our project; the promise of animated technology for enlivening such materials and facilitating their adoption and use is our special aspiration.
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RESUMES/BIOS

Covey
Harty
Piscolish
Vituccio
Preston K. Covey

Preston Covey received his BA (Psychology) and Ph.D. (Philosophy) from Stanford University, is a tenured Associate Professor of Philosophy, and Director of both the Center for Design of Educational Computing (CDEC) and the Center for the Advancement of Applied Ethics (CAAE) at Carnegie Mellon University. Previously, at Carnegie Mellon, he directed the Philosophy Program in the early '80's through its growth into a new Department of Philosophy and served for three years as Vice Provost for University Studies. While at Carnegie Mellon, Preston has been awarded many research grants, a Danforth Associateship, a Lilly Endowment Post-Doctoral Teaching Award Fellowship, and the Elliot Dunlap Smith Award for Distinguished Teaching and Educational Service. On the computing side of his professional life, he has served a five-year term as Chair of the American Philosophical Association's Committee on Computing in Philosophy, the Research Consortium of the National Demonstration Laboratory for Interactive Technologies at the Smithsonian Institution, the Editorial Board of *The Journal of Computing and Philosophy*, and the National Advisory Board of the Research Center for Computing and Society. On the applied ethics side, Preston seeks personal and professional engagement with ethical controversies in 'real world' settings: he serves as the ethicist on the National Institutes of Health Data and Safety Monitoring Committee for a five-year National Eye Institute study and is an active member of the American Society of Criminology, the American Society of Law Enforcement Trainers, the International Association of Law Enforcement Firearms Instructors (member, Training Criteria Committee), and the Smithsonian Institutions' Institute for Research on Small Arms in International Security. Preston combines his computing and applied ethics interests in the development of interactive multimedia environments designed to vivify and contextualize practical ethical issues; examples in collaboration with CAAE and CDEC colleagues include: *A Right to Die? The Case of Dax Cowart* (winner of the 1989 Best Humanities Software Award in the EDUCOM Higher Education Software Awards Program, with Scott Roberts); *Art or Forgery? The Strange Case of Han van Meegeren* (winner of the 1990 EDUCOM Best Humanities Software Award, with Lisa Leizman); *Art or Obscenity? The Robert Mapplethorpe Case* (with Lisa Leizman); *Birth or Abortion? The Human Face of a Dilemma* (with Robert Cavalier); *Fight or Flight? Dispute Resolution for Teenagers* (with Martha Harty); and *Excessive Force? The Case of Iowa v. Willems* (with Steven Bend), the first in a series collaborative with law enforcement entitled *Shoot/Don't Shoot? The Law & Ethics of Deadly Force Decisions*. Preston is currently working on a book, *Guns, Violence, & American Values: Ethics in Social Controversy* and a Freshman Seminar of the same title. With Martha Harty, he is planning a collaborative Freshman Seminar for the fall semester of 1992 on *Conflict, Culture, & Dispute Resolution*.

(A detailed Curriculum Vitae is available upon request.)
Martha Harty

EDSH 233
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

412-268-5017 or 412-422-1043
FAX: 412-268-6074
Internet: mh51@andrew.cmu.edu
Bitnet: mh51@andrew

Education


Current Positions

Research Associate in Conflict Resolution and Interactive Multimedia, Center for Design of Educational Computing and Center for Advancement of Applied Ethics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA. Developing interactive videodisc "FIGHT OR FLIGHT? Dispute Resolution Skills for Teens" and teaching.

Trainer, Pittsburgh Mediation Center Training Team. Developing training policy; planning and teaching workshops and courses in mediation, negotiation and communication skills, including cross-cultural communication; providing group and meeting facilitation services.

Community Mediator, Pittsburgh Mediation Center (volunteer). Mediation of family and neighbor disputes, landlord-tenant disputes, consumer complaints, etc.

Consultant, Conflict management systems design, planning and training for mediation and conciliation services for businesses and non-profit organizations; meeting facilitation.

Experience and Research in Dispute Resolution

Co-trainer, Community Mediation Training, Pittsburgh Mediation Center, 35 hours, October 8 to December 2, 1991.


Trainer, "Skills for Leadership" seminar, 1 hour workshop for student organization leaders, Carnegie Mellon University, February 1, 1992.


Experience and Research in Dispute Resolution (contd.)
Meeting facilitator, "Greenprint" project, Earthday Coalition, Pittsburgh, October 1990 to June 1991. Planned and facilitated six meetings of Local/Global Linkages Working Group and prepared reports for long-range environmental planning project.

Research fellow, project on history of the conflict resolution movement in the 1950s and 60s, with Dr. John Modell, Department of History, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, 1987-88.

Director, Scenario development project, Program on International Peace and Security, Carnegie Mellon University, 1987-88. Designed and convened five Scenario Development Workshops; supervised writing projects on peaceful futures.

Training in Dispute Resolution

Mediator Certification, Pittsburgh Mediation Center, Trainer: Deidre Levdansky, September to December 1989, 34 hours.

Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program Mediator Training, Pittsburgh VORP Project, February 1992, 7 hours.

Training of Trainers, Pittsburgh Mediation Center Training Team, January 1992, 3 hours.


Meeting Facilitation Training, PennACCORD, May 1990, 8 hours.

Cross-Cultural Awareness Training, Pittsburgh Mediation Center, May 1990, 3 hours.

Mediation Preparation Training, Pennsylvania Council of Mediators, May 1990, 2 hours.

Publications/Videos


Publications/Videos (contd.)


Extensive writing and editing experience including approximately 50 articles, columns and reviews, Cycles magazine, 1980-83 and editing of philosophical books and articles for Dr. Nicholas Rescher, Center for the Philosophy of Science, University of Pittsburgh. 1986-87 (details on request).

University Teaching Experience

"Conflict, Culture and Dispute Resolution", Carnegie Mellon University, Summer and Fall, 1992.

"Problem Solving and Decision Making" (2 terms), College of General Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1981-82, 1983-84.

"Scientific Reasoning" (2 terms), College of General Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1981-82, 1985-86.

Logic (1 term), College of Arts and Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, Summer 1986.

"Magic, Medicine and Science" (1 term), College of Arts and Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, 1984.

Awards and Fellowships


"Apple for the Teacher" Award (for good teaching, remuneration to department), College of General Studies, University of Pittsburgh, for 1983-84.

Andrew W. Mellon Predoctoral Fellowships, University of Pittsburgh, 1982-83 and 1984-85.
Marina Piscolish began her career as a Middle School social studies teacher. In 1983 Ms. Piscolish became Manager of Educational Programs for WQED-TV, Pittsburgh's Public Television Station. In this capacity, she supervised the design and evaluation of media-based programs.

From 1988 through 1991, Ms. Piscolish served as Research Associate for the Pittsburgh Public Schools. During that time documented, evaluated and researched staff training programs and curriculum innovations in conflict resolution, children's ethics, teacher development and education, school change, inter-institutional collaboration, and shared decisionmaking.

Since 1990, Ms. Piscolish has served as a volunteer community mediator for the Pittsburgh Mediation Center. She is also a founding member of the Mediation Center's training team. She has written and made professional presentations on the various topics that she researches, including the evaluation of conflict management, conflict resolution and peer mediation.

Currently, she provides evaluation consultation to the Pittsburgh Mediation Center, The Pittsburgh Public Schools, The Pennsylvania Department of Education, and The University of Pittsburgh. She is completing her Ph.D. in Education at the University of Pittsburgh.
### Summary of Evaluation Research

**Activities of Marina Piscolish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONFLICT RESOLUTION</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of curriculum-based program designed to teach conflict resolution skills to elementary students and teachers. Evaluation focused on assessment common conflict experiences, pre-post of content knowledge, adequacy of training and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEARTWOOD READING PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of children's literature-based ethics curriculum. Program of several studies looks at program concept, training, implementation and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECONDARY INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of program implementation re: ITL roles and responsibilities, training, certification, impact and recommendations. Survey probes perceptions of ITLs, Teachers, Principals and Supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of the three year project including analysis of secondary student indices, staff-initiated evaluations, and a survey study probing perceptions of both centrally-based and school-based personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHARED DECISION MAKING</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of district's move toward shared decision making, including studies of cabinet activity and interaction, and a study of staff perceptions of critical school-based decisions and the various decision processes used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA REGIONAL TEACHER CENTER</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of 90/91 Lead Teacher Program focusing on participants reactions to process and content of training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL-DISTRICT UNIVERSITY COLLABORATIVE</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of collaborative effort to restructure teacher education including documentation of program planning and implementation. Responsibilities also include coordination of University-based research and evaluation studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ralph Vituccio (B.S., Psychology and Communications, University of Pittsburgh) is an Independent film and video writer, producer and director. He is employed as a Producer/Director of Film and Video at Carnegie Mellon University where he manages the video production services department for the University. He is a part-time faculty member at the University of Pittsburgh and at Pittsburgh Filmmakers, The Media Arts Center where he also serves on the Board of Directors.

As an Independent, Ralph made "Valley Town 1983" a 16mm B/W documentary on unemployed steel workers in the Pittsburgh area. In March of 1987 he collaborated with the Pittsburgh Dance Alloys and Mark Taylor and Friends of New York to present an interactive media event called "Lost Continent", which combined dance and video in a live performance. The show met with critical acclaim in Pittsburgh, New York City and Washington, D.C. He has worked with performance artist Ping Chong shooting the video for Ping's acclaimed video "Plage Concrete".

Ralph completed a 60 minute documentary titled, "PERFORMANCE: The Living Art". It highlights many internationally recognized performance artists exhibiting and talking about their work. The program was aired nationally on several PBS stations. "PERFORMANCE: The Living Art" was featured at the 40th annual Berlin International Film Festival as part of the Median Operative program. He hopes to soon begin production on yet another art documentary, this time looking into the world of video art.

Ralph is currently wrapping-up production on a video that explores his roots as a native resident of the city of Pittsburgh. In November of 1990 he will be opening his video installation, "predestined to memory", at the Hewlett Gallery in Pittsburgh, PA. He has received numerous grants in support of his independent work from the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts and the Mid-Atlantic Region Media Arts Fellowship Program.

While at Carnegie Mellon University Ralph has produced and directed numerous documentaries and recruitment videos. In addition, he has participated in the production of several interactive video projects, most recently; The Piano Tutor, The Art Forger Disc, and an interactive program that instructs the user on software development. This particular interactive project utilized the newest CD ROM technology.
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BUDGET

FIPSE Budget Form
Budget Narrative
Workplan Schedule
### BUDGET*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ITEMS (FIPSE costs only)</th>
<th>Year 1 1992</th>
<th>Year 2 1993</th>
<th>Year 3 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Direct Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Salaries &amp; Wages (Professional and Clerical)</td>
<td>$9,329</td>
<td>25,473</td>
<td>27,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employee Benefits</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>5,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment (Purchase)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Consultants or Contracts</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other (Equipment Rental, Printing, etc.)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>9,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Indirect Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Requested from FIPSE (This Figure Should Appear on the Title Page)</strong></td>
<td>$16,914</td>
<td>57,676</td>
<td>64,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT (Project costs not requested from FIPSE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 1992</th>
<th>Year 2 1993</th>
<th>Year 3 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$12,759</td>
<td>42,185</td>
<td>46,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most items will need to be detailed in the Budget Narrative at the Final Proposal stage: This includes a breakdown of the institutional support.
FIPSE BUDGET NARRATIVE for DISPUTE RESOLUTION VIDEODISCS

Year 1: September thru December, 1992

The objectives during this semester are:

- to critique and revise the plan for Disc I, especially the video scripts
- to redesign the interface and write the Glossary and Help features of the videodiscs,
- to completely program the control software for Disc I, and finally
- to research and design appropriate evaluation strategies.

This development work is preparation for the video production. Everything else must be done before the video production because everything else can change, but once shot, the video will be very difficult to revise.

Year 1 Salaries/Personnel:

Dr. Martha Harty, Project Director and Co-Principal Investigator, also functioning as scriptwriter, researcher, and chief programmer, will be funded at 50% (base salary $34,000), or $17,000. Benefits are calculated at CMU’s rate of 25% of this amount, or $4,250. Harty's responsibilities will include:

- Gathering reviews of the plan for Disc I and incorporating them in revisions.
- Working with the programmer (Gross) to implement and debug the software for Disc I.
- Completing the design of the user interface for the videodiscs.
- Writing and revising the Glossary and Help features.
- Working with the video director (Vituccio) on pre-production planning, including script revisions, location surveys, talent recruiting, and production scheduling.
- Collaborating with Piscollish (see below) in research and design of evaluation.

(In addition to these project activities, Harty will have primary responsibility for teaching a Freshman Seminar, in collaboration with Covey, on "Conflict, Culture, and Dispute Resolution." The course will feature skills training, role-plays, and video-based exercises designed to test prototype instructional and video materials in the plan for Disc 1.)

Dr. Preston Covey: Co-Principal Investigator and developer of two previous national award-winning videodiscs, functioning as producer and ethics and design consultant, will consult on all phases and activities throughout the entire project. Five per cent of Covey's time, conservatively
estimated, at $1329 plus $339 benefits in Year 1 (base salary $79,800), will be donated. Cost sharing at 5% increments per year is reflected in the budgets for Years 2 and 3.

Marina Piscollish, previously Research and Evaluation Coordinator, Pittsburgh Board of Public Education, Mediator and Trainer, Pittsburgh Mediation Center, has developed and carried out evaluations of a number of school-based conflict resolution programs. She will be responsible for design, implementation, and reporting of the evaluation. In Year 1 her activities include a survey of faculty interest in dispute resolution training with and without videodisc technology and development of evaluation instruments in collaboration with Harty. A 25% position will be created (base salary $30,000), for $2498 plus benefits at a part-time rate of 10%, or $250 in Year 1.

Adam Gross, Programmer, will work 10 hrs./week for 13 weeks at $9/hr., for a total of $1170. Gross will implement and debug the scripts for Disc I in Hypercard, including the interface design, Glossary and Help features, index and database for video material. He will meet at least weekly with Harty. (Gross is a sophomore at Carnegie Mellon with excellent programming skills and a track record in graphics design and interactive multimedia design in CDEC. He will also be receiving credit for this project toward his self-designed major in interactive multimedia and applied ethics. He is ideally suited to serve as a student evaluator for the videodisc material.)

CDEC is underwriting the participation of technical and support staff throughout the project; for example, all required secretarial support and Steven Bend (Assistant Director of CDEC) for programming/hardware consulting/trouble-shooting, at approximately 5% (base salary $36,595), or $609 plus $155 benefits in Year 1. Cost sharing at 5% increments per year is reflected in the budgets for Years 2 and 3.

Year 1 Travel

One trip to Washington D.C. for Harty to attend the FIPSE meeting in the Fall of 1992. The current airfare is $428 roundtrip, plus $131/day and $40 ground transport, or $433. One trip to Boston, Massachusetts for Harty to meet with two key members of the Advisory Committee, Bernstein and Stone, who will be reviewing the plan for Disc I. Airfare is currently $676.50 roundtrip, and an additional $100 is budgeted for meals. A hotel will probably not be necessary.
**Year 1 Materials/Supplies**

We have budgeted $100/month for all computing and office supplies, for a total of $400.

**Year 1 Consultants**

*Ralph Vituccio*, Video Director, will work with Harty on planning the video production, reviewing scripts, surveying locations, and so on. In Year 1, work is estimated on a *per diem* consulting basis, for 2 days at $300/day, or $600.

Members of the Advisory Committee (*Daniel Bernstein, Deidre Levdansky, Scott Stevens, Doug Stone*—see Participants section of proposal for details) will be asked to review the plan for Disc I and meet with Harty to draft revisions. They are budgeted for 1.5 days each at $300/day, totalling $1800.

**Other**

We have budgeted $50/month for miscellaneous expenses, or $200, and 8% for allowed indirect/administrative costs, or $1,253.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIPSE Direct Costs:</th>
<th>$15,661</th>
<th>(shown in boldface in narrative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Allowance:</td>
<td>$1,253</td>
<td>(at 8% for FIPSE-allowed administrative costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1 TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,914</strong></td>
<td>(funding requested from FIPSE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost sharing:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS Direct Costs:</th>
<th>$2,432</th>
<th>(no clerical costs included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS Indirect Costs:</td>
<td>$10,327</td>
<td>(balance of indirect costs calculated at CMU's negotiated 64% federal rate minus the FIPSE allowance calculated on FIPSE costs only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,759</strong></td>
<td>(43% of total direct and indirect costs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year 2: 1993

The objectives during Year 2 are:

• to shoot the video for Disc I and produce a full prototype by Spring
• to test the prototype with 10-12 students, revise it, and "bulletproof" it
• to use the prototype of Disc I in courses
• to do impact and comparison evaluations of Disc I course use
• to write a manual and produce other supporting materials for Disc I
• to thoroughly research culture-, gender- and race-based conflicts on campuses
• to draft a complete plan (including evaluation) and set of video scripts for Disc II.

Year 2 Salaries:

Harty (see Year 1) will continue to be funded at 50% (base salary $34,000 through June 30th; $35,700 thereafter, projecting 5% salary increments), totalling $17,425. Benefits (25.5%) come to $4443. In the first semester of Year 2 her responsibilities will include:

• Pre-production for Disc I with Vituccio, including auditioning, casting, rehearsing and scheduling.
• Closely monitoring the video production for Disc I.
• Collaborating in the editing of video material for Disc I.
• Getting check discs pressed.
• Working with the programmer (Gross) to integrate the videodisc with the software.
• Facilitate running of initial tests of the prototype of Disc I with Piscolish, and revisions.

In the summer of 1993, Harty will

• Pilot the use of the Disc I prototype in a course.
• Continue revisions to the prototype of Disc I.
• Research the conflict scenarios and instructional content of Disc II, including a review of relevant literature, surveys, and focus group meetings with campus groups.

In the Fall semester of 1993, Harty will

• Collaborate with the formal evaluation of Disc I during use in a course.
• Prepare a manual and student handbook for Disc I.
• Draft a complete plan for the instructional content of Disc II.
• Write scripts for Disc II.

Piscolish will be responsible for evaluation activities: recruiting subjects, carrying out formative evaluation, and recommending revisions of the Disc I prototype; selecting faculty and courses for
impact and/or comparison evaluation of Disc I; report of the evaluation process for Disc I; and
design of the evaluation component of Disc II in collaboration with principal investigators. 25%
time (base salary $30,000 through June 30, 1992; $31,500 thereafter) is $7688 and benefits at
part-time rate of 10% is $769.

Gross will continue to do programming, incorporating the check disc(s) to complete the prototype
of Disc I in late February and March, and debugging and "bulletproofing" during testing of the
prototype. A rough estimate is four more 10-hr. weeks (at $9/hr.), or $360.

Year 2 Travel
A second trip to Washington D.C. for Harty to attend the FIPSE meeting in the Fall of 1993 (if
necessary): $904 (see Year 1), and a second trip to Boston, Massachusetts for Harty to meet with
Advisory Committee members to revise the plan for Disc II (in December): $815 (see Year 1)
(these figures have been increased by 5% from Year 1).

Video Production: Combined Consulting, Equipment Rental and Supplies

Video Materials/Supplies
Tape stock for the video production will cost $400, and making 5 check discs will cost about
$1500.

Video Consultants/Contracts
R. Vituccio will direct the video production, which will require approximately six days with a
production crew (of at least 3), at $400/day, or $2400. The video production will also require a
special additional camera with an operator (SteadyCam) for five days at $400/day, or $2000.
Following the shoot, Vituccio will assign a video film editor to do the editing (with Harty), at a
cost of $400/day including use of editing equipment. Approximately 8 days will be required,
totalling $3200.

Talent: 13 actors and actresses (plus extras) will be needed for the production, for a total of 20
actor-days at $100/day, or $2000. A narrator will also be needed for one day, at a cost of
$500/day including use of sound studio equipment, or $500.

Note: Charges for SteadyCam, editing and narration represent payments for personnel and the
equipment they use and are difficult to break down further. We have assigned 50% to the budget
category of consulting ($2850) and 50% to equipment rental ($2850).
Video Equipment Rental
Rental of video production equipment for the production crew, including cameras, sound equipment, lights, monitors and so on will cost $1000/day, or $6,000 during the production (plus $2850 of the charges from previous section—see Note).

Non-video Materials/Supplies
We have budgeted $100/month for office supplies, for a total of $1200.

Non-video Consultants
At the end of Year 2, the Advisory Committee will once again be called on, to review the plan and scripts for Disc II. (Most design issues will have been resolved during development of Disc I, but the issues involved in developing the content of Disc 2 will be challenging.) Four members, one day each at $300/day will cost $1200.

Other
We have budgeted $50/month for miscellaneous expenses, or $600, and 8% for allowed indirect/administrative costs, or $4272.

FIPSE Direct Costs: $53,404 (shown in boldface in narrative)
Indirect Cost Allowance: $4,272 (at 8% for FIPSE-allowed administrative costs)

Year 2 TOTAL: $57,676 (funding requested from FIPSE)

Cost sharing:
CS Direct Costs: $7,487 (no clerical costs included)
CS Indirect Costs: $34,698 (balance of indirect costs calculated at CMU's negotiated 64% federal rate minus the FIPSE allowance calculated on FIPSE costs only)

Total: $42,185 (42% of total direct and indirect costs)
Year 3: 1994

The objectives during Year 3 are:

- to complete the package for Disc I and begin distribution
- to critique and revise the plan for Disc II, especially the video scripts
- to program the software for Disc II
- to shoot the video for Disc II and produce a full prototype by Summer
- to test the prototype with students, revise it, and "bulletproof" it
- to use the prototype (along with Disc I) in courses
- to evaluate the impact of using Disc II in courses

Year 3 Salaries

Harty (see Year 1) will continue to be funded one-half time, at a base salary of $35,700 through June 30th; $37,485 thereafter (projected salary increment 5%), totalling $18,296. Benefits (25.5%) come to $4665. In the first semester of Year 3 her responsibilities will include:

- Gathering reviews of the plan for Disc II and incorporating them in revisions.
- Working with the programmer to implement and debug the software for Disc II,
- Working with the video director on planning and pre-production, including script revisions, location surveys, finding talent, casting, rehearsing, and scheduling.
- Closely monitoring the video production for Disc II.
- Collaborating in the editing of video material for Disc II.

In the Summer of 1994, Harty will

- Master Disc I for distribution.
- Arrange for distribution of Disc I package to begin.
- Get check discs pressed for Disc II.
- Work with the programmer to integrate Disc II with interactive software.
- Bulletproof and revise prototype of Disc II.

In the Fall semester of 1994, Harty will

- Pilot the use of Disc II in courses.
- Continue revisions to Disc II.
- Prepare a manual and student handbook for Disc II.
- Master Disc II for distribution.
Piscolish will perform the formative evaluation and recommend revisions for the prototype of Disc II, carry out impact and/or comparison evaluations during course usage, analyze data and prepare a final evaluation report. 25% (base salary $31,500 through June 1993; $33,075 thereafter) is $8072 and benefits (10%) of $807.

The programmer (Gross) will work 10 hrs./week for 10 weeks at $10/hr., for a total of $1000. The programmer will implement the plan for Disc II, revising the Disc I software and developing the index and database for new video material. He will meet at least weekly with Harty. In the Summer and Fall he will debug, revise and bulletproof the Disc II software.

Year 3 Travel
A third trip to Washington D.C. for Harty to attend the FIPSE meeting in the Fall of 1993 (if necessary): $949 (Year 2 expense plus 5%).

Video Production: Combined Consulting, Equipment Rental and Supplies

Video Materials/Supplies
Tape stock for the video production will cost $400, mastering Disc I and Disc II, so that copies can be made for distribution, will cost $6000, and making 5 check discs (for Disc II prototype) will cost about $1500.

Video Consultants/Contracts
R. Vituccio will direct the video production, which will require approximately six days with a production crew, at $400/day, or $2400. The video production will also require a SteadyCam and operator, for five days at $400/day, or $2000. Vituccio will assign a video film editor to do the editing (with Harty), at a cost of $400/day including use of editing equipment. Approximately 8 days will be required, totalling $3200.

Talent: 12 actors and actresses (plus extras) will be needed for the production, for a total of 18 actor-days at $100/day, or $1800. A narrator will also be needed for one day, at a cost of $500/day including use of sound studio equipment, or $500.

Note: Charges for SteadyCam, editing and narration represent payments for personnel and the equipment they use and are difficult to break down further. We have assigned 50% to salaries ($2850) and 50% to equipment rental ($2850).
**Video Equipment Rental**
Rental of video production equipment, including cameras, sound equipment, lights, monitors and so on will cost $1000/day, or $6,000 during the production (plus $2850 of charges from the previous section—see *Note*).

**Non-video Materials/Supplies**
We have budgeted $100/month for office supplies, for a total of $1200.

**Other**
We have budgeted $50/month for miscellaneous expenses, or $600, and 8% for allowed indirect/administrative costs, or $4,751.

**FIPSE Direct Costs:** $59,389  
(Shown in boldface in narrative)

**Indirect Cost Allowance:** $4,751  
(At 8% for FIPSE-allowed administrative costs)

**Year 3 TOTAL:** $64,140  
(Funding requested from FIPSE)

**Cost sharing:**

- **CS Direct Costs:** $7,861  
  (No clerical costs included)
- **CS Indirect Costs:** $38,289  
  (Balance of indirect costs calculated at CMU's negotiated 64% federal rate minus the FIPSE allowance calculated on FIPSE costs only)

**Total:** $46,150  
(42% of total direct and indirect costs)

**TOTAL requested for Years 1-3:** $138,730
## Workplan Schedule, Sep 1992 to Dec 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>Program and Debug Software--Plan for Video Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOV</td>
<td><strong>DISC I: Pre-Production</strong>--Shoot--Edit--Press Check Disc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Test DISC I Prototype--Revise and Debug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAN</td>
<td><strong>DISC I: Use in Course--Revise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEB</td>
<td><strong>DISC I: Evaluate Course Use--Report--Write Manuals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAR</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Research for Scripts and Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Draft Plan and Scripts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Revise Plan--Revise Evaluation Design--Program and Debug Software</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Planning and Pre-Production</strong>--Shoot--Edit--Press Check Disc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>Test DISC II Prototype--Revise--Debug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUG</td>
<td><strong>DISC I: Begin Distribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEP</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Use in Course and Evaluate--Report--Write Manuals--Revise--Master Disc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCT</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Use in Course and Evaluate--Report--Write Manuals--Revise--Master Disc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOV</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Use in Course and Evaluate--Report--Write Manuals--Revise--Master Disc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEC</td>
<td><strong>DISC II: Use in Course and Evaluate--Report--Write Manuals--Revise--Master Disc</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Assurances and Certificates
Transmittal Letter to State Dept. of Education
CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

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

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

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

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

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

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

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

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE

(GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Director, Grants and Contracts Service, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3124, CSA Regional Office H1
DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE
(GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)

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

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

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Director, Grants and Contracts Service, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3124, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4571. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

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

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


Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

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

NAME OF APPLICANT
CARNegie-MELLon UNIVERSITY

PR/AWARD NUMBER AND/OR PROJECT NAME

PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE
Thomas M. Eagan, Manager
Office of Spon. Research

SIGNATURE

DATE 2/27/92

ED 80-0013
ASSURANCES -- NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the fifteen statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM’s Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§ 623 and 627 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1506 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.


Authorized for Local Reproduction
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§ 1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clear Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended, (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93-205).


14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm-blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984.

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL
THOMAS N. EAGAN
MANAGER, OFFICE OF SPONSORED RESEARCH

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION
CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

DATE SUBMITTED 2/27/92
February 23, 1992

Dr. Peter H. Garland
Acting Commissioner for Higher Education
State Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Dear Dr. Garland,

Attached to this letter is a final proposal we are submitting to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. The project will create two interactive videodiscs that will teach dispute resolution skills to young adults and explore race-, culture- and gender-based conflicts on college campuses. The finished videodiscs, the first of their kind, will add a new mode of presentation, practice, and review to conflict resolution teaching in colleges, will facilitate establishment of new training programs, and will also serve as a general resource to be made available in libraries and for use in high schools. We are requesting $118,000 over the next 2.3 years to make and thoroughly field test the videodiscs.

We are providing a copy of this proposal to you so that you can review it and contribute comments to FIPSE in accordance with their charter. If appropriate, we would appreciate receiving copies of your input. Please address correspondence to Martha Harty at the address and phone numbers above. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Martha Harty
Preston Covey
Appendix D

A RIGHT TO DIE?
Descriptive Pamphlet