

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR: ED-2015-ICCD-0113-0005

Docket: ED-2015-ICCD-0113

TEACH Grant: Study of Institutional Practices and Grant Recipient Outcomes and Experiences

Comment On: ED-2015-ICCD-0113-0001

Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; TEACH Grant: Study of Institutional Practices and Grant Recipient Outcomes and Experiences

Document: ED-2015-ICCD-0113-0005

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-24326

First comment (1 of 2)

Submitter Information

Name: Patti Carlson

Address: Arcata, CA, 95521

Email: Patricia.Carlson@humboldt.edu

As of: 11/10/15 7:43 AM

Received: September 28, 2015

Status: Posted

Posted: September 29, 2015

Category: Financial Aid Administrator

Tracking No. 1jz-8lds-zty9

Comments Due: November 24, 2015

Submission Type: Web

General Comment

We have been reluctant to promote the TEACH Grant program to our students. Although it is considered a "grant", it comes with too many conditions. On our campus, we chose to make the TEACH Grant available to students who are already enrolled in the credential program. Our hopes were that this would increase the chances of the grant remaining a grant. Our experience has been different. Even

among these credential students, who are mostly Special Education, a high-need field, and who completed the credential program within the past 6 years, we find that more than half of the TEACH Grants we awarded have already been converted to loans. It is reasonable to expect that this percentage will be higher over the next few years.

It appears that, among our students, there are two problems. One is the difficulty of finding a full time position in an eligible program within the 4 year time limit needed to complete the service within 8 years. Another is that, since our grants are converting to loans so quickly, students appear to have difficulty with the annual documentation of progress.

There seem to be a serious faults in the program itself. It is misleading to call this a grant program. It would be more accurate to call it a loan with a forgiveness option. It would be more effective to either make it a true grant, with no strings attached, or to improve the existing loan forgiveness options for teachers.

Second comment (2 of 2)

Submitter Information

Name: JEAN PUBLEE

As of: 11/10/15 7:43 AM

Received: September 27, 2015

Status: Posted

Posted: September 28, 2015

Category: Academic/Think Tank

Tracking No. 1jz-8ld2-g89k

Comments Due: November 24, 2015

Submission Type: Web

General Comment

this progsam is worthless. how ,many fat cat bureaucracies does it take to get good educatin. right now taxpayers pay for local fat cat bureaucrats, county fat cat bureaucrats, state fat cat bureaucrats and federal fat cat bureaucrats. taxpayres are paying for a minimum of 4 levels of fat cat bureaucy plus all their additional fat cat add ons that exist to make them better. that makes 5 levels of fat cat bureaucracy. WHEN THE HELL IS ENOUGH ENOUGH? ITS TIME TO CUT THE BUDGETS. WE DONT NEED ALL THESE LEVELS OF GOVT TO MAKE EDUCAION WORK. IN FACT SO MANY LEVELS OF FAT CAT BUREAUCRACIES CAN IN

FACT WORK AS AN IMPEDIMENT TO GOOD EDUCATION. GOOD EDUCATION NEEDS WANTING TO LEARN. THAT MEANS WANTING TO LEARN WHAT YOU WANT TO LEARN TOO. ALL OF THESE FAT CATS DONT ADD A DAMN THING TO WHAT HAPPENS WITH OUR IDS. WHAT THEY NEED IS EXPOSURE TO EXPERTS IN FIELDS. NOT MORE FAT CAT SPENDING. THIS ENTIRE PRJECT SHOUDL BE SHUT DOWN. WE SHOUDL CLOSE DOWN THE FEDERAL FAT CAT BUREAUCRACY. THIS IS ACCOMPLISHING ABSOLUTELY NOTHING FOR OUR KIDS. OUR TEACHERS ARE VERY VERWY WELL PAID ALREADY. I SES ALOT OF THEM DRIVING THE MOST EXPENSIVE CARS AROUND. TEHY ARE NOT STARVING. THEY HAVE GUARANTEED INCOMES AND A PLATINUM HEALTH CARE PLAN THAT NOBODY ELSE HAS IN PRIVAT EINDUSTRY ANYMORE OR IN MOST OTHER INDUSTRIES. WE NEED TO CUT BACK ON THIS UNNECESSARY SPENDNG. THIS PROJECT HSOULD HAVBE A BUDGET OF ZERO AND THE PROJECT SHOUDL BE ENTIRELY SHUT DOWN. DOWNSIZE THIS DEPT BY70% NOW.