

EETT Research Responsibilities Overview

Viera, Florida

June 10, 2010

History of EETT Research

The purpose of the statewide research is to provide important and useful information to the state, districts and interested stakeholders. This work is not evaluative in nature but, designed to support continuous, data-based planning and improvements. These tools have resulted in many reports including interim, final and district level reports. Reports are available on the *Florida Innovates* page at <http://www.flinnovates.org/>.

2010-2011 Fundings Goals & Research Tools

Funding Goal	FL Ed. Tech. Goal http://floridatechplan.org	Data Collection/Level
<i>Improve technology integration practices</i>	2: Enhance the integration of technology in curricula	<i>Lesson Planner (Teacher)</i> http://tools.fcit.usf.edu/ar/
		<i>Student Artifact System (Teacher)</i> http://tools.fcit.usf.edu/ar/
<i>Increase access to technological tools, infrastructure</i>	5: Increase access to digital tools 6: Provide access to reliable infrastructure	<i>Quarterly Reporting System :</i> http://itts.flinnovates.org/EETTSurvey/index.aspx (District)
		<i>Technology Resources Survey</i> http://www.flinnovates.org/survey (School K-12 principals and District)
		<i>Perceptions Survey (Teacher)</i> URL Coming
<i>Strengthen teacher & administrator ICT skills through PD (i.e. FDE, MDE, local)</i>	9: Ensure trained instructional technology staff 11: Enable technology leadership 12: Support ICT training for educators to enhance instruction	<i>Teacher Tool for Technology Literacy (T3L) –</i> URL Coming (Teacher)
		<i>Principal Survey: Change Facilitator Styles Questionnaire (CFSQ) URL Coming</i> (Principals)
		<i>FDE Evaluation (FDE Participants)</i>
<i>Strengthen student ICT skills</i>	1: Strengthen student ICT skills	<i>Student Tool for Technology Literacy (ST2L) (Student)</i> http://www.flinnovates.org/st2l.htm
<i>Increase student achievement</i>	3: Enable opportunities to personalize and extend student learning	<i>Action Research Tool for Technology Integration (ARTI) (Teacher)</i> http://tools.fcit.usf.edu/ar/

Plans for EETT 2010-2011 Research

Research tools developed have been divided into two categories. *Florida Digital Educator* tools focus on the technology integration process. *Florida Innovates* tools focus on access, skills, and perceptions. A brief overview of each tool follows.

Florida Digital Educator Tools (Technology Integration Process)

<http://etc.usf.edu/fde/index.php>

Lesson Planner System

http://etc.usf.edu/fde/lesson_planner.php

- Teachers share a good example of how tech is integrated into teaching. (First qtr of school year and again at end of year).
- Based on Jonassen's criteria for constructive learning
- Possible changes to shift focus to STEM
- Blind review process
- Reviewed according to the TIM dimension of the ACOT levels of technology integration.

Student Digital Artifact System

- Teachers nominate best student example at beginning and end of the year.
- Newman's Indicators of Authentic Learning (reviewed to determine which are present in the students' work)
- Blind review process

Action Research Tool for Technology Integration (ARTI)

<http://etc.usf.edu/fde/arti.php>

- Teachers with MDE mentor can go through action research (AR) process, identify their question, grade level, and answer general questions about hardware/software etc.
- Upload artifact to support finding
- Combination of data collection and professional development
- Need to work on quality – focus on mentoring and feedback

Florida Innovates Tools (Access, Skills, and Perceptions)

<http://www.flinnovates.org/>

Quarterly Reporting System

<http://itts.flinnovates.org/EETTSurvey/index.aspx>

- Allows districts to submit quarterly reports for grant monitoring and data collection purposes.

Technology Resources Survey

<http://www.flinnovates.org/innovates.htm>

- Schools and districts complete survey about technology access and other factors which affect technology use and integration.
- Aligned to computer-based testing requirements
- EETT districts can be isolated
- Trends of that data over four years. (e.g. planning and funding , digital divide, connecting community)

Perception Survey

- Measures teacher comfort with and understanding of technology tools.
- (MDEs) Digital Educator Profile – attributes
- Working to identify teachers who are participating in EETT, but not necessarily in institute.

Student Tool for Tech Literacy (ST2L)

<http://www.flinnovates.org/sttl>

- Targeted to eighth grade students for measuring technology literacy.
- Looks at data for grants involving this grade level.
- Pre-post comparisons

Teacher Tool for Technology Literacy (T3L)

- Based on Student Tool for Technology Literacy (ST2L)
- Measures basic skills and literacy for teachers
- Will be field tested at Summer Institutes
- Pre-post comparisons

2010-2011 Tool Under Development

Technology Integration Matrix (TIM) within the Florida Digital Educator tools

<http://fcit.usf.edu/matrix/>

- MDEs validate where their teaching falls within the cells.
- Creating an observation tool so someone can walk into classroom and place the lesson on the TIM. (In pilot test with certain districts and during the summer institutes. Principals can do observations. MDEs might also use the tool in the districts. Next step is move from technology focus to content area integration).
- Considering associating artifacts from EETT with the TIM levels.
- Working on TIM technology comfort measure – Questions to ask teachers to figure out where they are on the TIM. Based on a set of photographs, teachers choose with which photo they are most comfortable. Thirty-five choices.

District Responsibilities

- Submit evaluation PO to UF in a timely manner
- Submit complete and accurate list of EETT participants in a timely manner
- Support EETT participants in completing tools in timely manner (anonymity guaranteed; no individual names will ever be used)
- Strive to help schools and teachers understand the importance of the research and the value of the data for local improvement efforts
- Communicate with the research team should issues arise

Deliverables to Districts

- MDE liaison to help coordinate data collection
- Support for district AR mentors
- Research team member on monthly conference calls to answer questions
- Interim and final reports documenting district outcomes on each of the above mentioned tools.
- Statewide report allowing districts to see how their outcomes compared to state averages.

Tentative Timeline

Time	Event	Research Actions
June 10, 2010	Initial meeting of all grantees at Viera HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview research responsibilities for districts • Identify district level points of contact (<i>Grant coordinator</i>)
June 2010	FDE Institutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Pre” assessments –T3L & Perceptions (<i>Teachers</i>)
July 2010	Grants begin FDE Institutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Pre” assessments –T3L & Perceptions (<i>Teachers</i>) • Identify participating schools, principals & teachers (<i>Grant coordinator</i>) • Identify districts targeting 8th grade for ST2L (<i>Grant coordinator</i>) • Districts identify MDE liaisons and mentors (<i>Grant coordinator</i>)
August 2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts submit POs to UF (<i>Grant coordinator</i>)
September 2010	AR Synchronous Training Session with Mentors (online)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly report 1 (<i>Grant coordinator</i>) • Pre-lessons ** (<i>Teachers</i>) • Pre-artifacts (<i>Teachers</i>) • Non-FDE teachers take T3L & Perceptions if applicable (<i>Teachers</i>)
October 2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin ARTI ** (<i>Teachers</i>) • Pre-ST2L for 8th grade (<i>Students</i>) • Technology Resource Survey (<i>Principals</i>)
November 2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal Survey (<i>Principals</i>)
December 2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim Report submitted by research team to FDOE
January 2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Report 2 submitted by districts (<i>Grant coordinator</i>)
February 2011		
March 2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Report 3 submitted by districts (<i>Grant coordinator</i>)
April 2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post T3L & Perceptions (<i>Teachers</i>)
May 2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post lessons (<i>Teachers</i>) • Post artifacts (<i>Teachers</i>) • Post ST2L (<i>Students</i>) • Complete ARTI (<i>Teachers</i>)
June 2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Report 4 submitted by districts (<i>Grant coordinator</i>)
July 2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Report submitted by research team to FDOE

**FDE participants will have begun this work as part of the Institutes

Recommended Action Research Timelines

Districts typically choose to complete the Action Research component of the action research before or after FCAT. The table below provides general timelines districts may wish to use to support teachers through the AR process. In general, teachers receiving more careful mentoring are able to produce more useful results for both the statewide research and for improving their own classroom practices.

Action Research Step	Brief Description	Pre-FCAT Timeline	Post-FCAT Timeline
Introduction	General Background (brief)	October 15	March 30
Identify Inquiry	AR question, targeted audience, main goals	October 15	March 30
Context	Details about inquiry (teaching strategies, technical tools, etc.)	October 30	April 15
Data Collection	Plans for how to collect data; length of inquiry	October 30	April 30
Data Analysis	Data has been collected; teachers are making sense of it. Must have data to support findings	November 30	May 30
Implications and Actions	Results of the work related to the teacher	November 30	May 30

Research Team

Kate Kemker, Florida Department of Education
Jenny Black, Florida Department of Education
Kara Dawson, University of Florida
Cathy Cavanaugh, University of Florida
Albert Ritzhaupt, University of Florida
Wendy Drexler, University of Florida
Christine Harmes, Independent Consultant
Ann Barron, University of South Florida
James Welsh, University of South Florida
Gladis Kersaint, University of South Florida
Chet Lyskawa, Florida Center for Instructional Technology (USF)
Roy Winkelman, Florida Center for Instructional Technology (USF)
Kris Mathews, Florida Center for Instructional Technology (USF)
Gordon Worley, Florida Center for Instructional Technology (USF)
Andrew Dennard, Florida Center for Interactive Media (FSU)
Ryan Wilke, Florida Center for Interactive Media (FSU)

Contacts for Districts

Research Contact:

Wendy Drexler

wdrexler@gmail.com

Professional Development/MDE Contact:

Kris Mathews

cmathews@usf.edu

