## Archived Information REGIONAL TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION CONSORTIA (R\*TECs)

<b>Goal:</b> To improve teaching and learning by providing technical assistance and development for the effective use of educational technology.	Funding History (\$ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
<b>Legislation:</b> Title III, Part A, SubPart 1, Section 3141 of the Elementary and	1985	\$0	2000	\$10
Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, (20 U.S.C. 8161-8202) P.L. 103-382.	1990	\$0	2001	\$10
Schools Act of 1994, (20 U.S.C. 6101-6202) F.L. 103-362.	1995	\$10	2002 (Requested)	\$0

## **Program Description**

The Regional Technology in Education Consortia (R\*TEC) Program supports regional centers that provide professional development, technical assistance, and dissemination of information on the various types and effective uses of hardware, software, and electronic networks to districts, schools, and others to help students meet challenging academic standards. Five-year grant awards are made to regional entities, which must include state educational agencies, institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, or a combination thereof.

Five year grant awards are made to regional entities, which must include state educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations, or a combination thereof. The program first received funds in FY 1995.

R\*TEC grantees help states, districts, schools, and adult education programs effectively integrate technologies into kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms, library media centers, and other educational settings. They identify or produce strategies, services and materials that promote the effective use of technology for teaching and learning and make them available to states, districts, schools, and classrooms. These include professional development programs, portfolios of tools and processes, research syntheses, and descriptions of best practices for planning and implementing instructional uses of technology to improve student achievement with a special focus on underserved schools and students.

## **Program Performance**

OBJECTIVE 1: PROMOTE EFFECTIVE USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING THROUGH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND THE LEVERAGING AND COORDINATION OF OTHER RESOURCES.

Indicator 1.1 Recipients of R\*TEC products, services and information – particularly those representing under-served schools: at least 85% of recipients (individuals or agencies) of the R\*TEC services and products –including those developed and produced through the Consortia, collaboration among R\*TECs, and strategic alliances– will indicate that these products and services are of high quality and meet their needs.

and strategic amances—will indicate that these products and services are of high quanty and meet then needs.							
Targets and Performance Data				-	Sources and Data Quality		
Percentage of R*TEC Clients who agree or strongly agree that R*TEC services and		<b>Status:</b> FY2000 data show the target exceeded	Source: Final Program Performance Report,				
products are:		with respect to quality of services and products.	FY2000.				
Services (85% Products (85%		This was an improvement over FY1999 in the	Frequency: Annually.				
Performance Target) Performance Target)		services area, a decrease in perceived quality	Next collection update: 2001.				
FY 1999	FY2000	FY 1999	FY2000	for products. Although there was marked	Date to be reported: November 2001.		
84%	86%	93%	89%				
74%	82%	89%	79%		Validation Procedure: Data supplied by		
					individual R*TEC projects, through the work of		
720/	0.607	020/	500/		external evaluators hired by the projects. No		
/3%	86%	83%	70%		formal validation procedure was applied.		
61%	68%	67%	67%				
71%	82%	84%	76%	lower in this category than in the previous year.	Limitations of Data and Planned		
70%	780/	730/	660/-		<b>Improvements:</b> The program faces two distinct		
7070	7670	7370	0070		challenges in collecting reliable data. One is the		
					lack of completely external sources of data on		
					program performance (data are collected by the		
					project evaluators). The other is that there are		
					slight variations in data collection practices and		
				The lower ratings for product quality and	procedures across projects. In FY2000, the		
				product usefulness may be due in part to a	Department began external evaluation activities		
				change in the type of products states and school	to develop common goals, objectives, indicators,		
				districts say they need. R*TECs report a recent	and definitions to ensure greater consistency of		
				shift in the types of materials states and districts	data across the R*TECs; and to validate data		
				say they need from a focus on classroom	collected and reported by project evaluators.		
				instructional materials to a focus on	Furthermore, the 2001 projects will attempt to		
				professional development, leadership	capture more direct measures of impact on		
				development and technology planning. The	planning, policy and instructional practice		
				R*TECs are currently developing products to	resulting from technical assistance and		
				address this new focus.	professional development.		
	Services Performan FY 1999 84% 74% 73% 61%	Services (85%   Performance Target)   FY 1999   FY 2000   84%   86%   74%   82%   86%   71%   82%	Cargets and Performance Data           Services (85%         Produc           Performance Target)         Performance Performance Target)           FY 1999         FY 2000         FY 1999           84%         86%         93%           74%         82%         89%           73%         86%         83%           61%         68%         67%           71%         82%         84%	Services (85%   Products (85%   Performance Target)   Performance Target)   FY 1999   FY 2000   FY 1999   FY 2000   FY 1999   FY 2000   FY 1999   FY 2000	Assessment of Progress  Assessment of Progress  Status: FY2000 data show the target exceeded with respect to quality of services and products. This was an improvement over FY1999 in the services area, a decrease in perceived quality for products. Although there was marked improvement in relevance of services to needs, the target was not met. In the product area, again there was a decrease in recipients' ratings of the quality of products. Ratings of the usefulness of services were higher in FY2000 than in FY1999, though products were rated lower in this category than in the previous year.  To% 78% 73% 66%  To% 73% 66%  To% 73% 66%  Explanation: FY2000 ratings of services are based on nearly 1500 survey respondents from five of the six R*TECs; ratings of products are based on only 88 survey respondents from two R*TECs that released new products in FY2000. The lower ratings for product sates and school districts say they need. R*TECs report a recent shift in the types of materials states and districts say they need. R*TECs report a recent shift in the types of materials to a focus on professional development, leadership development and technology planning. The R*TECs are currently developing products to		