Archived Information

Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.1a Did SCDE faculty redesign curricula to integrate technology?																
Response rate	204	91	121	88	61	95	22	96	330	81	137	77	94	90	103	81
Yes	177	87	102	84	57	93	18	82	228	69	107	78	77	82	47	46
Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	16	8	10	8	3	5	3	14	62	19	17	12	13	14	33	32
No	10	5	8	7	1	2	1	5	40	12	13	9	4	4	23	22
Not applicable, not an SCDE	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2A.1b How many SCDE faculty members redesigned curricula to integrate technology?																
Response rate	177	100	102	100	57	100	18	100	227	99.5	106	99.1	77	100	47	100
Total	2,169		917		986		322		2,169		917		986		322	
Mean	12.8		9.6		17.3		18.9		9.9		9.1		13		7.3	
Median	10		7.5		12		15		7		7		8.5		4	
Minimum	0		0		1		3		1		1		1		1	
Maximum	99		46		99		43		99		38		99		36	
Data not available*	8		6		0		1		9		5		1		3	
2A.1c For how many SCDE courses were curricula redesigned to integrate technology?																
Response rate	177	100	102	100	57	100	18	100	227	99.5	106	99.1	77	100	47	100
Total	2,713		1,085		1,259		428		2,713		1,085		1,259		428	
Mean	16.1		11.3		22.5		25.2		12.6		10.7		17.2		9.7	
Median	11		10		13		20		8		10		10		5	
Minimum	0		0		1		2		0		0		1		0	
Maximum	211		48		211		57		200		31		200		50	
Data not available*	9		6		1		1		12		5		4		3	
2A.1d For how many SCDE courses were redesigned curricula implemented to integrate technology?																
Response rate	177	100	102	100	57	100	18	100	227	99.5	106	99.1	77	100	47	100
Total	2,184		834		1,090		311		2,184		834		1,090		311	
Mean	13.6		9.3		19.8		18.3		10.6		8.8		15.1		7.2	
Median	9		7		12		13		6		7		8		4	
Minimum	0		0		1		1		0		0		1		0	
Maximum	161		46		161		49		150		31		150		45	
Data not available*	16		12		2		1		20		11		5		4	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.1e	Approximately what proportion of all redesigned SCDE courses integrated the following technologies or technology-related tools?																
	Response rate			Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.						227	99.5	106	99.1	77	100	47	100
	Internet or web-based materials																
	None									4	2	2	2	0	0	2	4
	Less than half									23	10	9	8	6	8	8	17
	More than half									98	43	45	42	38	49	18	38
	All									98	43	49	46	31	40	18	38
	Data not available									4	2	1	1	2	3	1	2
	Multi-media																
	None									11	5	5	5	1	1	5	11
	Less than half									95	42	48	45	32	42	17	36
	More than half									73	32	30	28	28	36	16	34
	All									41	18	21	20	13	17	7	15
	Data not available									7	3	2	2	3	4	2	4
	Software packages for word processing, spreadsheets, databases																
	None									9	4	5	5	1	1	3	6
	Less than half									46	20	19	18	16	21	12	26
	More than half									67	30	39	37	19	25	10	21
	All									94	41	38	36	38	49	19	40
	Data not available									11	5	5	5	3	4	3	6
	Teaching tools																
	None									54	24	22	21	17	22	16	34
	Less than half									94	41	45	42	32	42	19	40
	More than half									38	17	21	20	11	14	6	13
	All									16	7	8	8	7	9	1	2
	Data not available									25	11	10	9	10	13	5	11
	E-mail																
	None									10	4	5	5	2	3	3	6
	Less than half									17	7	3	3	7	9	9	19
	More than half									58	26	32	30	17	22	9	19
	All									136	60	63	59	49	64	25	53
	Data not available									6	3	3	3	2	3	1	2
	Additional software packages (presentation software, reference tools)																
	None									8	4	3	3	2	3	3	6
	Less than half									60	26	29	27	22	29	11	23
	More than half									87	38	45	42	27	35	15	32
	All									61	27	26	25	22	29	14	30
	Data not available									11	5	3	3	4	5	4	9

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

| | By Consortium | | | | | | | | By SCDE | | | | | | | |
| | All grantees | | Capacity Building | | Implementation | | Catalyst | | All Partners | | Capacity Building | | Implementation | | Catalyst | |
Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.1e *(Continued)*																
Approximately what proportion of all redesigned SCDE courses integrated the following technologies or technology-related tools?																
Response rate			*Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.*						227	99.5	106	99.1	77	100	47	100
Content-specific software																
None									32	14	15	14	8	10	9	19
Less than half									90	40	41	39	30	39	21	45
More than half									58	26	28	26	23	30	8	17
All									28	12	13	12	10	13	5	11
Data not available									19	8	9	8	6	8	4	9
Portfolio tools																
None									50	22	19	18	18	23	13	28
Less than half									113	50	59	56	38	49	19	40
More than half									27	12	11	10	9	12	7	15
All									25	11	12	11	9	12	4	9
Data not available									12	5	5	5	3	4	4	9
2A.2a Did SCDs of arts and science faculty redesign curricula to integrate technology?																
Response rate	115	100	65	100	34	100	16	100	146	100	68	100	41	100	39	100
Yes	85	74	45	69	29	85	12	75	105	72	46	68	36	88	25	64
Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	12	10	8	12	0	0	3	19	17	12	9	13	0	0	8	21
No	18	16	12	18	5	15	1	6	24	16	13	19	5	12	6	15
Not applicable, not an SCDE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2A.2b How many SCDs of arts and science faculty members redesigned curricula to integrate technology?																
Response rate	85	100	45	100	29	100	12	100	106	101	47	102	36	100	25	100
Total	573		268		225		81		573		268		225		81	
Mean	7.2		6.4		8		7.4		6.2		6.2		6.6		4.8	
Median	5		4		6		6		4		4		4.5		4	
Minimum	0		0		1		1		0		0		1		1	
Maximum	33		33		30		20		33		33		30		12	
Data not available*	5		3		1		1		13		4		2		8	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.2c	For how many SCD of arts and science courses were curricula redesigned to integrate technology?																
	Response rate	85	100	45	100	29	100	12	100	106	101	47	102	36	100	25	100
	Total	763		378		284		102		763		378		284		102	
	Mean	9.8		9.5		10.1		9.3		8.4		9.2		8.4		6	
	Median	7		7		7.5		7		6		7		5		4	
	Minimum	0		0		1		1		0		0		1		1	
	Maximum	50		40		50		40		50		40		50		20	
	Data not available*	7		5		1		1		15		6		2		8	
2A.2d	For how many SCD of arts and science courses were redesigned curricula implemented to integrate technology?																
	Response rate	85	100	45	100	29	100	12	100	106	101	47	102	36	100	25	100
	Total	660		338		252		71		660		338		252		71	
	Mean	8.6		8.5		9.3		6.5		7.5		8.2		7.6		4.7	
	Median	7		6.5		8		3		5		6		5		4	
	Minimum	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	Maximum	50		39		50		32		50		39		50		20	
	Data not available*	8		5		2		1		18		6		3		10	
2A.2e	Approximately what proportion of all redesigned SCD of arts and science courses integrated the following technologies or technology-related tools?																
	Response Rate	Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.								106	101	47	102	36	100	25	100
	Internet or web-based materials																
	None									3	3	2	4	0	0	1	4
	Less than half									8	8	3	6	1	3	4	16
	More than half									39	37	15	32	18	50	6	24
	All									42	40	23	49	13	36	7	28
	Data not available									14	13	4	9	4	11	7	28
	Multi-media																
	None									13	12	7	15	3	8	3	12
	Less than half									28	26	12	26	11	31	5	20
	More than half									32	30	14	30	12	33	6	24
	All									19	18	10	21	6	17	4	60
	Data not available									14	13	4	9	4	11	7	28

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.2e																
(Continued)																
Approximately what proportion of all redesigned SCD of arts and science courses integrated the following technologies or technology-related tools?																
Response Rate			Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.						106	101	47	102	36	100	25	100
Software packages for word processing, spreadsheets, databases																
None									9	8	4	9	2	6	4	16
Less than half									14	13	8	17	3	8	3	12
More than half									36	34	17	36	14	39	5	20
All									33	31	13	28	14	39	6	24
Data not available									14	13	5	11	3	8	7	28
Teaching tools																
None									34	32	19	40	10	28	5	20
Less than half									37	35	16	34	11	31	10	40
More than half									5	5	3	6	2	6	0	0
All									7	7	3	6	3	8	2	8
Data not available									23	22	6	13	10	28	8	32
E-mail																
None									7	7	3	6	0	0	4	16
Less than half									7	7	2	4	2	6	3	12
More than half									26	25	11	23	12	33	3	12
All									52	49	27	57	18	50	8	32
Data not available									14	13	4	9	4	11	7	28
Additional software packages (presentation software, reference tools)																
None									6	6	4	9	1	3	1	4
Less than half									20	19	12	26	6	17	2	8
More than half									43	41	17	36	17	47	9	36
All									20	19	9	19	7	19	5	20
Data not available									17	16	5	11	5	14	8	32
Content-specific software																
None									13	12	6	13	5	14	2	8
Less than half									33	31	18	38	10	28	5	20
More than half									26	25	9	19	12	33	5	20
All									16	15	8	17	5	14	4	16
Data not available									18	17	6	13	4	11	9	36
Portfolio tools																
None									35	33	18	38	11	31	7	28
Less than half									35	33	13	28	15	42	7	28
More than half									7	7	6	13	1	3	0	0
All									5	5	2	4	1	3	2	8
Data not available									24	23	8	17	8	22	9	36

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.3a	Which of the following were implemented when redesigning SCDE or SCD of arts and science curricula?																
	Response rate	178	100	102	100	58	100	18	100	235	100	108	100	79	100	51	100
	Release Time	86	48	43	42	33	57	11	61	97	41	44	41	40	51	16	31
	Researching other models	115	65	66	65	34	59	15	83	140	60	69	64	43	54	30	59
	Collaboration	172	97	97	95	57	98	18	100	220	94	101	94	77	97	45	88
	Partnerships with K-12 schools	158	89	91	89	50	86	18	100	186	79	94	87	59	75	36	71
	Other partnerships	98	55	48	47	36	62	15	83	109	46	48	44	41	52	21	41
	Among those implemented above, which were found to be valuable when redesigning SCDE or SCD of arts and science curricula?																
	Response rate	86	100	43	100	33	100	11	100	97	100	44	100	40	100	16	100
	Release Time	85	99	42	98	33	100	11	100	94	97	43	98	40	100	14	88
	Response rate	115	100	66	100	34	100	15	100	140	100	69	100	43	100	30	100
	Researching other models	115	100	66	100	34	100	15	100	140	100	69	100	43	100	30	100
	Response rate	172	100	97	100	57	100	18	100	220	100	101	100	77	100	45	100
	Collaboration	171	99	96	99	57	100	18	100	219	99.5	100	99	77	100	45	100
	Response rate	158	100	91	100	50	100	18	100	186	100	94	100	59	100	36	100
	Partnerships with K-12 schools	158	100	91	100	50	100	18	100	186	100	94	100	59	100	36	100
	Response rate	98	100	48	100	36	100	15	100	109	100	48	100	41	100	20	100
	Other partnerships	95	97	47	98	34	94	15	100	105	96	47	98	39	95	20	100
2A.4a	Were incentives offered to encourage faculty to integrate technology into their curriculum?																
	Response rate	201	89	119	86	61	95	22	96	328	80	135	76	94	90	103	81
	Yes, as a grant activity	164	82	92	77	56	92	17	77	219	67	102	76	76	81	45	44
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	10	5	9	8	0	0	1	5	37	11	9	7	6	6	22	21
	No	26	13	16	13	5	8	4	18	72	22	24	18	12	13	36	35
	Not applicable, not an SCDE	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.4b	Which of the following incentives were offered to encourage faculty to integrate technology into their curriculum?																
	Response rate	164	100	92	100	56	100	17	100	219	100	102	100	76	100	45	100
	Release time																
	Yes	75	46	34	37	29	52	13	76	82	37	34	33	34	45	17	38
	No	88	54	58	63	26	46	4	24	133	61	68	67	41	54	25	56
	Data not available	1	<1	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	2	0	0	1	1	3	7
	Stipend																
	Yes	131	80	72	78	43	77	16	94	166	76	80	78	53	70	35	78
	No	33	20	20	22	13	23	1	6	52	24	22	22	22	29	10	22
	Data not available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	<1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	Additional technological equipment for professional use																
	Yes	122	74	66	72	42	75	14	82	148	68	72	71	57	75	21	47
	No	41	25	25	27	14	25	3	18	67	31	29	28	19	25	21	47
	Data not available	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	0	0	3	7
	Additional technological equipment for instructional use																
	Yes	138	84	78	85	46	82	14	82	174	79	86	84	64	84	26	58
	No	25	15	13	14	10	18	3	18	42	19	15	15	12	16	17	38
	Data not available	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	2	4
	Increased professional development opportunities (e.g., workshops)																
	Yes	158	96	89	97	54	96	17	100	203	93	96	94	73	96	38	84
	No	5	3	2	2	2	4	0	0	13	6	4	4	3	4	6	13
	Data not available	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	1	2
2A.5a	Is integration of technology into curricula considered a contributing factor:																
	Response rate	200	89	117	85	61	95	22	96	325	79	134	76	94	90	103	81
	In tenure decisions or career advancement																
	Yes	91	46	48	41	26	43	17	77	121	37	50	37	40	43	32	32
	No	90	45	57	49	28	46	5	23	157	48	67	50	40	43	53	52
	Data not available	19	10	12	10	7	11	0	0	47	14	17	13	14	15	16	16
	In hiring decisions																
	Yes	144	72	84	72	41	67	19	86	202	62	90	67	62	66	52	51
	No	35	18	21	18	12	20	2	9	608	21	27	20	15	16	28	28
	Data not available	21	11	12	10	8	13	1	5	55	17	17	13	17	18	21	21

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.6a	Were SCDE courses delivered to students through any technological means?																
	Response rate	200	89	117	85	61	95	22	96	324	79	134	76	94	90	100	79
	Yes, as a grant activity	104	52	55	47	37	61	12	55	124	38	58	43	44	47	24	24
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	63	32	38	69	15	25	10	45	127	39	44	33	31	33	54	54
	No	33	17	24	63	9	15	0	0	73	23	32	24	19	20	22	22
	Not applicable, not an SCDE									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2A.6b	How many SCDE courses were at least partially available through technological means?																
	Response rate	104	100	55	100	37	100	12	100	124	100	58	100	44	100	24	100
	Total	1,561		864		585		139		1,561		864		585		139	
	Mean	17		17.6		16.7		12.6		14.6		16.9		15.4		7	
	Median			8		12.5		6		6		6		7.5		4	
	Minimum	1		1		1		1		0		1		0		0	
	Maximum	66		142		66		33		142		142		66		33	
	Data not available*	12		6		5		1		17		7		6		4	
2A.6c	Which of the following options were available for SCDE courses?																
	Response rate	104	100	55	100	37	100	12	100	124	100	58	100	44	100	24	100
	Two-way audio-video conferencing	58	56	25	45	23	62	10	83	58	47	24	41	27	61	9	38
	One-way audio-video conferencing	29	28	8	15	13	35	8	67	27	22	8	14	12	27	9	38
	Web-based courses (course completely online)	58	56	29	53	20	54	9	75	62	50	30	52	23	52	10	42
	Web-enhanced courses (course at least partially online)	98	94	49	89	37	100	12	100	115	93	51	88	42	95	24	100
2A.7a	Were SCD of arts and science courses involved in the grant collaboration delivered to students through any technological means?																
	Response rate	111	100	61	100	35	100	15	100	139	100	64	100	42	100	35	100
	Yes, as a grant activity	47	42	26	43	15	43	6	40	51	37	26	41	16	38	9	26
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	24	22	15	25	4	11	5	33	36	26	15	23	7	17	15	43
	No	38	34	20	33	15	43	3	20	47	34	22	34	17	40	9	26
	Data not available	2	2	0	0	1	3	1	7	5	4	1	2	2	5	2	6

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.7b	How many SCD of arts and science courses involved in the collaboration were available through technological means?																
	Response rate	47	100	26	100	15	100	6	100	40	100	21	100	13	100	6	100
	Total	291		126		144		21		291		126		144		21	
	Mean	7.7		6		12		4.2		7.3		6		11.1		3.5	
	Median	3.5		3		5		2		3		3		4		2	
	Minimum	1		1		2		1		1		1		2		1	
	Maximum	66		29		66		12		66		29		66		10	
	Data not available*	9		5		3		1		11		5		3		3	
2A.7c	Which of the following options were available for SCD of arts and science courses?																
	Response rate	47	100	26	100	15	100	6	100	51	100	26	100	16	100	9	100
	Two-way audio-video conferencing	21	45	10	38	7	47	4	67	19	37	10	38	7	44	2	22
	One-way audio-video conferencing	15	32	6	23	5	33	4	67	14	27	6	23	5	31	3	33
	Web-based courses (course completely online)	23	49	11	42	8	53	4	67	22	43	11	42	9	56	2	22
	Web-enhanced courses (course at least partially online)	46	98	25	96	15	100	6	100	49	96	25	96	16	100	8	89
2A.8a	Were models or strategies developed for SCDE faculty to use in preparing preservice teachers to integrate technology?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	177	88	99	84	59	97	20	91	234	72	110	81	78	84	50	49
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	12	6	7	6	2	3	2	9	46	14	10	7	7	8	29	28
	No	12	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	46	14	15	11	8	9	23	23
2A.8b	Were models or strategies field-tested for SCDE faculty to use in preparing preservice teachers to integrate technology?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	128	64	66	56	45	74	18	82	153	47	74	55	53	57	28	27
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	18	9	12	10	4	7	1	5	51	16	16	12	13	14	22	22
	No	55	27	40	34	12	20	3	14	122	37	45	33	27	29	52	51

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.8c	Were models or strategies for SCDE faculty to use in preparing preservice teachers to integrate technology disseminated in any of the following ways:																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
	Locally																
	Yes, as a grant activity	157	78	90	76	48	79	19	86	200	61	97	72	66	71	38	37
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	10	5	5	4	3	5	2	9	37	11	7	5	8	9	23	23
	No	34	17	23	19	10	16	1	5	89	27	31	23	19	20	41	40
	State-wide																
	Yes, as a grant activity	98	49	45	38	35	57	18	82	118	36	49	36	44	47	26	25
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	27	13	18	15	7	11	2	9	42	13	19	14	12	13	13	13
	No	76	38	55	47	19	31	2	9	166	51	67	50	37	40	63	62
	Regionally																
	Yes, as a grant activity	88	44	41	35	32	52	15	68	100	31	40	30	37	40	23	23
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	20	10	11	9	5	8	4	18	32	10	12	9	10	11	11	11
	No	93	46	66	56	24	39	3	14	194	60	83	61	46	49	68	67
	Nationally																
	Yes, as a grant activity	87	43	43	36	31	51	14	64	97	30	45	33	33	35	21	21
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	26	13	12	10	9	15	4	18	35	11	12	9	13	14	11	11
	No	88	44	63	53	21	34	4	18	194	60	78	58	47	51	70	69

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.8d	How were models or strategies for SCDE faculty to use in preparing preservice teachers to integrate technology disseminated?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
	Presentation at a conference																
	Yes, as a grant activity	136	68	74	63	44	72	19	86	161	49	77	57	56	60	31	30
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	19	9	13	11	4	7	1	5	39	12	15	11	10	11	15	15
	No	46	23	31	26	13	21	2	9	126	39	43	32	27	29	56	55
	Article in journal or other publication																
	Yes, as a grant activity	52	26	26	22	14	23	13	59	59	18	25	19	15	16	20	20
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	27	13	12	10	10	16	4	18	42	13	14	10	15	16	14	14
	No	122	61	80	68	37	61	5	23	225	69	96	71	63	68	68	67
	Posting on a Web site																
	Yes, as a grant activity	128	64	66	56	43	70	20	91	166	51	73	54	55	59	41	40
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	15	7	11	9	3	5	0	0	31	10	13	10	8	9	10	10
	No	58	29	41	35	15	25	2	9	129	40	49	36	30	32	51	50
2A.9a	Were field experiences added, expanded, or modified to place preservice students in learning environments with information technologies readily available for use with K-12 students?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	118	59	66	56	40	66	14	64	137	42	68	50	46	49	25	25
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	24	12	13	11	4	7	7	32	53	16	17	13	11	12	26	25
	No	58	29	38	32	17	28	1	5	136	42	50	36	36	39	51	50
	Not applicable, not an SCDE	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2A.9b	How many preservice students' field experiences placed them in learning environments with information technologies readily available for use with K-12 students?																
	Response rate	118	100	66	100	40	100	14	100	139	101	68	100	47	102	26	104
	Total	15,120		6,523		5.568		3,738		15,120		6,523		5,568		3,738	
	Mean	164.3		123.1		185.6		339.8		145.4		123.1		168.7		186.9	
	Median	62		45		90		53		52.5		45		90		19.5	
	Minimum	0		2		1		0		0		2		1		0	
	Maximum	2,373		1,147		2,000		2,373		1,600		1,147		754		1,600	
	Data not available*	16		13		10		3		35		15		14		6	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		**Capacity Building**		**Implementation**		**Catalyst**		**All Partners**		**Capacity Building**		**Implementation**		**Catalyst**	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.9c	Approximately what proportion of preservice students engaged in the following types of activities during their field experiences?																
	Response rate			Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.						139	101	68	100	47	102	26	104
	Observe K-12 teachers modeling the use technology in instruction																
	None									4	3	1	1	1	2	2	8
	Less than half									35	25	16	24	12	26	8	31
	More than half									60	43	26	38	24	51	11	42
	All									21	15	15	22	6	13	0	0
	Data not available									19	14	10	15	4	9	5	19
	Work individually with K-12 students on technology-related projects																
	None									7	5	3	4	1	2	3	12
	Less than half									53	38	58	41	16	34	11	42
	More than half									48	35	22	32	20	43	6	23
	All									11	8	5	7	5	11	1	4
	Data not available									20	14	10	15	5	11	5	19
	Teach K-12 classes modeling the use of technology in instruction																
	None									8	6	5	7	1	2	2	8
	Less than half									50	36	23	34	16	34	13	50
	More than half									45	32	22	32	18	38	5	19
	All									16	12	8	12	6	13	2	8
	Data not available									20	14	10	15	6	13	4	15
	Observe SCDE faculty teaching K-12 class in collaboration with K-12 teachers																
	None									37	27	19	28	8	17	11	42
	Less than half									58	42	27	40	25	53	7	27
	More than half									15	11	9	13	5	11	1	4
	All									6	4	2	3	3	6	1	4
	Data not available									23	17	11	16	6	13	6	23

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.9d	Approximately what proportion of preservice students used the following technologies or technology-related tools in their field experiences?																
	Response rate			Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.						139	101	68	100	47	102	26	104
	Internet or web-based materials																
	None									3	2	2	3	0	0	1	4
	Less than half									31	22	12	18	12	26	8	31
	More than half									52	37	22	32	19	40	11	42
	All									35	25	21	31	12	26	3	12
	Data not available									18	13	11	16	4	9	3	12
	Multi-media																
	None									4	3	1	1	1	2	2	8
	Less than half									56	40	23	34	20	43	15	58
	More than half									47	34	24	35	17	36	6	23
	All									13	9	9	13	4	9	0	0
	Data not available									19	14	11	16	5	11	3	12
	Software packages for word processing, spreadsheets, databases																
	None									4	3	2	3	1	2	1	4
	Less than half									27	19	9	13	9	19	9	35
	More than half									46	33	27	40	14	30	7	27
	All									45	32	21	31	18	38	6	23
	Data not available									17	12	9	13	5	11	3	12
	Teaching tools																
	None									19	14	10	15	5	11	4	15
	Less than half									56	40	28	41	21	45	8	31
	More than half									29	21	11	16	12	26	6	23
	All									5	4	2	3	2	4	1	4
	Data not available									30	22	17	25	7	15	7	27
	E-mail																
	None									3	2	1	1	1	2	1	4
	Less than half									20	14	9	13	7	15	4	15
	More than half									42	30	19	28	16	34	8	31
	All									57	41	29	43	19	40	10	38
	Data not available									17	12	10	15	4	9	3	12
	Additional software packages (presentation software, reference tools)																
	None									7	5	2	3	3	6	2	8
	Less than half									38	27	21	31	11	23	7	27
	More than half									49	35	22	32	19	40	9	35
	All									22	16	10	15	9	19	3	12
	Data not available									23	17	13	19	5	11	5	19

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

B-13

	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2A.9d (Continued) Approximately what proportion of preservice students used the following technologies or technology-related tools in their field experiences?																
Response rate	Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.								139	101	68	100	47	102	26	104
Content-specific software																
None									8	6	3	4	2	4	3	12
Less than half									50	36	23	34	24	43	9	35
More than half									45	32	21	31	16	34	8	31
All									12	9	7	10	4	9	1	4
Data not available									24	17	14	21	5	11	5	19
Portfolio tools																
None									15	11	7	10	4	9	4	15
Less than half									66	47	29	43	24	51	14	54
More than half									26	19	13	19	11	23	3	12
All									7	5	3	4	3	6	1	4
Data not available									25	18	16	24	5	11	4	15
2B.1a Was professional development provided to SCDE faculty to integrate technology in course instruction?																
Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
Yes, as a grant activity	184	92	107	91	57	93	21	95	251	77	117	87	82	88	56	55
Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	10	5	6	5	2	3	1	5	43	13	10	7	8	9	25	25
No	6	3	4	3	2	3	0	0	32	10	8	6	3	3	21	21
Not applicable, not an SCDE	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2B.1b How many SCDE faculty members received professional development to integrate technology in course instruction?																
Response rate	184	100	107	100	57	100	21	100	251	100	117	100	82	100	56	100
Total	3,682.60		1,601.60		1,416		747		3,683		1,601		1,416		747	
Mean	20		15		24.8		35.6		14.7		13.7		17.3		13.3	
Median	13		12		18		15		10		11		13		6	
Minimum	1		1		2		1		0		1		2		0	
Maximum	168		70		111		168		90		70		73		90	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.1c Of those SCDE faculty who participated in professional development activities, what percentage received the following amount of professional development during the reporting period?																
Response rate	— Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.								251	100	117	100	82	100	56	100
1-5 hours																
Total									1070.8		398		347.4		332.8	
Percent receiving this training									29		24.9		24.5		44.6	
6-10 hours																
Total									598.9		279.4		215.8		133.5	
Percent receiving this training									16		17.4		15.2		17.9	
11-20 hours																
Total									668.4		314.3		279		89.4	
Percent receiving this training									18		19.6		19.7		12	
21-50 hours																
Total									867.4		399.9		342.1		144.4	
Percent receiving this training									24		25		24.2		19.3	
More than 50 hours																
Total									477.1		210		231.8		46.9	
Percent receiving this training									13		13.1		16.4		6.3	
2B.1d Which of the following types of professional development were implemented for SCDE faculty, and which of the following types of professional development facilitators were used?																
Response rate	184	100	107	100	57	100	21	100	251	100	117	100	82	100	56	100
Workshops (required)																
Outside trainer	51	28	25	23	15	26	11	52	58	23	26	22	20	24	12	21
SCDE or university technology specialist	68	37	37	35	21	37	12	57	88	35	37	32	34	41	19	34
Professor	56	30	29	27	17	30	10	48	69	27	28	24	26	32	15	27
K-12 teacher	33	18	21	20	8	14	4	19	41	16	22	19	13	16	6	11
Undergraduate or graduate student	20	11	6	6	8	14	6	29	27	11	6	5	14	17	7	13
Workshops (optional)																
Outside trainer	96	52	52	49	31	54	15	71	104	41	53	45	33	40	20	36
SCDE or university/college technology specialist	130	71	70	65	43	75	19	90	148	59	75	64	51	62	25	45
Professor	100	54	55	51	31	54	15	71	111	44	57	49	37	45	18	32
K-12 teacher	69	38	39	36	20	35	11	52	68	27	40	34	21	26	8	14
Undergraduate or graduate student	54	29	24	22	22	39	9	43	56	22	25	21	24	29	8	14

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.1d (Continued) Which of the following types of professional development were implemented for SCDE faculty, and which of the following types of professional development facilitators were used?																
Response rate	184	100	107	100	57	100	21	100	251	100	117	100	82	100	56	100
Individual training																
Outside trainer	28	15	17	16	4	7	7	33	27	11	17	15	4	5	6	11
SCDE or university technology specialist	120	65	61	57	43	75	18	86	143	57	66	56	56	68	25	45
Professor	88	48	44	41	30	53	16	76	98	39	45	38	38	46	16	29
K-12 teacher	42	23	19	18	18	32	7	33	46	18	21	18	21	26	6	11
Undergraduate or graduate student	78	42	35	33	33	58	11	52	83	33	36	31	35	43	16	29
Available technical support for drop-in assistance																
Outside trainer	15	8	10	9	2	4	3	14	18	7	11	9	2	2	5	9
SCDE or university technology specialist	136	74	75	70	43	75	19	90	161	64	77	66	56	68	30	54
Professor	62	34	33	31	21	37	10	48	71	28	32	27	26	32	15	27
K-12 teacher	19	10	11	10	5	9	3	14	22	9	11	9	7	9	4	7
Undergraduate or graduate student	77	42	37	35	29	51	12	57	80	32	37	32	31	38	13	23
Mentorships																
Outside trainer	8	4	4	4	3	5	2	10	8	3	4	3	3	4	2	4
SCDE or university technology specialist	40	22	21	20	11	19	10	48	40	16	21	18	12	15	9	16
Professor	64	35	33	31	20	35	13	62	73	29	33	28	25	30	18	32
K-12 teacher	36	20	21	20	13	23	3	14	41	16	26	22	14	17	2	4
Undergraduate or graduate student	36	20	14	13	17	30	7	33	36	14	14	12	17	21	8	14
Conferences																
Outside trainer	70	38	36	34	25	44	11	52	81	32	39	33	28	34	15	27
SCDE or university technology specialist	62	34	29	27	22	39	12	57	71	28	30	26	29	35	13	23
Professor	82	45	42	39	29	51	12	57	97	39	44	38	37	45	17	30
K-12 teacher	43	23	20	19	17	30	7	33	50	20	22	19	24	29	5	9
Undergraduate or graduate student	25	14	11	10	13	23	2	10	31	12	11	9	19	23	2	4
Courses																
Outside trainer	22	12	10	9	9	16	3	14	22	9	10	9	9	11	3	5
SCDE or university technology specialist	36	20	12	11	16	28	8	38	38	15	12	10	18	22	8	14
Professor	42	23	22	21	11	19	9	43	41	16	20	17	13	16	8	14
K-12 teacher	7	4	4	4	3	5	0	0	7	3	4	3	3	4	0	0
Undergraduate or graduate student	9	5	4	4	5	9	0	0	9	4	4	3	5	6	0	0

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.1f	Were SCDE faculty assessed on their level of technology proficiency?																
	Response rate	184	100	107	100	57	100	21	100	251	100	117	100	82	100	56	100
	Yes	145	79	85	79	45	79	16	76	171	68	86	74	56	68	32	57
2B.1g	Which of the following were used to assess SCDE faculty proficiency with technology?																
	Response rate	145	100	85	100	45	100	16	100	171	100	87	100	55	100	32	100
	Self-assessment	139	96	83	98	43	96	14	88	164	96	84	97	53	96	29	91
	Observation (e.g., by dean, technology coordinator, facilitator)	66	46	41	48	19	42	6	38	70	41	41	47	21	38	9	28
	Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)	14	10	7	8	6	13	1	6	14	8	7	8	6	11	1	3
	Portfolio assessment	15	10	7	8	5	11	3	19	17	10	7	8	5	9	5	16

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.1h	How many SCDE faculty who participated in professional development to integrate technology were rated as technologically proficient using the assessment tool identified in the previous question																
	Self-assessment																
	Response rate	99		65		24		11		111		67		31		14	
	Total	893		546		256		111		893		546		256		111	
	Mean	9		8.4		10.7		10.1		8		8.1		8.3		7.9	
	Median	8		7		9.5		9		6		6		6		4.5	
	Minimum	0		0		2		1		0		0		1		1	
	Maximum	47		47		27		34		47		47		27		30	
	Data not available																
	Observation (e.g., by dean, technology coordinator, facilitator)																
	Response rate	49		31		13		6		52		31		15		7	
	Total	469		224		169		107		469		224		169		107	
	Mean	9.6		7.2		13		17.8		9		7.2		11.3		15.3	
	Median	7		6		12		7.5		6		6		8		10	
	Minimum	0		1		0		3		0		1		0		3	
	Maximum	55		20		31		55		44		20		31		44	
	Data not available																
	Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)																
	Response rate	8		5		3		0		8		5		3		0	
	Total	70		50		20		0		70		50		20		0	
	Mean	8.8		10		6.7		0		8.8		10		6.7		0	
	Median	8.5		12		4		0		8.5		12		4		0	
	Minimum	1		1		1		0		1		1		1		0	
	Maximum	20		20		15		0		20		20		15		0	
	Data not available																
	Portfolio assessment																
	Response rate	7		4		1		2		8		4		1		3	
	Total	102		34		9		59		102		34		9		59	
	Mean	14.6		8.5		9		29.5		12.8		8.5		9		19.7	
	Median	9		8.5		9		29.5		9		8.5		9		9	
	Minimum	5		5		9		9		5		5		9		6	
	Maximum	50		12		9		50		44		12		9		44	
	Data not available																

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.2a	Was professional development provided to SCD of arts and science faculty to integrate technology in course instruction?																
	Response rate	110	100	61	100	34	100	15	100	140	100	64	100	41	100	37	100
	Yes, as a grant activity	87	79	51	84	27	79	10	67	105	75	54	84	34	83	18	49
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	6	5	3	5	1	3	2	13	13	9	3	5	2	5	8	22
	No	17	15	7	11	6	18	3	20	22	16	7	11	5	12	11	30
2B.2b	How many SCD of arts and science faculty members received professional development to integrate technology in course instruction?																
	Response rate	88	101	52	102	27	100	10	100	106	101	55	102	34	100	18	100
	Total	1,564		650		645		272		1,564		650		645		272	
	Mean	17.8		12.5		23.9		27.2		14.8		11.8		19		15.1	
	Median	8		7.5		10		7		7		8		7.5		4.5	
	Minimum	0		0		2		1		0		0		2		1	
	Maximum	242		106		242		137		165		101		165		110	
2B.2c	Of those SCD of arts and science faculty who participated in professional development activities, what percentage received the following amount of professional development?																
	Response rate			Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.						106	101	55	102	34	100	18	100
	1-5 hours																
	Total									686.3		216.8		342.1		127.4	
	Percent receiving this training									44		33		53		47	
	6-10 hours																
	Total									277.5		145.6		87.8		44	
	Percent receiving this training									18		22		14		16	
	11-20 hours																
	Total									194.2		120		66.1		8	
	Percent receiving this training									12		18		10		29	
	21-50 hours																
	Total									222.9		97.6		93.3		32.9	
	Percent receiving this training									14		15		14		12	
	More than 50 hours																
	Total									183.2		70		55.6		59.6	
	Percent receiving this training									12		11		9		22	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.2d	Which of the following types of professional development were implemented for SCD of arts and science faculty and which of the following types of professional development facilitators were used?																
	Response rate	88	101	52	102	27	100	10	100	106	101	55	102	34	100	18	100
	Workshops (required)																
	Outside trainer	28	32	14	27	8	30	7	70	28	26	14	25	8	24	7	39
	SCDE or university technology specialist	38	43	16	31	14	52	9	90	40	38	16	29	17	50	8	44
	Professor	26	30	12	23	5	19	9	90	24	23	12	22	5	15	7	39
	K-12 teacher	18	20	11	21	4	15	3	30	21	20	11	20	5	15	5	28
	Undergraduate or graduate student	11	13	6	12	3	11	2	20	12	11	6	11	3	9	3	17
	Workshops (optional)																
	Outside trainer	43	49	26	50	13	48	5	50	42	40	26	47	14	41	3	17
	SCDE or university technology specialist	61	69	35	67	19	70	8	80	68	64	37	67	23	68	9	50
	Professor	41	47	23	44	13	48	5	50	45	42	24	44	15	44	6	33
	K-12 teacher	22	25	16	31	4	15	2	20	22	21	16	29	4	12	2	11
	Undergraduate or graduate student	21	24	13	25	6	22	2	20	35	33	14	25	7	21	2	11
	Individual training																
	Outside trainer	13	15	7	13	5	19	2	20	13	12	7	13	5	15	2	11
	SCDE or university technology specialist	55	63	30	58	20	74	6	60	61	58	33	60	24	71	5	28
	Professor	37	42	22	42	11	41	4	40	42	40	24	44	13	38	5	28
	K-12 teacher	18	20	10	19	6	22	2	20	19	18	54	98	32	94	18	100
	Undergraduate or graduate student	32	36	18	35	9	33	5	50	23	22	19	35	10	29	6	33
	Available technical support for drop-in assistance																
	Outside trainer	5	6	3	6	1	4	1	10	4	4	3	5	1	3	0	0
	SCDE or university technology specialist	56	64	35	67	15	56	7	70	60	57	36	65	20	59	5	28
	Professor	20	23	11	21	5	19	4	40	22	21	11	20	7	21	4	22
	K-12 teacher	7	8	4	8	1	4	2	20	7	7	4	7	1	3	2	11
	Undergraduate or graduate student	27	31	16	31	8	30	3	30	29	27	16	29	9	26	4	22
	Mentorships																
	Outside trainer	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
	SCDE or university technology specialist	15	17	7	13	6	22	2	20	15	14	7	13	7	21	1	6
	Professor	20	23	8	15	6	22	6	60	21	20	9	16	8	24	4	22
	K-12 teacher	9	10	4	8	4	15	1	10	11	10	5	9	5	15	1	6
	Undergraduate or graduate student	15	17	7	13	7	26	1	10	15	14	7	13	7	21	1	6

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.2d	*(Continued)* Which of the following types of professional development were implemented for SCD of arts and science faculty and which of the following types of professional development facilitators were used?																
	Response rate	88	101	52	102	27	100	10	100	106	101	55	102	34	100	18	100
	Conferences																
	Outside trainer	29	33	14	27	13	48	3	30	31	29	15	27	14	41	3	17
	SCDE or university/college technology specialist	23	26	12	23	7	26	5	50	24	23	13	24	8	24	4	22
	Professor	26	30	12	23	9	33	5	50	28	26	14	25	11	32	3	17
	K-12 teacher	17	19	10	19	6	22	1	10	19	18	11	20	7	21	1	6
	Undergraduate or graduate student	7	8	4	8	3	11	0	0	8	8	4	7	4	12	0	0
	Courses																
	Outside trainer	7	8	4	8	2	7	1	10	7	7	4	7	2	6	1	6
	SCDE or university/college technology specialist	12	14	5	10	4	15	3	30	12	11	6	11	4	12	2	11
	Professor	8	9	4	8	2	7	2	20	6	6	4	7	2	6	0	0
	K-12 teacher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Undergraduate or graduate student	3	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	0	0	0	0
2B.2e	Were SCD of arts and science faculty assessed on their level of technology proficiency?																
	Response rate	88	101	52	102	27	100	10	100	106	101	55	102	34	100	18	100
	Yes	57	65	33	63	18	67	6	60	66	62	35	64	22	65	9	50
2B.2f	Which of the following were used to assessed SCD of arts and science faculty proficiency with technology?																
	Response rate	57	100	33	100	18	100	6	100	66	100	35	100	22	100	9	100
	Self-assessment	55	96	32	97	17	94	6	100	62	94	34	97	20	91	8	89
	Observation (e.g., by dean, technology coordinator, facilitator)	26	46	15	45	8	44	4	67	27	41	15	43	8	36	4	44
	Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)	3	5	3	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	9	0	0	0	0
	Portfolio assessment	7	12	3	9	2	11	2	33	8	12	3	9	2	9	3	33

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
	Question	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.2g	How many SCD of arts and science faculty who participated in professional development to integrate technology were rated as technologically proficient using the assessment tool identified in the question above.																
	Self-assessment																
	Response rate	40		27		8		5		44		29		10		5	
	Total	411		324		64		44		411		324		64		44	
	Mean	10.3		12		8		8.8		9.3		11.2		6.4		8.8	
	Median	6		6		7		9		4.5		6		4.5		9	
	Minimum	0		0		1		2		0		0		1		2	
	Maximum	106		106		21		21		106		106		21		21	
	Data not available																
	Observation (e.g., by dean, technology coordinator, facilitator)																
	Response rate	19		11		5		3		20		11		5		4	
	Total	204		60		57		87		204		60		57		87	
	Mean	10.7		5.5		11.4		29		10.2		5.5		11.4		21.8	
	Median	7		6		11		9		7.5		6		11		11	
	Minimum	0		0		3		4		0		0		3		4	
	Maximum	74		13		21		74		61		13		21		61	
	Data not available																
	Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)																
	Response rate	3		3		0		0		3		3		0		0	
	Total	9		9		0		0		9		9		0		0	
	Mean	3		3		0		0		3		3		0		0	
	Median	3		3		0		0		3		3		0		0	
	Minimum	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	Maximum	6		6						6		6		0		0	
	Data not available																
	Portfolio assessment																
	Response rate	5		3		1		1		6		3		1		2	
	Total	47		8		19		20		47		8		19		20	
	Mean	9.4		2.7		19		20		7.8		2.7		19		10	
	Median	6		2		19		20		6.5		2		19		10	
	Minimum	0		0		19		20		0		0		19		7	
	Maximum	20		6		19		20		19		6		19		13	
	Data not available																

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.3a	Was professional development provided to K-12 teachers at partner schools to integrate technology in class instruction?																
	Response rate	197	100	115	100	60	100	22	100	304	100	130	100	90	100	88	100
	Yes, as a grant activity	124	63	71	62	44	73	10	45	153	50	79	61	52	58	24	27
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	20	10	14	12	3	5	3	14	31	10	15	12	9	10	7	8
	No	53	27	30	26	13	22	9	41	120	39	36	28	29	32	57	65
2B.3b	How many K-12 teachers received professional development to integrate technology in course instruction?																
	Response rate	127	102	73	103	44	100	11	110	156	102	81	103	52	100	25	104
	Total	7,660		2,525		2,865		2,347		5,845		2,469		2,865		588	
	Mean	60.3		34.6		65.1		213.4		37.5		30.5		55.1		23.5	
	Median	20		15		27		47		14.5		14		21.5		8	
	Minimum	2		2		2		10		2		2		2		2	
	Maximum	1,576		325		398		1,576		398		325		398		220	
2B.3c	Of those K-12 teachers who participated in professional development activities, what percentage received the following amount of professional development during the reporting period?																
	Response rate	Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.								156	102	81	103	52	100	25	104
	1-5 hours																
	Total									1,456.80		645.2		718.6		97.6	
	Percent receiving this training									25		26		25		17	
	6-10 hours																
	Total									1,426.10		645.1		684		140.6	
	Percent receiving this training									24		26		24		24	
	11-20 hours																
	Total									1,066.10		431.3		571.9		75.2	
	Percent receiving this training									18		17		20		13	
	21-50 hours																
	Total									1,432.30		529.3		668.3		251.2	
	Percent receiving this training									25		21		23		43	
	More than 50 hours																
	Total									461.2		214.9		222.3		24	
	Percent receiving this training									8		9		8		4	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.3d	Which of the following types of professional development were implemented for K-12 teachers, and which of the following types of professional development facilitators were used?																
	Response rate	127	102	73	103	44	100	11	110	156	102	81	103	52	100	25	104
	Workshops (required)																
	Outside trainer	29	23	16	22	6	14	7	64	36	23	17	21	7	13	12	48
	SCDE or university/college technology specialist	34	27	15	21	12	27	7	64	37	24	15	19	14	27	8	32
	Professor	39	31	17	23	14	32	8	73	37	24	17	21	13	25	7	28
	K-12 teacher	26	20	15	21	8	18	3	27	27	17	14	17	8	15	5	20
	Undergraduate or graduate student	16	13	5	7	5	11	6	55	15	10	5	6	5	10	5	20
	Workshops (optional)																
	Outside trainer	47	37	24	33	18	41	6	55	50	32	26	32	19	37	6	24
	SCDE or university/college technology specialist	56	44	30	41	23	52	3	27	53	34	30	37	22	42	1	4
	Professor	55	43	27	37	22	50	6	55	52	33	27	33	21	40	5	20
	K-12 teacher	43	34	27	37	12	27	4	36	44	28	27	33	13	25	4	16
	Undergraduate or graduate student	31	24	13	18	13	30	6	55	29	19	13	16	13	25	4	16
	Individual training																
	Outside trainer	14	11	8	11	4	9	3	27	16	10	8	10	5	10	4	16
	SCDE or university/college technology specialist	38	30	24	33	13	30	2	18	40	26	25	31	14	27	2	8
	Professor	34	27	21	29	7	16	6	55	33	21	21	26	7	13	6	24
	K-12 teacher	29	23	19	26	7	16	4	36	26	17	17	21	6	12	4	16
	Undergraduate or graduate student	35	28	20	27	12	27	5	45	35	22	20	25	12	23	5	20
	Available technical support for drop-in assistance																
	Outside trainer	12	9	6	8	4	9	3	27	14	9	6	7	4	8	5	20
	SCDE or university/college technology specialist	46	36	26	36	16	36	4	36	46	29	26	32	16	31	4	16
	Professor	26	20	15	21	8	18	4	36	25	16	15	19	7	13	4	16
	K-12 teacher	23	18	17	23	4	9	3	27	21	13	16	20	4	8	2	8
	Undergraduate or graduate student	28	22	14	19	11	25	4	36	27	17	14	17	11	21	3	12
	Mentorships																
	Outside trainer	5	4	3	4	1	2	1	9	6	4	4	5	1	2	1	4
	SCDE or university/college technology specialist	16	13	8	11	7	16	1	9	15	10	8	10	7	13	0	0
	Professor	32	25	16	22	11	25	5	45	33	21	17	21	11	21	5	20
	K-12 teacher	27	21	16	22	9	20	3	27	26	17	16	20	9	17	2	8
	Undergraduate or graduate student	22	17	10	14	10	23	4	36	21	13	9	11	10	19	4	16

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.3d *(Continued)*																
Which of the following types of professional development were implemented for K-12 teachers, and which of the following types of professional development facilitators were used?																
Response rate	127	102	73	103	44	100	11	110	156	102	81	103	52	100	25	104
Conferences												0		0		0
Outside trainer	26	20	16	22	8	18	2	18	28	18	17	21	9	17	2	8
SCDE or university/college technology specialist	21	17	13	18	6	14	2	18	22	14	13	16	7	13	2	8
Professor	26	20	14	19	9	20	3	27	30	19	15	19	11	21	5	20
K-12 teacher	28	22	16	22	9	20	4	36	29	19	16	20	9	17	5	20
Undergraduate or graduate student	12	9	5	7	6	14	1	9	13	8	5	6	6	12	2	8
Courses																
Outside trainer	5	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	6	0	0	0	0
SCDE or university/college technology specialist	18	14	6	8	11	25	1	9	16	10	6	7	9	17	1	4
Professor	19	15	7	10	11	25	2	18	16	10	7	9	9	17	1	4
K-12 teacher	4	3	3	4	1	2	0	0	3	2	2	2	1	2	0	0
Undergraduate or graduate student	3	2	1	1	2	5	0	0	3	2	1	1	2	4	0	0

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2B.4a	**LEAD ORGANIZATIONS ONLY:** In addition to SCDE and SCD of arts and science faculty at partner institutions and K-12 teachers, how many other individuals participated in professional development?																
	Preservice students																
	Response rate	172	76	105	76	52	81	15	65	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	Total	13,245		7,260		4,029		1,956									
	Mean	77		69.1		77.5		130.4									
	Median	10		10		12		3									
	Minimum	0		0		0		0									
	Maximum	2,400		2,400		1,792		1,500									
	Community college faculty																
	Response rate	147	65	87	63	45	70	15	65	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	Total	260		65		33		162									
	Mean	1.8		1		1		10.8									
	Median	0		0		0		0									
	Minimum	0		0		0		0									
	Maximum	129		15		12		129									
	SCDE and SCD of arts and science faculty at non-consortium member schools																
	Response rate	143	64	84	61	45	70	14	61	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	Total	1,026		48		131		847									
	Mean	7.2		1		2.9		60.5									
	Median	0		0		0		3.5									
	Minimum	0		0		0		0									
	Maximum	578		17		64		578									
	Faculty in school or colleges outside the SCDE and SCD of arts and science																
	Response rate	138	61	82	59	44	69	12	52	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	Total	695		129		66		500									
	Mean	5		1.6		1.5		41.7									
	Median	0		0		0		0									
	Minimum	0		0		0		0									
	Maximum	450		39		30		450									
2C.1a	Did you add or expand a graduation requirement for preservice students to demonstrate proficiency in the use of technology in teaching or learning?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	43	21	21	18	15	25	7	32	43	13	21	16	15	16	7	7
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	46	23	27	23	11	18	8	36	77	24	29	21	24	26	24	24
	No	109	54	68	58	34	56	7	32	191	59	84	62	52	56	59	58
	Not applicable, not an SCDE	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Data not available	2	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	15	5	1	1	2	2	12	12

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2C.1b	Do you plan to add or expand a graduation requirement for preservice students to demonstrate proficiency in the use of technology in teaching or learning in the next two years?																
	Response rate	109	100	68	100	34	100	7	100	207	101	85	100	56	104	70	100
	Yes	63	58	41	60	18	53	5	71	103	50	45	53	28	50	32	46
	No	34	32	19	28	14	41	0	0	62	30	24	28	23	41	17	24
	Data not available	12	11	8	12	2	6	2	17	42	20	16	19	5	9	21	30
2C.1c	Which of the following abilities were new requirements for preservice students to demonstrate for purposes of graduation:																
	Response rate	44	102	21	100	16	107	7	100	44	102	21	100	16	107	7	100
	To apply computers and related technologies to support instruction in teachers' grade level and subject areas																
	Added as a grant activity	31	70	13	62	13	81	5	71	31	70	13	62	13	81	5	71
	Added, but NOT as a grant activity	4	9	1	5	1	6	2	29	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0
	Already required	7	16	5	24	2	13	0	0	8	18	5	24	2	13	1	14
	Not required	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	14
	Data not available	2	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	10	1	6	0	0
	To plan and deliver instructional units that integrate a variety of software applications and learning tools																
	Added as a grant activity	32	73	15	71	13	81	4	57	32	73	15	71	13	81	4	57
	Added, but NOT as a grant activity	3	7	0	0	1	6	2	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Already required	4	9	2	10	2	13	0	0	5	11	2	10	2	13	1	14
	Not required	2	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	4	9	2	10	1	6	1	14
	Data not available	3	7	2	10	0	0	1	14	3	7	2	10	0	0	1	14
	To develop technology lessons that reflect effective grouping and assessment strategies for diverse populations																
	Added as a grant activity	29	66	13	62	12	75	4	57	29	66	13	62	12	75	4	57
	Added, but NOT as a grant activity	3	7	1	5	0	0	2	29	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0
	Already required	2	5	1	5	1	6	0	0	2	5	1	5	1	6	0	0
	Not required	6	14	4	19	2	13	0	0	7	16	4	19	2	13	1	14
	Data not available	4	9	2	10	1	6	1	14	5	11	2	10	1	6	2	29
	To use computer-based technologies such as telecommunications and the Internet to enhance personal and professional productivity																
	Added as a grant activity	32	73	15	71	12	75	5	71	32	73	15	71	12	75	5	71
	Added, but NOT as a grant activity	3	7	1	5	0	0	2	29	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0
	Already required	8	18	4	19	4	25	0	0	10	23	4	19	4	25	2	29
	Not required	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Data not available	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2C.1c *(Continued)*																
Which of the following abilities were new requirements for preservice students to demonstrate for purposes of graduation:																
Response rate	44	102	21	100	16	107	7	100	44	102	21	100	16	107	7	100
To use software application packages to solve problems, collect data, manage information, make presentations, and make decisions																
Added as a grant activity	28	64	12	57	9	56	7	100	28	64	12	57	9	56	7	100
Added, but NOT as a grant activity	1	2	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Already required	11	25	5	24	6	38	0	0	11	25	5	24	6	38	0	0
Not required	3	7	3	14	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	14	1	6	0	0
Data not available	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0
To know about computer and technology uses in business, industry, and society																
Added as a grant activity	16	36	9	43	4	25	3	43	16	36	9	43	4	25	3	43
Added, but NOT as a grant activity	7	16	0	0	4	25	3	43	2	5	0	0	2	13	0	0
Already required	9	20	5	24	4	25	0	0	10	23	5	24	4	25	1	14
Not required	8	18	5	24	3	19	0	0	12	27	5	24	5	31	2	29
Data not available	4	9	2	10	1	6	1	14	4	9	2	10	1	6	1	14

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2C.1d	Which of the following means did you use to assess preservice students' performance in the graduation requirements listed in the previous question (2C.1c)?																
	Response rate	44	102	21	100	16	107	7	100	44	102	21	100	16	107	7	100
	In-class demonstration																
	Yes	41	93	19	90	15	94	7	100	40	91	19	90	15	94	6	86
	No	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0
	Data not available	2	5	1	5	1	6	0	0	3	7	1	5	1	6	1	14
	Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)																
	Yes	15	34	7	33	5	31	3	43	12	27	7	33	5	31	0	0
	No	26	59	12	57	10	63	4	57	27	61	12	57	9	56	6	86
	Data not available	3	7	2	10	1	6	0	0	5	11	2	10	2	13	1	14
	Self-assessment																
	Yes	35	80	14	67	14	88	7	100	32	73	14	67	13	81	5	71
	No	8	18	6	29	2	13	0	0	9	20	6	29	2	13	1	14
	Data not available	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	1	5	1	6	1	14
	Portfolio assessment																
	Yes	37	84	17	81	15	94	5	71	34	77	17	81	14	88	3	43
	No	6	14	3	14	1	6	2	29	7	16	3	14	1	6	3	43
	Data not available	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	1	5	1	6	1	14
	Performance assessment																
	Yes	37	84	17	81	14	88	6	86	35	80	17	81	13	81	5	71
	No	5	11	3	14	2	13	0	0	6	14	3	14	3	19	0	0
	Data not available	2	5	1	5	0	0	1	14	3	7	1	5	0	0	2	29
2C.1e	Did you add a requirement for preservice students to develop an electronic portfolio to demonstrate proficiency in selected technology competencies?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	325	79	135	76	93	89	101	80
	Added as a grant activity	42	21	18	15	18	30	6	27	42	13	18	13	17	18	7	7
	Added, but NOT as a grant activity	24	12	14	12	3	5	7	32	32	10	14	10	6	6	12	12
	Already required	19	9	7	6	8	13	4	18	36	11	9	7	15	16	13	13
	Not required	108	54	73	62	31	51	4	18	190	58	88	65	53	57	52	51
	Not applicable, not an SCDE	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Data not available	7	3	5	4	1	2	1	5	25	8	6	4	2	2	17	17

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2C.1f	Does your state require preservice students to demonstrate proficiency in the use of technology in teaching and learning as a condition for graduation?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	325	79	135	76	93	89	101	80
	Yes	97	48	52	44	28	46	17	77	128	39	58	43	36	39	36	36
	No	95	47	59	50	31	51	5	23	156	48	67	50	52	56	39	39
	Data not available	9	4	7	6	2	3	0	0	41	13	10	7	5	5	26	26
2D.1a	Did SCDE faculty use technology (such as e-mail or the Internet) to communicate with students?																
	Response rate	201	89	118	86	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	128	64	71	60	43	70	15	68	176	54	78	58	59	63	43	42
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	71	35	46	39	18	30	6	27	140	43	55	41	34	37	51	50
	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0
	Not applicable, not an SCDE	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Data not available	1	<1	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	3	1	1	0	0	8	8

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	By Consortium								By SCDE							
	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2D.1b About what proportion of all SCDE faculty and students used the following types of technology to communicate?																
Response rate									175	99	77	99	59	100	42	100
Email																
None									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less than half									12	7	5	6	2	3	6	14
More than half									73	42	32	42	29	49	13	30
All									88	50	39	51	27	46	24	56
Data not available									2	1	1	1	1	2	0	0
ListServs																
None									16	9	4	5	4	7	9	21
Less than half									86	49	45	58	27	46	16	37
More than half									39	22	17	22	18	31	4	9
All									15	9	4	5	6	10	5	12
Data not available									19	11	7	9	4	7	9	21
World Wide Web/Internet																
None									1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Less than half									31	18	13	17	11	19	8	19
More than half									69	39	33	43	24	41	13	30
All									68	39	30	39	20	34	19	44
Data not available									6	3	1	1	4	7	2	5
2D.2a Did SCDE faculty integrate technology in their course in new ways?																
Response rate	200	89	117	85	61	95	22	96	326	80	135	76	93	89	102	80
Yes, as a grant activity	174	87	99	85	56	92	19	86	238	73	109	81	77	83	56	55
Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	19	10	12	10	5	8	2	9	60	18	18	13	15	16	27	26
No	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	9	3	3	2	0	0	6	6
Data not available	5	3	4	3	0	0	1	5	19	6	5	4	1	1	13	13

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
	Question	All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2D.2b	About what proportion of all SCDE faculty applied technology in their courses in the following ways?																
	Response rate		Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.							237	99.5	108	99	77	100	56	100
	Used the Web as an online resource for syllabi, lesson plans, and course materials																
	None									9	4	3	3	2	3	4	7
	Less than half									111	47	50	46	38	49	27	48
	More than half									77	32	35	32	29	38	13	23
	All									29	12	16	15	5	7	8	14
	Data not available									11	5	4	4	3	4	4	7
	Required students to use the Web to conduct research, including accessing documents and online bibliographic services																
	None									2	1	0	0	0	0	2	4
	Less than half									69	29	29	27	24	31	19	34
	More than half									113	48	54	50	38	49	22	39
	All									40	17	19	18	12	16	9	16
	Data not available									13	5	6	6	3	4	4	7
	Used presentation software and multi-media (including digital cameras and scanners) to create electronic presentations																
	None									9	4	3	3	2	3	4	7
	Less than half									134	57	61	56	41	53	36	64
	More than half									67	28	33	31	27	35	7	13
	All									14	6	6	6	4	5	4	7
	Data not available									13	5	5	5	3	4	5	9
	Required students to use presentation software and multi-media (including digital cameras and scanners) to create electronic presentations																
	None									17	7	7	6	3	4	7	13
	Less than half									146	62	70	65	46	60	34	61
	More than half									52	22	22	20	21	27	9	16
	All									10	4	5	5	3	4	2	4
	Data not available									12	5	4	4	4	5	4	7
	Used video for preservice students to observe K-12 teachers modeling integration of technology in classroom instruction																
	None									57	24	30	28	16	21	13	23
	Less than half									115	49	52	48	41	53	24	43
	More than half									27	11	12	11	8	10	7	13
	All									5	2	2	2	1	1	2	4
	Data not available									33	14	12	11	11	14	10	18

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2D.2b	*(Continued)* About what proportion of all SCDE faculty applied technology in their courses in the following ways?																
	Response rate					Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.				237	99.5	108	99	77	100	56	100
	Used asynchronous, editable learning modules or learning objects (interactive electronic tutorials to teach specific lessons or material)																
	None									91	38	41	38	27	35	24	43
	Less than half									88	37	43	40	31	40	17	30
	More than half									12	5	4	4	6	8	2	4
	All									5	2	3	3	1	1	1	2
	Data not available									41	17	17	16	12	16	12	21
2D.3a	Was there an increase from the previous academic year in the number of hours of available technical support for faculty, staff, and students?																
	Response rate	199	88	116	84	61	95	22	96	325	79	134	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	126	63	69	59	42	69	16	73	146	45	72	54	50	54	27	26
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	31	16	19	16	7	11	5	23	72	22	23	17	16	17	34	33
	No	32	16	22	19	10	16	0	0	76	23	32	24	20	22	24	24
	Data not available	10	5	6	5	2	3	1	5	31	10	7	5	7	8	17	17
2D.3b	In 1998-1999 about how many hours of technical support were available to SCDE faculty, staff, and students per week?																
	Response rate	126	100	69	100	42	100	16	100	148	101	74	103	50	100	27	100
	Total	2,857		932.5		1,766		264.5		2,837		932.5		1746		264.5	
	Mean	36.6		20.3		67.9		33.1		32.2		20.3		51.4		26.5	
	Median	15		9		38.8		39		15		9		20		19	
	Minimum	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	Maximum	400		110		400		100		400		110		400		100	
	Data not available*	48		23		16		8		60		28		16		17	
2D.3c	In 1999-2000 about how many hours of technical support were available to SCDE faculty, staff, and students per week?																
	Response rate	126	100	69	100	42	100	16	100	148	101	74	103	50	100	27	100
	Total	6,603		2,408.50		3,758.50		650		6,578		2,408.50		3733.5		650	
	Mean	64.1		40.8		107.4		65		57.2		40.8		86.8		43.3	
	Median	40		30		60		72.5		40		30		48		40	
	Minimum	1		1.5		1.5		1		0		1.5		1		0	
	Maximum	460		205		460		155		460		205		460		150	
	Data not available	23		10		7		6		33		15		7		12	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2D.3d	Who provided technical support to SCDE faculty, staff, and students during the reporting period?																
	Response rate	199	88	116	84	61	95	22	96	324	79	134	76	93	89	101	80
	Outside consultant																
	Yes	84	42	44	38	27	44	15	68	98	30	49	37	29	31	23	23
	No	107	54	69	59	31	51	5	23	187	58	81	60	57	61	50	50
	Data not available	8	4	3	3	3	5	2	9	39	12	4	3	7	8	28	28
	SCDE technology support specialist																
	Yes	162	81	88	76	55	90	19	86	227	70	97	72	77	83	57	56
	No	35	18	27	23	6	10	2	9	76	23	35	26	14	15	27	27
	Data not available	2	<1	1	1	0	0	1	5	21	6	2	1	2	2	17	17
	University technology support specialist																
	Yes	177	89	104	90	51	84	22	100	273	84	118	88	77	83	82	80
	No	21	11	11	9	10	16	0	0	37	11	14	10	15	16	8	8
	Data not available	1	<1	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5	2	1	1	1	12	12
	Professor																
	Yes	149	75	88	76	44	72	17	77	215	66	97	72	67	72	54	53
	No	44	22	27	23	14	23	3	14	81	25	35	26	20	22	27	27
	Data not available	6	3	1	1	3	5	2	9	28	9	2	1	6	6	20	20
	K-12 teacher																
	Yes	67	34	42	36	17	28	8	36	77	24	47	35	20	22	11	11
	No	118	59	69	59	37	61	12	55	205	63	81	60	63	68	64	63
	Data not available	14	7	5	4	7	11	2	9	42	13	6	5	10	11	26	26
	Undergraduate or graduate student																
	Yes	138	69	75	65	46	75	17	77	183	56	79	59	61	66	46	45
	No	53	27	38	33	13	21	2	9	105	32	50	37	26	28	30	29
	Data not available	8	4	3	3	2	3	3	14	37	11	5	4	6	6	26	25
3A.1a	Did preservice students have to demonstrate proficiency in using technology in teaching?																
	Response rate	200	89	117	85	61	95	22	96	325	79	134	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	82	41	45	38	28	46	10	45	101	31	48	36	36	39	18	18
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	62	31	35	30	19	31	8	36	110	34	41	31	32	34	39	38
	No	51	26	35	30	13	21	2	9	96	30	41	31	22	24	34	33
	Not applicable, not an SCDE	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Data not available	4	2	1	1	1	2	2	10	18	6	4	3	3	3	11	11

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3A.1b	How many preservice students demonstrated proficiency in the following ways:																
	To apply computers and related technologies to support instruction in preservice students' grade level and subject area focus																
	Response rate	82	100	45	100	28	100	10	100	102	101	36	100	27	100	19	106
	Total	11,605		2,885		6,662		2,058		11,605		2885		6662		2,058	
	Mean	187.2		84.9		317.1		294		156.8		80.1		246.7		187.1	
	Median	84		53.5		130		200		80		47.5		100		29	
	Minimum	0		4		0		20		0		2		0		0	
	Maximum	2,667		262		2,667		1,025		1,006		262		1,006		1,006	
	Data not available*	20		11		7		3		28		12		9		8	
	To plan and deliver instructional units that integrate a variety of software applications and learning tools																
	Response rate	82	100	45	100	28	100	10	100	102	101	36	100	27	100	19	106
	Total	9,014		3,029		3,999		1,986		9,014		3,029		3,999		1,986	
	Mean	138.7		84.1		181.8		283.7		120.2		79.7		153.8		180.5	
	Median	80		58.5		93.5		109		62		51		90.5		50	
	Minimum	0		3		0		16		0		2		0		0	
	Maximum	1,025		262		1,006		1,025		1,006		262		1,006		1,006	
	Data not available*	17		9		6		3		27		10		10		8	
	To develop technology lessons that reflect effective grouping and assessment strategies for diverse populations																
	Response rate	82	100	45	100	28	100	10	100	102	101	36	100	27	100	19	106
	Total	7,078		2,062		3,384		1,632		7,078		2,062		3,384		1,632	
	Mean	157,3		85.9		211.5		326.4		138.8		79.3		188		233.1	
	Median	85		63		103.5		190		80		45.5		93.5		100	
	Minimum	0		0		0		36		0		0		0		0	
	Maximum	1,006		250		1,006		1,006		1,006		250		1,006		1,006	
	Data not available*	37		21		12		5		51		22		18		12	
3A.1c	What was the total number (unduplicated count) of preservice students that demonstrated proficiency in using technology?																
	Response rate	82	100	45	100	28	100	10	100	102	101	36	100	27	100	19	106
	Total	11,408		4,219		5,241		1,948		11,408		4,219		5,241		1,948	
	Mean	175.5		120.5		238.2		243.5		150.1		114		201.6		149.8	
	Median	120		80		145.5		154.5		83		70		110		50	
	Minimum	4		4		7		4		2		2		7		4	
	Maximum	1,025		600		1,006		1,025		1,006		600		1,006		1,006	
	Data not available*	17		10		6		2		26		11		10		6	

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3A.1d	How many of the preservice students that demonstrated proficiency in using technology were in their graduating year?																
	Response rate	82	100	45	100	28	100	10	100	102	101	36	100	27	100	19	106
	Total	4,859		1,389		1,986		1,484		4,859		1,389		1,986		1,484	
	Mean	85.2		46.3		99.3		212		71.5		42.1		86.3		123.7	
	Median	40		20		48		62		29.5		16		50		18.5	
	Minimum	0		0		0		4		0		0		0		0	
	Maximum	1,025		243		580		1,028		1,006		243		386		1,006	
	Data not available*	25		15		8		3		34		15		13		7	
3A.1e	How were students' technology proficiency assessed?																
	Response rate	82	100	45	100	28	100	10	100	102	101	36	100	27	100	19	106
	In-class demonstration/observation																
	Yes	78	95	42	93	27	96	10	100	92	90	45	94	35	97	13	68
	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	16
	Data not available	4	5	3	7	1	4	0	0	7	7	3	6	1	3	3	16
	Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)																
	Yes	22	27	14	31	5	18	4	40	22	22	12	25	9	25	1	5
	No	52	63	26	58	21	75	5	50	69	68	31	65	25	69	14	74
	Data not available	8	10	5	11	2	7	1	10	11	11	5	10	2	6	4	21
	Self-assessment																
	Yes	65	79	35	78	22	79	9	90	71	70	35	73	27	75	9	47
	No	13	16	7	16	5	18	1	10	23	23	10	21	8	22	6	32
	Data not available	4	5	3	7	1	4	0	0	8	8	3	6	1	3	4	21
	Portfolio assessment																
	Yes	51	62	24	53	18	64	10	100	56	55	25	52	22	61	10	53
	No	25	30	17	38	8	29	0	0	38	37	19	40	12	33	7	37
	Data not available	6	7	4	9	2	7	0	0	8	8	4	8	2	6	2	11
	Performance assessment																
	Yes	70	85	37	82	24	86	10	100	79	78	37	77	31	86	12	63
	No	7	9	4	9	3	11	0	0	15	15	7	15	4	11	4	21
	Data not available	5	6	4	9	1	4	0	0	8	8	4	8	1	3	3	16
3A.3a	Did you develop an assessment tool to measure preservice students' ability to integrate technology into instruction?																
	Response rate	200	89	117	85	61	95	22	96	325	79	134	76	93	89	102	80
	Yes, as a grant activity	84	42	46	39	27	44	11	50	98	30	46	34	34	37	19	19
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity	21	11	6	5	10	16	5	23	39	12	9	7	14	15	16	16
	No	93	47	63	54	24	39	6	27	168	52	76	57	44	47	51	50
	Data not available	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	20	6	3	2	1	1	16	16

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

		By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
	Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3A.3b	What type of assessment tool did you develop to measure preservice students' ability to integrate technology into instruction?																
	Response rate	84	100	46	100	27	100	11	100	99	101	46	100	34	100	20	105
	In-class demonstration/observation	50	60	28	61	15	56	7	64	55	56	29	63	17	50	9	45
	Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)	19	23	13	28	4	15	2	18	19	19	13	28	4	12	2	10
	Self-assessment	71	85	37	80	24	89	10	91	80	81	35	76	30	88	16	80
	Portfolio assessment	42	50	21	46	14	52	7	64	42	42	19	41	15	44	8	40
	Performance assessment	48	57	23	50	17	63	8	73	53	54	24	52	19	56	10	50
4A.1a	Did you develop a written plan (or do you have a written plan) to continue preservice teacher training reforms in technology after termination of grant funding?																
	Response rate	200	89	117	85	61	95	22	96	324	79	134	76	93	89	101	80
	Yes	133	67	82	70	36	59	15	68	150	46	86	64	43	46	22	22
	No	55	28	26	22	23	38	6	27	138	43	37	28	43	46	61	60
	Data not available	12	6	9	8	2	3	1	5	36	11	11	8	7	8	18	18
4B.1a	In which of the following activities was the SCD of arts and science involved?																
	Response rate	113	100	63	100	34	100	16	100	139	100	63	100	41	100	37	100
	Curriculum redesign to incorporate best practices in the use of technology for preservice students	84	74	43	68	28	82	13	81	102	73	46	73	33	80	25	68
	Integration of Web-based, multi-media resources in preservice education courses	84	74	46	73	27	79	11	69	101	73	48	76	32	78	23	62
	Faculty development workshops in technology	91	81	51	81	29	85	11	69	110	79	54	86	36	88	21	57
	Providing technical consultants/educators for the SCDE	56	50	32	51	15	44	9	56	65	47	35	56	18	44	13	35
	Development of student assignments reflecting use of technology	84	74	47	75	24	71	13	81	102	73	50	79	30	73	23	62

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4C.2a	In which of the following activities were the K-12 schools involved?																
	Response rate	183	100	109	100	58	100	18	100	233	100	118	100	74	100	45	100
	Providing clinical opportunities for preservice students																
	Yes	166	91	98	90	52	90	17	94	206	88	107	91	67	91	35	78
	No	15	8	9	8	6	10	1	6	19	8	9	8	7	9	4	9
	Data not available	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	8	3	2	2	0	0	6	13
	Modeling effective use of technology in instruction by K-12 teachers for SCDE faculty																
	Yes	107	58	68	62	30	52	9	50	125	54	73	62	40	54	12	27
	No	68	37	38	35	25	43	7	39	90	39	42	36	29	39	23	51
	Data not available	8	4	3	3	3	5	2	11	18	8	3	3	5	7	10	22
	Modeling effective use of technology in instruction by K-12 teachers for preservice students																
	Yes	144	79	85	78	46	79	13	72	178	76	94	80	59	80	27	60
	No	24	13	16	15	7	12	2	11	31	13	16	14	8	11	8	18
	Data not available	15	8	8	7	5	9	3	17	24	10	8	7	7	9	10	22
	Providing mentors for preservice students																
	Yes	117	64	66	61	37	64	15	83	144	62	70	59	48	65	28	62
	No	59	32	40	37	19	33	1	6	75	32	44	37	23	31	10	22
	Data not available	7	4	3	3	2	3	2	11	14	6	4	3	3	4	7	16
	Designing and developing of high-quality induction programs for program graduates																
	Yes	42	23	20	18	17	29	6	33	46	20	21	18	19	26	8	18
	No	124	68	76	70	40	69	9	50	156	67	84	71	52	70	22	49
	Data not available	17	9	13	12	1	2	3	17	31	13	13	11	3	4	15	33
	Designing and developing of curriculum and/or graduation requirements for preservice students that reflect the technology needs of K-12 teachers																
	Yes	85	46	50	46	30	52	7	39	96	41	51	43	38	51	9	20
	No	85	46	52	48	26	45	7	39	112	48	59	50	33	45	22	49
	Data not available	13	7	7	6	2	3	4	22	25	11	8	7	3	4	14	31
	Assessing the technology proficiency of preservice students																
	Yes	85	46	55	50	23	40	8	44	94	40	58	49	28	38	10	22
	No	85	46	47	43	33	57	6	33	116	50	53	45	44	59	21	47
	Data not available	13	7	7	6	2	3	4	22	23	10	7	6	2	3	14	31
	Sharing software, multi-media, and other technology tools																
	Yes	155	85	95	87	47	81	14	78	188	81	103	87	60	81	28	62
	No	22	12	11	10	9	16	3	17	31	13	11	9	10	14	11	24
	Data not available	6	3	3	3	2	3	1	6	14	6	4	3	4	5	6	13

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4C.2a	In which of the following activities were the K-12 schools involved? *(cont.)*																
	Response rate	183	100	109	100	58	100	18	100	233	100	118	100	74	100	45	100
	Providing professional development opportunities for current teachers to improve their technology skills through training at the SCDE																
	Yes	125	68	73	67	38	66	15	83	151	65	78	66	51	69	24	53
	No	51	28	33	30	17	29	2	11	72	31	37	31	20	27	17	38
	Data not available	7	4	3	3	3	5	1	6	10	4	3	3	3	4	4	9
LEAD ORGANIZATIONS ONLY:																	
5A.1a	Do your state's standards for initial certification of teachers address technology?																
	Response rate	193	86	113	82	59	92	21	91	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	Yes	124	64	72	64	37	63	15	71								
5A.2a	How does your state's initial certification address technology?																
	Response rate	124	100	72	100	38	103	14	93	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	By the assessment of technology proficiency	48	39	27	38	15	39	6	43								
	By the required completion of technology or technology-integrated courses	80	65	48	67	22	58	10	71								
5A.3a	Is your state in the process of reviewing initial certification or licensure requirements to add or expand technology requirements?																
	Response rate	190	84	113	82	59	92	18	78	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	Yes	118	62	73	65	37	63	8	44								
5A.4a	Are efforts to add or expand technology requirements for your state's initial certification or licensure part of your grant's requirements?																
	Response rate	190	84	113	82	59	92	18	78	These items were asked only of lead organizations							
	Yes	33	17	23	20	7	12	3	17								
6A.1a	Were any technology training activities targeted to districts with high-need rural, urban, low-income, min																
	Response rate	Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.								280	68	119	67	79	75	86	68
	Yes, as a grant activity									137	49	68	57	41	52	31	36
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity									32	11	8	7	11	14	13	15
	No									80	29	30	25	24	30	27	31
	Data not available									31	11	13	11	3	4	15	17

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.
* Responses not included in summary statistics

	Question	By Consortium								By SCDE							
		All grantees		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst		All Partners		Capacity Building		Implementation		Catalyst	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6A.2a	Were any technology training program activities targeted to students with disabilities?																
	Response rate	Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.								236	58	99	56	66	63	75	59
	Yes, as a grant activity									35	15	14	14	14	21	7	9
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity									32	14	14	14	8	12	10	13
	No									134	57	58	59	42	64	38	51
	Data not available									35	15	13	13	2	3	20	27
6B.1a	Did graduating preservice teachers accept teaching positions at districts serving high-need populations?																
	Response rate	Data not aggregated at the consortium level for these items.								220	54	93	53	60	57	70	55
	Yes, as a grant activity									10	5	5	5	4	7	1	1
	Yes, but NOT as a grant activity									94	43	44	47	26	43	25	36
	No									7	3	1	1	4	7	2	3
	Data not available									109	50	43	46	26	43	42	60

Response rates may exceed 100 if respondent noted they did not undertake a specific activity but provided data.

* Responses not included in summary statistics

B-40

| State | Do your state's standards for initial certification of teachers address technology? | | How does your state's standards for initial certification address technology? | | | | Is your state in the process of reviewing initial certification or licensure requirements to add or expand technology requirements? | |
| | | | By the assessment of technology proficiency? | | By the required completion of technology or technology-integrated courses? | | | |
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Alabama	3	1	0	2	2	0	1	3
Alaska	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
Arizona	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	2
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	1	17	9	8	14	3	6	12
Colorado	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Florida	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	2
Georgia	1	6	4	2	5	1	0	7
Hawaii	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
Idaho	0	2	2	0	1	1	2	0
Illinois	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
Indiana	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
Iowa	2	3	0	3	3	0	3	2
Kansas	3	2	0	2	2	0	0	5
Kentucky	0	3	3	0	0	3	2	1
Louisiana	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	4
Maine	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Maryland	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	5
Massachusetts	2	3	0	2	1	1	2	1
Michigan	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	2
Minnesota	3	6	3	3	4	2	5	4
Mississippi	3	2	0	2	2	0	2	3
Missouri	2	4	3	1	0	4	0	6
Montana	1	3	1	2	1	2	2	2
Nebraska	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nevada	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
New Hampshire	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
New Jersey	2	4	0	4	2	2	3	3
New Mexico	0	3	1	2	3	0	0	3
New York	3	4	2	2	2	2	1	6
North Carolina	0	6	5	1	1	5	3	3
North Dakota	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
Ohio	1	6	0	6	3	3	3	3
Oklahoma	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	1
Oregon	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Pennsylvania	3	4	0	4	2	2	2	5
Rhode Island	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
South Carolina	4	2	0	2	2	0	3	3
South Dakota	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Tennessee	0	3	0	3	3	0	2	1
Texas	5	8	3	4	5	2	1	12
Utah	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	1
Virginia	1	5	4	1	1	4	4	2
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	1	2	0	2	2	0	3	0
Wisconsin	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	2
West Virginia	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	1
Wyoming	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Outlying areas	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	69	124	48	76	80	44	71	118