Archived Information

Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.342 - Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology

Goal 8: To improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Strengthen teacher preparation programs so that they provide high-quality training in the use of technology for instructional purposes.

techn	technology for instructional purposes.							
	Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Curriculum redesign: The percentage of funded teacher preparation programs that redesign their curriculum to incorporate best practices in the use of technology in teacher education will increase.							
	Targets and Perfo	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality					
Perce	entage of programs				Additional Source Information: Project			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Target	ts					
	Capacity Building ImplementationCatalyst Projects Projects Projects		atalyst rojects	of projects that redesigned curriculum <i>during this</i> reporting period has decreased.	Performance Reports.			
2000	78 82			decreased.	Frequency: Annually.			
2001	87 66		68	Explanation: Curriculum	Collection Period: 2003			
2002	84 68	89	68	design is a priority for many Implementation	Data Available:			
Indica	ator 8.1.2 of 2: Technology-prof	icient faculty: The percen	ntage of	completed redesign before this reporting period. The cumulative percent of Implementation projects that have redesigned curriculum as a grant activity since the beginning of the program is ninety-one percent (91%). Curriculum redesign is not the purpose of all Catalyst projects, many of which are not located at an institution of higher education.	Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator. Capacity-building grants were one-year grants given in 1999 so there are data only for 2000.			
prepa	ration programs that effectively	y use technology in their	teachin	g will increase.	.			
	Targets and Perfo	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality					
	entage of faculty members in fund ams that effectively use technolog	Status: Target not met Source: Performance	Performance					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Target	ts	Progress: Positive movement toward target.	Report Contractor			
	Capacity Building ImplementationCatalyst Projects Projects Projects		atalyst rojects	The percentage of technology proficient faculty is increasing.	Performance Report			
2000	56 53			Explanation:	Additional Source			
2001	61	63		Implementation projects	Information:			
			1	are using various methods	Project			

2002	62	63	to assess technology proficiency. Fifty-seven	Performance Reports
			percent (57%) of faculty were rated to be proficient using self-assessment, fifteen percent (15%) using observation, and thirty-three percent (33%) using other methods such as exams and portfolios.	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification. Limitations: Performance report data will be self- reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator. Capacity building grants were one- year grants given in 1999 so there are data only for 2000.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the technology skills and proficiency of new teachers for improved classroom instruction.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
	entage of students assessed at catalyst projects that demonstrated ciency in using technology. Actual Performance Performance Targets					Status: Target not met Progress: The percentage	Additional Source Information: Project	
	Capacity Building In Projects	nplementati Projects		Capacity	nplementation Projects		of graduating students who are rated as technology proficient out of all those assessed has decreased.	Performance Reports. Frequency: Annually.
2000 2001	42	32 34	38		36	40	Explanation: Fifty-nine percent (59%) of	Collection Period 2002
2002		29	19		36	40	Implementation projects required preservice teachers to demonstrate technology as a grant activity during the reporting period and an additional thirty-one percent (31%) required proficiency but not as a grant activity. Implementation grantees are assessing a growing number of graduating students for technology proficiency. Many Catalyst projects are not located at institutions of higher education and therefore do not assess the technology proficiency of preservice	Data Available: December 2003 Validated By: No Formal Verification Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review as well as survey and analysi performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations: Performance repor data will be self-

	•
teachers.	reported from program grantees.