



C C T R E P O R T S
MARCH 2004

INTEL TEACH TO THE FUTURE®
U.S. CLASSIC PROGRAM AND
U.S. EXPANSION PROGRAM
PARTICIPANT TEACHER
END OF TRAINING SURVEY
SUMMARY REPORT

PREPARED BY
NAOMI HUPERT
WENDY MARTIN
TOMOE KANAYA

CENTER FOR CHILDREN & TECHNOLOGY

Copyright © 2002 by Education Development Center Inc.

This report was written and produced by EDC's Center for Children and Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher, except where permitted by law.

To inquire about permission, write to:

ATTN: REPRINTS

Center for Children and Technology

96 Morton Street, 7th Floor

New York, NY 10017

Or email:

cct_reprints@edc.org

INTRODUCTION

This report compares findings from the End of Training surveys administered to Participant Teachers (PTs) who took part in the Classic version of Intel Teach to the Future and who took part in the Expansion version of Intel Teach to the Future. Classic survey data were collected between March 2001 and July 2003. PT Expansion survey data were collected between April 2002 and March 2004. The comparison of data from these two surveys shows strong commonalities as well as differences between these two groups of teachers. In many cases the two groups were so similar that any differences were found to be not statistically significant. Unless otherwise noted, all of the findings presented in this report are statistically significant. It is important to bear in mind, however, that the formula for determining statistical significance is based in part on the size of the sample. Because the sample sizes for the data reported here are quite large, the reader should use caution when interpreting the meaning of statistically significant but otherwise small differences between the two groups. The frequencies for the Classic and Expansion PT End of Training survey data can be found in Appendix A.

METHODS

Subjects

All teachers who participated in the Classic or Expansion training were expected to complete an End of Training survey at the end of their training. In addition, all teachers participating in the Classic training were required to complete an application prior to the training experience. The total number of valid survey responses was 59,129, with 49,329 participants included in the Classic PT training and 9,800 participants included in the Expansion PT training, unless otherwise indicated. The substantial differences in sample sizes between the Expansion and Classic participants suggest that far fewer Expansion participants completed the End of Training surveys. It is important to keep these sample size discrepancies in mind while interpreting the comparisons between the results of these surveys. Pearson Chi-Square tests were used to determine the statistical significance of findings across both Participant Teacher groups.

No application data were collected for teachers participating in the Expansion Participant Teacher training until August 2003, and these demographic surveys were not administered in the same way that the End of Training surveys were administered. The PT demographic surveys were pop-up forms that appeared when participants clicked on the button to access the End of Training survey on the Intel Teach to the Future web site. Participant Teachers could choose to fill out, but were not required to do so. Because the information requested was optional, only small numbers of Expansion participants responded to the questions in this survey (N=2,367). Unlike the Master Teacher Expansion application data, the demographic data collected from Expansion PTs in this manner could not be linked to the End of Training surveys. Therefore, it is impossible to determine if the small group of teachers who completed the demographic surveys are included among or are representative of teachers who completed the End of Training survey.

Instruments

The survey was developed by CCT in consultation with ICT and Intel staff who had been involved in the development of the curriculum. Minor revisions were made to the survey in Spring 2001.

Procedures

Surveys were administered via the World Wide Web. Specifically, the surveys were mounted within an extranet maintained by Intel for Intel Teach to the Future participants. Classic participants were asked to complete the application prior to their participation. All teachers were asked to complete the End of Training survey at the conclusion of their training. The data reported here from the Classic Intel Teach to the Future training were collected between March 2001 and July 2003. The data reported here from the Expansion Intel Teach to the Future training were collected between April 2002 and March 2004.

FINDINGS

Participant demographics

While demographic data were collected from Classic participants through a required application form prior to participation in the training experience, Expansion participants were not required to complete an application and only limited demographic data from this population were collected. In August 2003, demographic data collection from Expansion participants began through the inclusion of an optional pop-up window that opened when participants clicked on the link to access the End of Training survey. Because of the issues described in the Methods section regarding the demographic data available on Expansion program PTs, this report does not present demographic data except for Table 1, which presents the percentage of participants' schools serving students who are eligible for free or reduced lunch programs. Starting in April 2004, the Intel Teach to the Future team plans to begin including demographic questions in the End of Training survey for Expansion participants in order to address the issues raised above.

This report presents information regarding the poverty level of students at participants' schools, as indicated by eligibility for free and reduced lunch programs, (see Table 1) because, though problematic, the data suggest that differences exist between the Classic and Expansion Participant Teacher populations, a distinction also found among Master Teachers (see Master Teacher Classic and Expansion Report). In each of these cases, participants in the Expansion trainings work in schools serving fewer disadvantaged students than those participating in Classic trainings: (30.5%) of Expansion teachers reported working in school where 0%-25% of the students were eligible for free or reduced lunch programs, while 28.5% of the Classic participants worked in such schools. However, unlike the Master Teacher population, a greater percentage of Participant Teachers in the Expansion population also worked in schools serving high numbers of disadvantaged students (23.5%) than did Classic Participant Teachers (22.1%). While this information is not highly reliable due to difficulties in collecting consistent data from Expansion training participants, it warrants further examination once additional data have been collected.

TABLE 1: PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO RECEIVE FREE OR REDUCED LUNCH IN PARTICIPATING TEACHERS' SCHOOLS (CLASSIC: N=49,329, EXPANSION: N=2,367)

% of students at schools with free or reduced lunch	Intel Teach to the Future %	
	Classic	Expansion
0 – 25%	28.5	30.5
26 – 50%	26.8	21.4
51 – 75%	22.5	24.5
76 – 100%	22.1	23.5

Description of the training experience

Both Classic and Expansion participants responded positively to questions about the training experience. However, when asked to describe their experience as a participant in the training, Expansion teachers generally rated their experience on several options at higher levels than did Classic participants. Expansion participants indicated that the training focused on technology integration into the curriculum, provided useful new ideas, showed effective uses of technology, and provided collaboration opportunities with others, and in each of these areas Expansion teachers rated their experiences at between 3% and 5% higher than did Classic teachers (see Table 2).

TABLE 2: TO WHAT EXTENT DO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS DESCRIBE THE INTEL TEACH TO THE FUTURE TRAINING YOU PARTICIPATED IN? (CLASSIC: N=49,329; EXPANSION: N=9,800)

	Not At All %		Small Extent %		Moderate Extent %		Great Extent %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
The training focused on integration of technology into the curriculum	0.6	0.1	1.6	0.5	11.7	8.5	86.2	90.9
The training provided useful new ideas for teaching strategies to apply with your students	0.4	0.2	2.7	1.9	20.2	17.5	76.7	80.4
The training illustrated effective uses of technology with students	0.3	0.2	2.0	1.3	17.9	15.2	79.8	83.2
The training provided opportunities to collaborate with other teachers during training	0.4	0.2	3.2	1.9	18.8	14.7	77.6	83.2

Teachers' expectations for classroom use of technology

When asked if the ideas and skills learned from the training would help them integrate technology into their classrooms, again, more Expansion participants (71.0%) indicated that the training would “definitely” help them than Classic participants (68.5%). In addition, 3.4% of Classic participants indicated that the training would “probably” or “definitely” not help them, and only 1.9% of Expansion participants indicated this (see Table 3).

TABLE 3: WILL THE IDEAS AND SKILLS YOU LEARNED FROM THE INTEL TEACH TO THE FUTURE TRAINING HELP YOU SUCCESSFULLY INTEGRATE TECHNOLOGY INTO YOUR STUDENTS' ACTIVITIES? (CLASSIC: N=49329; EXPANSION: N=9800)

	Definitely Not %		Probably Not %		Probably Yes %		Definitely Yes %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
Will ideas and skills learned help with technology integration?	0.9	0.3	2.5	1.6	28.1	27.1	68.5	71.0

Obstacles to technology integration

Participant teachers were asked about obstacles to the integration of technology into their teaching. Of the seven potential obstacles listed, both Classic and Expansion participants indicated that lack of technology access in their classroom was the most significant obstacle with 54.7% of Classic participants and 53.9% Expansion participants responding that this was either a “major” or “moderate” obstacle. While several of the obstacles elicited responses that were similar, some interesting variations did exist. For example, nearly 60% of Classic participants indicated that lack of administrative support was not an obstacle, while only 45.3% of Expansion participants reported this. In addition, 22.8% of Classic participants indicated that lack of flexible classroom time was not an obstacle, while 66.1% of Expansion respondents indicated this (see Table 4).

TABLE 4: HOW MUCH OF AN OBSTACLE TO THE INTEGRATION OF TECHNOLOGY INTO YOUR TEACHING IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING? (CLASSIC: N=49,329; EXPANSION: N=9,800)

	Not An Obstacle %		Small Obstacle %		Moderate Obstacle %		Major Obstacle %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
Lack of technology access in my school	31.3	38.2	24.8	25.2	30.1	27.9	13.9	8.7
Lack of technology access in my classroom	23.2	15.4	22.9	29.1	29.1	32.3	24.8	23.1
Lack of planning time	15.8	21.8	29.4	33.0	32.1	29.5	22.6	15.6
Lack of flexible classroom time	22.8	66.1	32.4	20.7	29.5	10.0	15.2	3.2
Lack of administrative support	59.8	45.3	23.5	30.5	12.3	17.4	5.3	6.9
Lack of technical support	39.8	50.1	31.8	33.4	19.5	13.2	8.9	3.3
Lack of instructional support	42.9	27.0	33.7	23.4	17.4	27.9	5.9	21.7

Feelings of preparedness and usefulness of training components

When asked how prepared participants felt to implement technology and related activities into their teaching after completing the training, slightly more Expansion participants indicated that they were “very well prepared” than did Classic participants. This difference persisted across five categories of preparedness. Slightly more Classic participants indicated that they were “moderately prepared” to engage in these activities than did Expansion participants across all categories (see Table 5). Similarly, when asked how useful a set of components was in helping teachers to integrate technology (Table 6), responses from Expansion participants were higher for almost all components in the category indicating the components were “very useful”. While Classic participants did indicate in large numbers that they also found the components to be “very useful”, their response percentages were lower than the Expansion participants. Both groups identified “discussing and thinking through the pedagogical topics” as the least useful component of the training, with 23.1% of Classic participants and 20.3% of Expansion participants indicating that this was either “not useful” or “somewhat useful”. Responses to this question for two components—creating student multimedia presentations and creating student publications—showed no statistically significant differences.

TABLE 5: HAVING COMPLETED YOUR TRAINING, HOW WELL PREPARED DO YOU FEEL TO DO THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES WITH YOUR STUDENTS? (CLASSIC: N=49,329; EXPANSION: N=9,800)

	Not at all prepared %		Somewhat prepared %		Moderately prepared %		Very well prepared %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
Implement methods of teaching that emphasize independent work by students	2.5	0.8	14.7	13.6	43.8	43.1	39.0	42.6
Intergrate educational technology into the grade or subject I teach	0.8	0.7	11.5	10.3	40.7	37.5	47.0	51.5
Support my students in using technology in their schoolwork	0.9	0.6	11.8	11.2	40.6	39.2	46.8	48.9
Evaluate technology-based work my students produce	0.9	0.8	10.2	9.9	39.1	37.6	49.7	51.7
Align my teaching and assessment with state learning standards	1.3	1.1	10.9	10.3	36.8	35.8	51.0	52.8

TABLE 6: HOW USEFUL WAS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING COMPONENTS OF THE TRAINING IN HELPING YOU LEARN HOW TO INTEGRATE TECHNOLOGY INTO YOUR TEACHING PRACTICES? (CLASSIC: N=49,329; EXPANSION: N=9,800)

	Not useful %		Somewhat useful %		Moderately useful %		Very useful %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
Understanding and applying Fair Use and copyright law	1.7	1.4	15.5	13.2	32.6	29.6	50.3	55.8
Creating, and exploring the uses of, Essential Questions and Unit Questions	2.7	1.9	17.2	13.4	38.9	35.9	41.2	48.8
Discussing and thinking through the pedagogical topics	3.2	2.5	19.9	17.8	41.5	41.1	35.4	38.6
Locating and evaluating resources for my unit	0.8	0.4	4.4	3.7	23.0	21.4	71.9	74.5
Creating teacher support materials	0.6	0.4	4.4	3.7	23.0	21.4	71.9	74.5
Craeting student web sites	1.7	2.8	8.3	10.1	25.9	24.8	64.1	62.3
Creating unit plan support materials	0.9	0.6	6.9	5.5	29.8	27.1	62.4	66.9
Peer-reviewing unit plans	2.7	2.2	14.1	12.3	37.8	36.1	45.4	49.4
Creating an implementation plan	2.5	1.9	12.3	10.8	36.6	34.4	48.6	52.8

Responses to Master Teachers

Participants were also asked to rate their workshop leader in four areas of leadership (see Table 7). Again a greater percentage of Expansion participants (between 85.6% and 73.5%) rated their workshop leaders as “very successful” in all areas than did the Classic participants (between 82.8% and 67.6%).

TABLE 7: THINK ABOUT THE TRAINER WHO LED YOUR WORKSHOP AND HIS OR HER LEADERSHIP OF THE TRAINING AS A WHOLE. RATE YOUR OPINION ABOUT YOUR TRAINER IN THE AREAS LISTED BELOW (CLASSIC: N=49,329; EXPANSION: N=9,800)

	Not at all %		Somewhat %		Adequately %		Very %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
How successful was he/she at exposing participants to the overall scope and sequence of the curriculum?	0.8	0.2	4.4	3.2	18.8	15.9	76.0	80.6
How successful was he/she at leading participants through the process of creating unit plans?	1.1	0.4	5.4	3.7	19.8	16.9	73.7	78.9
How successful was he/she at engaging the group in discussions of pedagogical and classroom management issues?	1.8	1.0	7.1	5.2	23.5	20.3	67.6	73.5
How well prepared was he/she for each day's activities, on average?	0.6	0.3	3.4	2.2	13.1	11.8	82.8	85.6

A greater percentage of Expansion participants also indicated that they found their workshop leaders’ interactions with individuals to be “very responsive” to teachers’ questions and needs than did Classic participants (see Table 8). In addition, 84.9% of Expansion participants reported that their trainer was “very effective” in facilitating the training experience (see Table 9), while 81.2% of Classic respondents indicated this.

TABLE 8: THINK ABOUT THE TRAINER WHO LED YOUR WORKSHOP AND HIS OR HER INTERACTIONS WITH INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS, INCLUDING YOURSELF. IN YOUR OPINION: (CLASSIC: N=49,329; EXPANSION: N=9,800)

	Not at all %		Somewhat %		Moderately %		Very well %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
How responsive was your trainer to teachers’ questions about how to use the technology?	0.4	0.2	3.1	2.0	10.8	8.6	85.6	89.2
How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers develop ideas for their unit plan?	0.9	0.5	4.6	3.6	18.9	16.4	75.6	79.6
How effective was your trainer at working teachers develop ideas for their unit plan?	0.8	0.4	4.4	2.8	13.9	12.2	80.9	84.6
How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers find resources to use in their unit plan?	0.8	0.4	4.2	3.0	17.4	14.8	77.6	81.8

TABLE 9: OVERALL, HOW EFFECTIVE WAS YOUR TRAINER IN FACILITATING YOUR EXPERIENCE OF THIS TRAINING? (CLASSIC: N=49,329; EXPANSION: N=9,800)

	Not at all %		Somewhat %		Adequately %		Very %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
Trainer as effective facilitator	0.6	0.3	3.5	2.3	14.8	12.5	81.2	84.9

When asked if they would recommend this training to a friend or a colleague, 78% of Expansion participants reported that they would “definitely” recommend this to a colleague or friend, and 19.7% indicated that they would “probably” recommend the training. Of Classic participants, 76.9% reported they would “definitely” recommend and 19.2% reported they would “probably” recommend this training to a colleague or friend (see Table 10).

TABLE 10: WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS TRAINING TO A FRIEND OR COLLEAGUE? (CLASSIC: N=49,308; EXPANSION: N=9,793)

	Definitely Not %		Probably Not %		Probably Yes %		Definitely Yes %	
	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.	Classic	Exp.
Would you recommend this training to a friend or colleague?	1.0	0.4	2.0	1.9	19.2	19.7	76.9	78.0

CONCLUSION

While program evaluators have access to limited data about who the Expansion participants are demographically, it is clear that those teachers participating in the Expansion training report equal, or often times higher, levels of satisfaction with the Intel Teach to the Future training experience as teachers participating in the Classic training. The data indicate that Expansion teachers found the trainings to be focused on the central components of the Intel Teach to the Future curriculum, such as the integration of technology into curriculum, using technology effectively, and collaborating with others, and that they plan to use the information learned in the training in their classrooms. Expansion participants also reported higher levels of preparedness to implement technology-related activities in their classrooms, higher levels of usefulness for components of the training, and higher levels of success for their trainer in conveying aspects of the training during workshops and to individuals with questions or needs than did their Classic counterparts. Interestingly, however, one area showed substantial differences between the two groups of teachers. When reporting on obstacles to the integration of technology, 14.5% more Classic participants reported that lack of administrative support was not an obstacle than did Expansion participants, and 15.9% more Classic participants than Expansion participants stated that lack of instructional support was not an obstacle. This suggests that Classic participants are anticipating fewer logistical challenges to their future use of technology in their classrooms. Differences between items that were described as major obstacles were less substantial, though still evident in many of the categories listed.

It is striking that even without incentives available and with a much more loosely coupled accountability structure in place to guide implementation, Expansion participants' responses to the program seem to be just as positive as that of Classic participants or, in some cases, even more positive. This finding is somewhat counterintuitive. While it is difficult to explain, given the lack of demographic information about the Expansion participants, some possible explanations are presented here.

First, the sample sizes of the two groups suggest one possible reason for the differences between participant responses. The Classic sample size is five times that of the Expansion sample. Generally, larger samples tend to produce less dramatic survey results. Highly negative and highly positive responses begin to balance each other out as the sample size increases, and large numbers of moderate responses will pull the overall results toward the middle. In addition, given the large discrepancy, the group of Expansion participants who completed the End of Training survey may be quite different from the Classic participants who completed the survey. If Expansion Master Teachers were less systematic than Classic Master Teachers about having all of their PTs complete the survey, then it may be reasonable to assume that those Expansion teachers who felt positively about the training would be more likely to complete the survey than those who did not.

Second, it is possible that the overall high levels of satisfaction regarding the training experience can be understood by examining the makeup of the Expansion Master Teacher group. As was

noted in our Classic and Expansion Master Teacher End of Training Survey Report, the data suggest that the Expansion group of Master Teachers includes far fewer classroom teachers than the Classic group, which is comprised almost entirely of classroom teachers. Those educators included in the Expansion Master Teacher group may be individuals with administrative or professional development responsibilities at either the school or district level, though this information is not provided in the survey data collected. If this is the case, these educators would have had previous training and experience with providing professional development to teachers on a regular basis, and this would offer an explanation for the Expansion participants' high level of satisfaction with their workshop leaders and with the presentation of workshop content.

Third, although the Expansion program does not provide direct incentives to participants, such as software and discounts on hardware, it is being offered at a time when many indirect incentives for participation in technology professional development are becoming part of the larger educational culture. As computer technology increasingly becomes integral to our society, more states and districts are demanding that teachers acquire technical skills in order to meet the instructional needs of students. Some states are now requiring that teachers illustrate technical competencies in order to maintain their accreditation. Even in those states that do not have specific accreditation requirements, teachers are facing increased accountability for meeting technology standards in their teaching. These conditions create strong incentives for teachers to seek out technology training, and for districts to provide that training. Therefore, it may not be accurate to conclude from these survey results that teachers do not need incentives to motivate them to take part in technology professional development, but that incentives can come from outside, as well as inside, the program.

In order to fully understand the results of these surveys and the comparisons between the results, more information needs to be gathered about both the Master and Participant teachers the Expansion program is reaching. However, this initial analysis reveals that the Expansion version of Intel Teach to the Future is maintaining the program's high standards for professional development by providing quality instruction and preparing teachers to take what they learn back to their classrooms.

APPENDIX A:**End of Training Survey Frequencies for Classic and Expansion Participant Teachers**

1) To what extent do the following statements describe the Intel Teach to the Future training in which you participated?

a) Focused on integration of technology into the curriculum

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at All	283	0.6	11	0.1
Small extent	774	1.6	46	0.5
Moderate extent	5751	11.7	834	8.5
Great Extent	42521	86.2	8909	90.9
Total	49329	100	9800	100

b) Provided useful new ideas for teaching strategies to apply with your students

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at All	188	0.4	20	0.2
Small extent	1328	2.7	190	1.9
Moderate extent	9966	20.2	1714	17.5
Great Extent	37847	76.7	7876	80.4
Total	49329	100	9800	100

c) Illustrated effective uses of technology with students

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at All	162	0.3	16	0.2
Small extent	989	2.0	132	1.3
Moderate extent	8838	17.9	1494	15.2
Great Extent	39340	79.8	8158	83.2
Total	49329	100	9800	100

d) Provided opportunities to collaborate with other teachers during training?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at All	193	0.4	23	0.2
Small extent	1580	3.2	185	1.9
Moderate extent	9296	18.8	1440	14.7
Great Extent	38260	77.6	8152	83.2
Total	49329	100	9800	100

2) Will the ideas and skills you learned from the Intel Teach to the Future training help you successfully integrate technology into your students' activities?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Definitely not	445	0.9	34	0.3
Probably not	1241	2.5	154	1.6
Probably yes	13861	28.1	2653	27.1
Definitely yes	1384	81.7	1918	78.8
Total	49329	100	9800	100

3) How much of an obstacle to the integration of technology into your teaching is each of the following?

a) Lack of technology access in my school

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not an obstacle	15429	31.3	3740	38.2
Small obstacle	12228	24.8	2474	25.2
Moderate obstacle	14837	30.1	2734	27.9
Major obstacle	6835	13.9	852	8.7
Total	49329	100	9800	100

b) Lack of technology access in my classroom

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not an obstacle	11457	23.2	1514	15.4
Small obstacle	11295	22.9	2856	29.1
Moderate obstacle	14340	29.1	3168	32.3
Major obstacle	12237	24.8	2262	23.1
Total	49329	100	9800	100

c) Lack of planning time

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not an obstacle	7817	15.8	2141	21.8
Small obstacle	14489	29.4	3235	33.0
Moderate obstacle	15857	32.1	2895	29.5
Major obstacle	11166	22.6	1529	15.6
Total	49329	100	9800	100

d) Lack of flexible classroom time

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not an obstacle	11263	22.8	6475	66.1
Small obstacle	15990	32.4	2031	20.7
Moderate obstacle	14571	29.5	978	10.0
Major obstacle	7505	15.2	316	3.2
Total	49329	100	9800	100

e) Lack of administrative support

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not an obstacle	29065	58.9	4437	45.3
Small obstacle	11579	23.5	2987	30.5
Moderate obstacle	6077	12.3	1704	17.4
Major obstacle	2608	5.3	672	6.9
Total	49329	100	9800	100

f) Lack of technical support

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not an obstacle	19639	39.8	4905	50.1
Small obstacle	15662	31.8	3272	33.4
Moderate obstacle	9638	19.5	1297	13.2
Major obstacle	4390	8.9	326	3.3
Total	49329	100	9800	100

g) Lack of instructional support

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not an obstacle	21182	42.9	2650	27.0
Small obstacle	16632	33.7	2292	23.4
Moderate obstacle	8603	17.4	2735	27.9
Major obstacle	2912	5.9	2123	21.7
Total	49329	100	9800	100

4) Having completed your training, how well prepared do you feel to do the following activities with your students?

a) Implement methods of teaching that emphasize independent work by students.

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all prepared	1223	2.5	74	0.8
Somewhat	7276	14.7	1331	13.6
Moderately well	21585	43.8	4224	43.1
Very well	19245	39.0	4171	42.6
Total	49329	100	9800	100

b) Integrate educational technology into the grade or subject that I teach.

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all prepared	378	0.8	65	0.7
Somewhat	5680	11.5	1014	10.3
Moderately well	20076	40.7	3677	37.5
Very well	23195	47.0	5044	51.5
Total	49329	100	9800	100

c) Support my students in using technology in their schoolwork.

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all prepared	1223	2.5	74	0.8
Somewhat	7276	14.7	1331	13.6
Moderately well	21585	43.8	4224	43.1
Very well	19245	39.0	4171	42.6
Total	49329	100	9800	100

d) Evaluate technology-based work my students produce.

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all prepared	468	0.9	75	0.8
Somewhat	5040	10.2	966	9.9
Moderately well	19302	39.1	3689	37.6
Very well	24519	49.7	5070	51.7
Total	49329	100	9800	100

e) Align my teaching and assessment with state learning standards.

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all prepared	634	1.3	110	1.1
Somewhat	5382	10.9	1008	10.3
Moderately well	18176	36.8	3505	35.8
Very well	25137	51.0	5177	52.8
Total	49329	100	9800	100

5) How useful was each of the following components of the training in helping you learn how to integrate technology into your teaching practices?

a) Understanding and applying Fair Use and copyright law

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	828	1.7	139	1.4
Somewhat useful	7630	15.5	1294	13.2
Moderately useful	16059	32.6	2898	29.6
Very useful	24812	50.3	5469	55.8
Total	49329	100	9800	100

b) Creating, and exploring the uses of, Essential Questions and Unit Questions

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	1322	2.7	187	1.9
Somewhat useful	8495	17.2	1313	13.4
Moderately useful	19195	38.9	3516	35.9
Very useful	20317	41.2	4784	48.8
Total	49329	100	9800	100

c) Discussing and thinking through the pedagogical topics

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	1569	3.2	246	2.5
Somewhat useful	9807	19.9	1740	17.8
Moderately useful	20491	41.5	4031	41.1
Very useful	17460	35.4	3783	38.6
Total	49327	100	9800	100

d) Locating and evaluating resources for my unit

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	370	0.8	41	0.4
Somewhat useful	3282	6.7	502	5.1
Moderately useful	14728	29.9	2547	26.0
Very useful	30947	62.7	6710	68.5
Total	49327	100	9800	100

f) Creating student multimedia presentations

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	299	0.6	61	0.6
Somewhat useful	1821	3.7	392	4.0
Moderately useful	9600	19.5	1867	19.1
Very useful	37607	76.2	7480	76.3
Total	49327	100	9800	100

g) Creating student publications

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	339	0.7	70	0.7
Somewhat useful	2047	4.1	428	4.4
Moderately useful	10022	20.3	2944	20.9
Very useful	3619	74.8	7258	74.1
Total	49327	100	9800	100

h) Creating teacher support materials

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	319	0.6	36	0.4
Somewhat useful	2185	4.4	361	3.7
Moderately useful	11335	23.0	2101	21.4
Very useful	35488	71.9	7302	74.5
Total	49327	100	9800	100

i) Creating student web sites

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	835	1.7	271	2.8
Somewhat useful	4090	8.3	992	10.1
Moderately useful	12771	25.9	2428	24.8
Very useful	31631	64.1	6109	62.3
Total	49327	100	9800	100

j) Creating unit plan support materials

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	455	0.9	56	0.6
Somewhat useful	3428	6.9	537	5.5
Moderately useful	14688	29.8	2655	27.1
Very useful	30756	62.4	6552	66.9
Total	49329	100	9800	100

k) Peer-reviewing unit plans

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	1333	2.7	220	2.2
Somewhat useful	6965	14.1	1203	12.3
Moderately useful	18629	37.8	3534	36.1
Very useful	22400	45.4	4843	49.4
Total	49327	100	9800	100

l) Creating an implementation plan

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not useful	1227	2.5	190	1.9
Somewhat useful	6079	12.3	1063	10.8
Moderately useful	18059	36.6	3375	34.4
Very useful	23692	48.6	5172	52.8
Total	49327	100	9800	100

6) Think about the trainer who led your workshop and his or her leadership of the training as a whole. In your opinion:

a) How successful was he/she at exposing participants to the overall scope and sequence of the curriculum?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	400	0.8	24	0.2
Somewhat	2173	4.4	314	3.2
Adequately	9276	18.8	1560	15.9
Very	37478	76.0	7902	80.6
Total	49327	100	9800	100

b) How successful was he/she at leading participants through the process of creating unit plans?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	518	1.1	41	0.4
Somewhat	2655	5.4	367	3.7
Adequately	9790	19.8	1656	16.9
Very	36364	73.7	7736	78.9
Total	49327	100	9800	100

c) How successful was he/she at engaging the group in discussions of pedagogical and classroom management issues?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	879	1.8	95	1.0
Somewhat	3493	7.1	510	5.2
Adequately	11607	23.5	1992	20.3
Very	33348	67.6	7203	73.5
Total	49327	100	9800	100

d) How well prepared was he/she for each day's activities, on average?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	310	0.6	32	0.3
Somewhat	1678	3.4	219	2.2
Adequately	6481	13.1	1156	11.8
Very	40858	82.8	8393	85.6
Total	49327	100	9800	100

7) Think about the trainer who led your workshop and his or her interactions with individual teachers, including yourself. In your opinion:

a) How responsive was your trainer to teachers' questions about how to use the technology?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	207	0.4	17	0.2
Somewhat	1540	3.1	193	2.0
Adequately	5345	10.8	846	8.6
Very	42235	85.6	8744	89.2
Total	49327	100	9800	100

b) How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers develop ideas for their unit plan?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	422	0.9	46	0.5
Somewhat	2282	4.6	352	3.6
Adequately	9328	18.9	1603	16.4
Very	37294	75.6	7799	79.6
Total	49326	100	9800	100

c) How effective was your trainer at working with teachers who were having trouble with portions of the curriculum?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	392	0.8	43	0.4
Somewhat	2154	4.4	274	2.8
Adequately	6854	13.9	1193	12.2
Very	39925	80.9	8289	84.6
Total	49329	100	9800	100

d) How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers find resources to use in their unit plan?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	373	0.8	40	0.4
Somewhat	2082	4.2	292	3.0
Adequately	8571	17.4	1451	14.8
Very	38299	77.6	8016	81.6
Total	49325	100	9799	100

8) Overall, how effective was your trainer in facilitating your experience of this training?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	292	0.6	26	0.3
Somewhat	1724	3.5	225	2.3
Adequately	7278	14.8	1228	12.5
Very	40031	81.2	8320	84.9
Total	49325	100	9799	100

9) Would you recommend this training to a friend or a colleague?

RESPONSES	CLASSIC		EXPANSION	
	N	%	N	%
Definitely not	478	1.0	36	0.4
Probably not	1432	2.9	190	1.9
Probably yes	9459	19.2	1927	19.7
Definitely yes	37939	76.9	7640	78.0
Total	49327	100	9800	100

10) If you have any comments about the training, please use the space below to explain.