C C T   R E P O R T S

MARCH 2004

INTEL TEACH TO THE FUTURE®
U.S. CLASSIC PROGRAM
CUMULATIVE MASTER TEACHER
END-OF-TRAINING
SURVEY DATA
SUMMARY REPORT

PREPARED BY

NAOMI HUPERT
WENDY MARTIN
TOMOE KANAYA

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes responses of Master Teachers to questions from a program application form and a survey administered at the conclusion of every Intel Teach to the Future Master Teacher training in the United States between March 2001 to July 2002. The data reported here demonstrate that Master Teachers' responses to this training have been highly positive throughout the life of the program. Findings reported here include the following:

- Master Teachers give high ratings to the curriculum and to the trainers who provided this professional development experience.

- Master Teachers report that the program focuses heavily on topics that are the core intended themes of the training.

- Master Teachers say the training has prepared them to integrate technology into their teaching.

- Master Teachers would recommend the training to a friend or colleague.

The data summarized here are referred to in other reports discussing findings from the evaluation of Intel Teach to the Future. Education Development Center's Center for Children and Technology (CCT) has been conducting an independent evaluation of the U.S. implementation of Intel Teach to the Future since March 2000. CCT will continue to collect and report on End of Training data throughout 2004, along with continuing other evaluation activities.

Methods

Subjects

All teachers who completed the Intel Teach to the Future Master Teacher training were expected to complete this survey. Participant Teachers from this program completed a slightly different version of this survey at the conclusion of their training, and those results are presented in a separate report. Variations between Master Teacher and Participant Teacher responses are noted in this report.

The total number of valid responses to this survey was 1,702. Paired t-tests were used to calculate change in Master Teachers' responses to some questions included both in the application to the program (prior to training) and in the survey administered at the conclusion of the training.

Instruments

The survey is presented in Appendix A. The survey was developed by CCT in consultation with the ICT and Intel staff involved in developing the curriculum. Minor revisions were made to the survey in Spring 2001.

Procedures

This survey was administered via the World Wide Web. Specifically, the survey was mounted within an extranet maintained by Intel for Intel Teach to the Future participants. Teachers were asked to complete the survey at the conclusion of their training. The data reported here were collected between March 2001 and July 2002, with 82% of submissions being made between May and August 2001. The largest number of submissions in a single month (June 2001) was 640.

Findings

Participant demographics

Survey respondents were generally representative of the U.S. teaching population. Almost 10% more Master Teachers were male (28.8%) compared to the percentage for Participant Teachers (20%). When asked to identify themselves by racial/ethnic group, 83.9% reported White/Caucasian, 7.6% reported Other, 6.7% reported Black or African American, 1% reported Asian, 0.6% reported American Indian or Alaskan Native, and 0.1% reported Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Additionally, 11.5% reported themselves to be Hispanic or Latino (a category that the U.S. Census recognizes as also belonging to either the White/Caucasian or Black/African American category). In both the Master Teacher and Participant Teacher Application data, the number of respondents who identify themselves as Hispanic is higher than the percentage who identify themselves as such in the national K-12 teaching population. There are likely two reasons for this. The first is that the Intel Teach to the Future application form follows the practice of the U.S. Census, with one question asking respondents to identify their race, and a second question asking whether they were Hispanic or not. This is why the total percentage for Race/Ethnicity is greater than 100%. In other surveys, including the U.S. Department of Education Schools and Staffing survey of 2000 (from which the national data reported here is drawn) respondents are asked to report their "Race/Ethnicity," and are given options for response including White, Hispanic or African American. Another probable reason that the percentage of Hispanic Master and Participant Teachers is higher than the percentage in the general U.S. K-12 teaching population is that many of the RTAs participating in Intel Teach to the Future are in states with large Hispanic populations, such as Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona and Florida. See Table 1 for a comparison of demographic figures with national data.

TABLE 1: SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS (N=1,702) AND OF NATIONAL TEACHING POPULATION.

		Intel Teach to the Future Master Teachers	National Teaching Population*
Sex	Female	71.2%	74.8%
	Male	28.8%	25.2%
Race/Ethnicity	White	83.9%	84.3%
	Hispanic**	11.5%	5.6%
	Other	7.6%	-
	Black or African American	6.7%	7.7%
	Asian	1.0%	1.6%
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.6%	0.9%
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.1%	1.6%

* NCES, (2000). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Schools and Staffing Survey "Public Teacher Questionnaire." 1999-2000.
** The Intel Teach to the Future Application form asked teachers to indicate their race in one question, and then indicate if they were Hispanic or not Hispanic in a separate question. This is why the total percentage for Race/Ethnicity is greater than 100%.

Subject and grade levels taught

Master Teachers were asked to report which subjects and grade levels they taught. (See Table 2 for a summary of subject areas these teachers reported specializing in. Totals sum to more than 100% because teachers sometimes marked more than one response.) The most common response to the question about subject taught was "Self-contained" (39.3%), which includes elementary grade teachers working with a single group of students all day. English was the next most common subject taught (29.2%). Science, Math, working with special populations (special education, ESL or gifted), Social Studies/History, and Computer Science and were each reported by between 20% and 30% of respondents. Interestingly, about 10% more Master Teachers report teaching Science and Math than Participant Teachers, and 15% more report teaching computer science. All of the Subject Taught categories have higher percentages of Master Teachers reporting that they teach these than Participant Teachers, suggesting that those educators who become Master Teachers may be more likely to have taught many subjects in their careers than Participant Teachers.

There was also a wide range in teachers' reports of the grade levels they teach (see Table 3). 14.5% report teaching lower elementary grades (K-3), 13.7% report teaching middle elementary grades (4-5), and 7.4% report teaching across grades K-5. This leads to a total of 35.6% of respondents teaching in the elementary grades of K through 5. More than a quarter of respondents (28.4%) report teaching grades 9-12 while 23% report teaching middle school grades (6-8) and the remaining 13% of respondents teach some other combination of grades, such as 6 through 12, or 4 through 8. Five percent more Master Teachers report teaching at the high school level than Participant Teachers, and 12% more Participant Teachers report teaching lower elementary grade levels than Master Teachers.

TABLE 2: SUBJECT TAUGHT* (N=1702)

Subject	%
Self- Contained	39.3
English	29.2
Science	27.4
Math	25.9
Special Population	21.1
Social Studies/History	21.0
Computer Science	20.0
Nonacademic	17.2
Other Humanities	11.0

*Overlaps exist in teacher responses, e.g., if teacher listed science and math as subjects taught, the teacher's responses are counted for both science and math.

TABLE 3: GRADE LEVELS TAUGHT* (N=1,702)

Grade level taught	%
Lower Elementary (K-3)	14.5
Middle Elementary (4-5)	13.7
Middle/Junior High (6-8)	23.0
High (9-12)	28.4
K-5	7.4
K-8	3.9
K-12	1.8
4-8	1.9
4-12	.5
6-12	4.1
K-3, 6-12	.1
4-5, 9-12	.1
K-5, 9-12	.1
K-3, 9-12	.1
K-3, 6-8	.4
Total	100.0

*Overlaps exist in teacher responses, e.g if teacher listed both Lower and Middle elementary as grades taught, teachers' responses are counted for both.

RTAs represented

Survey respondents represent fifteen RTAs. The largest response group is from the University of North Texas (13.9%), Texas A&M has the second most respondents (12.2%). This means a total of 26.1%, or more than a quarter, of respondents coming from Texas. The next best-represented RTA is WGBH, with 10.2% of respondents. See Table 4 for a complete report of RTAs represented in this survey.

TABLE 4: RTAS REPRESENTED (N=1,702)

Regional Training Agency	%
University of North Texas	13.9
Texas A&M	12.2
WGBH Educational Foundation (Mass.)	10.2
Miami Museum of Science (Fla.)	9.0
Potomac (D.C.)	7.6
New Mexico	6.8
HEAT (Colo.)	6.1
Utah Education Network	6.1
Asset (Ariz.)	6.0
The Learning Space (Wash.)	5.6
Accelerated Schools Program (national)	5.2
Southern Calif.	5.0
ICT (Northern Calif.)	4.3
NWRESD (Ore.)	2.1

Response to the training

Master Teachers consistently recognized Intel Teach to the Future as offering experiences that prepare them to be effective educational technology users. The large majority of teachers indicated that the training they received addressed the following topics to "a great extent:" technology integration, teaching strategies to use with students, effective uses of technology with students, and collaboration with other teachers. None of these items received a rating of "addressed this topic to a small extent" or "not at all" from more than 1.5% of respondents (see Table 5).

TABLE 5. MASTER TEACHER PARTICIPANT DESCRIPTION OF TRAINING EXPERIENCE. (N=1,702)

	Not at all %	Small extent %	Moderate extent %	Great extent %
The training focused on integration of technology into the curriculum.	0.5	0.6	7.4	91.5
The training provided useful new ideas for teaching strategies to apply with your students.	0.1	1.0	16.0	82.9
The training illustrated effective uses of technology with students.	0.1	0.2	11.3	88.4
The training provided opportunities to collaborate with other teachers during training.	0.1	1.4	13.0	85.5

Master Teachers also indicated that this training would help them to integrate technology successfully into their students' activities. A majority of respondents (98.4%) said that this was "probably" (6.7%) or "definitely" (91.7%) true for them. Only 0.6% responded that this was "probably not" true, and 1% of respondents said this was "definitely not" true.

Obstacles

Master Teachers reported that a range of issues are not very significant obstacles to the integration of technology into their classrooms. For example, 79.2% of respondents said that "lack of administrative support" was "not an obstacle" to technology integration or was only a "minor obstacle." Similarly, 71% reported that "lack of instructional support" was either "not an obstacle" or only a "minor obstacle." However, lack of planning time was identified by 57.4% of respondents as either a "moderate" or "major obstacle", and lack of access to technology in the classroom was identified by 46.9% respondents as either a "major" or "moderate obstacle" to integrating technology into teaching (see Table 6).

TABLE 6: HOW MUCH OF AN OBSTACLE TO THE INTEGRATION OF TECHNOLOGY INTO YOUR TEACHING IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING? (N=1,702)

	Not an obstacle %	Minor obstacle %	Moderate obstacle %	Major obstacle %
Lack of technology access in my classroom.	30.5	22.6	24.6	22.3
Lack of planning time.	15.1	27.5	35.7	21.7
Lack of flexible classroom time.	25.7	35.1	26.2	12.9
Lack of technology access in my school.	35.5	26.7	25.6	12.3
Lack of technical support.	32.0	35.7	22.7	9.6
Lack of instructional support.	36.0	35.0	20.9	8.1
Lack of administrative support.	48.9	30.3	16.0	4.8

Teachers' feelings of preparedness

In 1999, the U.S. Department of Education administered the Fast Response Survey System[1], a national survey collecting data on a range of issues related to teachers and their work lives. In that survey teachers were asked to report on how well prepared they felt to integrate technology into their teaching. Only 20% of teachers reported in that survey that they felt "adequately" or "well" prepared to do this.

We included a similar question in this survey in order to track whether Master Teachers felt significantly more prepared after the training to integrate technology into their own teaching than they felt before the training, as well as to track the growth in their preparedness on several other issues.

Paired t-tests were used to calculate change in Master Teachers' ratings on this question, which were collected both in their application to the program (prior to training) and at the conclusion of the training experience. We found that teachers report a growth in their feelings of preparedness toward integrating educational technology into the grade they teach; toward supporting their students in using technology; and toward evaluating their students' technology-based work. While this growth was modest, teachers did show a statistically significant change in their reporting of preparedness to do certain activities involving technology. See Table 7 for complete data on Master Teacher preparedness to use technology in a classroom setting.

TABLE 7. HOW WELL PREPARED DO YOU FEEL TO DO THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES WITH YOUR STUDENTS?
(Change in mean response [M] from pre to post-test with standard deviation [SD])

Integrate educational technology into the grade or subject I teach. (N=1,692)	Mpost pre = .21	SD= .77
Support my students in using technology in their schoolwork (N=1,693)	Mpost pre = .19	SD= .75
Align my teaching with state and national learning standards: (N=1,527)	Mpost pre = .08	SD= .81
Evaluate technology-based work my students produce (N=1,691)	Mpost pre = .30	SD= .84

Table 8 shows Master Teacher responses to questions about their preparedness to engage in technology integration activities before and after participating in the Master Teacher training experience. Across 4 of the 5 categories, these teachers showed positive gains in their perceptions of preparedness to implement technology-inclusive activities in classrooms. In one category, implementing methods of teaching that emphasize independent work by students, Master Teachers showed almost no change. Overall, the change in Master Teachers' feelings of preparedness before and after the training was lower than the change in Participant Teachers' feelings of preparedness. This is most likely because Master Teachers reported feeling more prepared on all of these items than Participant Teachers before they took part in the training.

---

[1] National Center for Educational Statistics. (2000a). Teachers' tools for the 21st century: A report on teachers' use of technology [Online]. Washington, DC: Author. Available at: http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2000102

TABLE 8: HOW PREPARED DO YOU FEEL TO DO THE FOLLOWING? (N=1702)

		Not at all prepared %	Somewhat prepared %	Moderately prepared %	Very prepared %
Evaluate technology-based work my students produce.	Before training	1.4	10.3	30.3	58.0
	After training	0.1	1.7	21.9	76.3
Integrate educational technology into the grade or subject that I teach.	Before training	0.7	6.3	27.2	65.7
	After training	0.1	1.1	18.5	80.3
Support my students in using technolog in their schoolwork.	Before training	1.2	4.7	23.4	70.6
	After training	0.1	1.1	15.5	83.4
Align my teaching and assessment with state learning standards.	Before training	0.7	4.1	29.4	65.8
	After training	0.2	3.6	24.2	72.0
Implement methods of teaching that emphasize independent work by students.	Before training	0.6	3.8	28.9	66.6
	After training	1.5	4.5	28.3	65.7

Usefulness of training components

Between 89% and 97% of Master Teachers rated each element of the training to be either "moderately" or "very useful". Activities focused on creating student samples or support materials, such as creating student publications, were generally rated as the "most useful" (see Table 9).

TABLE 9: HOW USEFUL WAS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING COMPONENTS OF THE TRAINING IN HELPING YOU LEARN HOW TO INTEGRATE TECHNOLOGY INTO YOUR TEACHING PRACTICES? (N=1,702)

	Not at all useful %	Somewhat useful %	Moderately useful %	Very useful %
Understanding and applying Fair Use and copyright law.	0.5	6.6	25.0	67.9
Creating, and exploring the uses of, Essential Questions and Unit Questions.	0.6	7.8	32.5	59.1
Discussing and thinking through the pedagogical topics.	0.9	7.6	36.1	55.4
Locating and evaluating resources for my unit.	0.4	4.5	26.4	68.7
Creating student multimedia presentations.	0.1	2.9	16.5	80.4
Creating student publications.	0.2	2.5	15.6	81.6
Creating teacher support materials.	0.2	2.8	16.9	80.2
Creating student web sites	0.6	2.9	18.1	78.4
Creating unit plan support materials.	0.3	2.5	20.8	76.4
Peer-reviewing unit plans.	0.6	6.2	29.9	63.3
Creating an implementation plan.	1.8	9.2	32.9	56.1

Response to trainers

Master Teachers consistently gave their trainers very high ratings on all dimensions. The survey asked for responses to the trainers' leadership of the training overall, and also about trainers' ability to work effectively with individual teachers. Ratings were high for all items relating to overall leadership. Participants gave particularly high ratings (91.9%) to trainers for their overall preparedness for each day's activities, and also indicated that the trainers were very successful at encouraging discussions of pedagogy and classroom management issues (see Table 10).

In response to a question asking for an overall rating of the trainer, 83.6% of respondents said that their trainer was "very" effective, and 13.5% rated their trainer "adequately" effective. Only 2.6% rated their trainer "somewhat" effective, and less than 1% (0.2%) reported their trainer was "not at all" effective.

TABLE 10: RESPONSE TO THE TRAINERS' LEADERSHIP OF THE TRAINING AS A WHOLE. (N=1,702)

	Not at all %	Somewhat %	Adequately %	Very %
How well prepared was he/she for each day's activities, on average?	0.2	0.8	7.1	91.9
How successful was he/she at exposing participants to the overall scope and sequence of the curriculum?	0.4	3.3	14.7	81.7
How successful was he/she at leading participants through the process of creating unit plans?	0.1	2.8	17.8	79.4
How successful was he/she at engaging the group in discussions of pedagogical and classroom management issues?	0.3	1.7	11.3	86.7

Program participants were also asked to rate trainer's interactions with individuals. In all categories over 75% of participants rated their trainers as "very" responsive to teachers' needs or questions, and between 11% and 21% rated their trainers' interactions as "adequately" responsive (see Table 11).

TABLE 11: RESPONSE TO THE TRAINERS' INTERACTIONS WITH INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS. (N=1,702)

	Not at all %	Somewhat %	Adequately %	Very %
How responsive was your trainer to teachers' questions about how to use the technology?	0.0	2.1	11.7	86.2
How effective was your trainer at working with teachers who were having trouble with portions of the curriculum?	0.4	3.3	15.9	80.5
How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers find resources to use in their unit plan?	0.4	3.5	19.4	76.7
How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers develop ideas for their unit plan?	0.3	3.2	20.8	75.7

Master Teacher preparation as trainers

Another way to assess the quality of the training was to ask Master Teachers whether they left the training feeling confident in their ability to conduct Intel Teach to the Future workshops on their own. When asked how prepared they felt to present the Intel Teach to the Future workshop to other teachers in their schools or districts, Master teachers generally stated that they were "adequately" prepared (53%) or "very" prepared (38.1%) and very few teachers indicated that they were "unprepared" (0.5%). This information is represented in Table 12.

TABLE 12: HOW WELL PREPARED DO YOU FEEL TO PRESENT THIS WORKSHOP TO THE TEACHERS IN YOUR LEA? (N=1702)

	Unprepared %	Somewhat %	Adequately %	Very %
Level of reported preparedness to present workshop to others.	0.5	8.5	53.0	38.1

Master Teachers were also asked about which aspects of the Master Teacher training were must helpful in preparing them to lead training sessions for other teachers. The majority (73.8% or more) found each of six aspects of their training to be "very" helpful in preparing them to lead their own trainings, with reviewing of Master Teacher Resources on CD-ROM being the most highly rated (86%) item (see Table 13).

TABLE 13: WHAT ASPECTS OF THE TRAINING WERE THE MOST HELPFUL IN PREPARING YOU TO LEAD THIS TRAINING YOURSELF? (N=1,702)

	Not helpful %	Somewhat %	Very %
Observing my senior trainer's own techniques for guiding us through the training.	2.3	23.9	73.8
Tips on leading the training provided by my senior trainer.	1.5	18.6	80.0
The notes on leading the training included in each module.	0.7	19.3	80.0
Reviewing Master Teacher resources in the curriculum binder and CD-ROM.	0.4	13.6	86.0
Talking with other Master Teachers about the curriculum.	1.8	23.2	75.0
The process of creating a unit portfolio myself.	5.6	12.2	82.2

The survey also asked Master Teachers whether they already act as trainers or professional developers. Most indicated that training others was not a key responsibility for them. A majority of Master Teachers (73.8%) reported that they spend a quarter of their work time or less providing in-service training to other teachers (see Table 14). This finding suggests that the large majority of Master Teachers are also full time classroom teachers working in K to 12th grade classrooms and covering a broad range of content areas.

TABLE 14: ABOUT HOW MUCH OF YOUR WORK TIME DO YOU SPEND LEADING IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR YOUR COLLEAGUES IN YOUR CURRENT PROFESSIONAL LIFE? (N=1,702)

	0-5%	6-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Amount of work time spend leading in-service trainings.	35.6	38.2	9.5	14.2	2.5

Recommending the training to others

Master Teachers were asked whether they would recommend Intel Teach to the Future Master Teacher training to a friend of colleague. Of those who responded 81.7% reported they would "definitely" do so, and 15.9% reported they would "probably" do so. Only 1.7% reported they "probably would not" recommend the training, and 0.8% definitely would not recommend it.

CONCLUSION

Findings from the analysis of responses to the End of Training survey and application data for Master Teachers indicate that these teachers and their reactions to the program are generally similar to those of Participant Teachers, although there are some notable differences. Demographically, there were more male Master Teachers than Participant Teachers, although the large majority of Master Teachers was still female. In terms of sex and race/ethnicity, the Master Teacher respondents were very representative of K-12 teachers in the U.S., although there were more respondents who identified themselves as Hispanic than in the general teaching population.

Regarding their reactions to Intel Teach to the Future, Master Teachers' responses to both the content of the course and their training experience were very positive, even more so than the responses of Participant Teachers. This may be attributed in part to Master Teachers being more invested in the program, but also to the greater natural variation in responses among the much larger pool of Participant Teachers, and the larger variation of the trainings they experienced. Master Teachers reported their satisfaction with the content and presentation of the training material, and demonstrated a shift in their perceptions of their preparedness to integrate technology into their classroom activities. However, there were smaller changes from before the training to the end of the training in Master Teachers' feelings of preparedness to integrate technology into their teaching than there were in the Participant Teacher responses. This primarily reflects the fact that prior to the training (in their program applications) Master Teachers reported themselves to be more prepared, on average, than Participant Teachers to do each of the tasks described in the survey question. This higher level of preparedness is consistent with the overall character of the Master Teacher cohort as, on average, a group of teachers with an unusually strong background in using technology in their teaching.

Master Teachers also reported feeling prepared to present the Intel Teach to the Future training to others. This finding is corroborated by a large majority of Participant Teacher respondents who indicated in their End-of-Training survey that the training provided by Master Teachers was "very" effective, with responses particularly strong in areas such as the Master Teachers' preparedness for each day's activities, responsiveness to teacher questions about technology and in working with individuals who encountered trouble with some portion of the curriculum. These findings point to the effective support and preparation offered to Master Teachers, who in turn have been able to engage and support teachers in developing the necessary skills to use technology with their students and to integrate technology into their classroom practice.

APPENDIX A

Master Teacher Training Evaluation
Intel Teach to the Future

1) To what extent do the following statements describe the Intel Teach to the Future training in which you participated?
For each item below, select the choice that best represents your experience.

The training:	Not at all 1	Small extent 2	Moderate extent 3	Great extent 4
a) Focused on integration of technology into the curriculum				
b) Provided useful new ideas for teaching strategies to apply with your students				
c) Illustrated effective uses of technology with students				
d) Provided opportunities to collaborate with other teachers during training				

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?
Please check one.

Definitely not

Probably not

Probably yes

Definitely yes

3) In the past year, how often have you done the following **in your own classroom?**
For each item below, select the choice that best represents how frequently you do each of the following.

	Never 1	Rarely 2	Sometimes 3	Often 4	Very Often 5
a) Used a textbook as your primary guide through units.					
b) Used other project-based or teacher-developed curricula.					
c) Had many activities going on in the room at the same time.					
d) Had students individually answer textbook or worksheet questions.					
e) Had students review and revise their own work.					
f) Had students peer-review each other's work.					
g) Had students engage in independent/group research activities.					

4) During a typical two week period of teaching a class, in how many of the class meeting times did your students use computers to do each of the following:

If you teach multiple classes, think of the class in which you use computers most often.

If you are taking this training over the summer, think of your teaching experience last year.

	# of times
a) Learn about subject matter.	
b) Practice and master skills.	
c) Solve problems.	
d) Work collaboratively with other students in the same classroom.	
e) Produce multimedia products, Web pages, or video reports/projects.	
f) Do word processing.	
g) Correspond with experts, authors, or students from other schools via email or the Internet.	

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

For each item below, select the choice that best represents your experience.

	Not an obstacle 1	Small obstacle 2	Moderate obstacle 3	Major obstacle 4
a) Lack of technology access in my school				
b) Lack of technology access in my classroom				
c) Lack of planning time				
d) Lack of flexible classroom time				
e) Lack of administrative support				
f) Lack of technical support				
g) Lack of instructional support				

6) Having completed your training, how well prepared do you feel to do the following activities with your students?
For each item below, select the choice that best represents your experience.

	Not at all prepared 1	Somewhat prepared 2	Moderately well prepared 3	Very well prepared 4
a) Implement methods of teaching that emphasize independent work by students				
b) Integrate educational technology into the grade or subject I teach				
c) Support my students in using technology in their schoolwork				
d) Evaluate technology-based work my students produce				
e) Align my teaching and assessment with state learning standards				

7) How useful was each of the following components of the training in helping you learn how to integrate technology into your teaching practices?
For each item below, select the choice that best represents your experience.

	Not useful 1	Somewhat useful 2	Moderately useful 3	Very useful 4
a) Understanding and applying Fair Use and copyright law				
b) Creating, and exploring the uses of, Essential Questions and Unit Questions				
c) Discussing and thinking through the pedagogical topics				
d) Locating and evaluating resources for my unit				
e) Creating student multimedia presentations				
f) Creating student publications				
g) Creating teacher support materials				
h) Creating student web sites				
i) Creating unit plan support materials				
j) Peer-reviewing unit plans				
k) Creating an implementation plan				

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

For each item below, select the choice that best represents your experience.

	Not at all 1	Somewhat 2	Adequately 3	Very 4
a) How successful was he/she at exposing participants to the overall scope and sequence of the curriculum?				
b) How successful was he/she at leading participants through the process of creating unit plans?				
c) How successful was he/she at engaging the group in discussions of pedagogical and classroom management issues?				
d) How well prepared was he/she for each day's activities, on average?				

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

For each item below, select the choice that best represents your experience.

	Not at all 1	Somewhat 2	Adequately 3	Very 4
a) How responsive was your trainer to teachers' questions about how to use the technology?				
b) How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers develop ideas for their unit plan?				
c) How effective was your trainer at working with teachers who were having trouble with portions of the curriculum?				
d) How skilled was your trainer at helping teachers find resources to use in their unit plan?				

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

Please check one.

Not at all

Somewhat

Adequately

Very

Please answer the following five questions with reference to your upcoming role as a Master Teacher for the Intel Teach to the Future program.

11) How well prepared do you feel to present this workshop to the teachers in your LEA?
Please check one.

Unprepared
Somewhat unprepared
Adequately prepared
Well prepared

12) What aspect of the training was the most helpful in preparing you to lead this training yourself?
For each item below, select the choice that best represents your opinion.

	Not helpful 1	Somewhat helpful 2	Very helpful 3
a) Observing my senior trainer's own techniques for guiding us through the training.			
b) Tips on leading the training provided by my senior trainer.			
c) The notes on leading the training included in each module.			
d) Reviewing the Master Teacher resources in the curriculum binder and CD-ROM.			
e) Talking with other Master Teachers about the curriculum.			
f) The process of creating a unit portfolio myself.			

13) About how much of your work time do you spend leading in-service training for your colleagues in your **current** professional life?
Please check one.

0-5%c
6-25%
26-50%
51-75%
76-100%

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

Definitely not
Probably not
Probably yes
Definitely yes

15) What concerns do you still have about acting as a Master Teacher? What needs for support or further guidance do you anticipate you will have? Please use the space below to explain or to share other comments.