U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NoChild LeftBehind

National Educational Technology Trends Study: Local-level Data Summary

National Educational Technology Trends Study
Local-level Data Summary

Prepared by:

Marianne Bakia
Edith Yang
Karen Mitchell

SRI International

For:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development
Policy and Program Studies Service

2008

This summary was prepared for the U.S. Department of Education under Contract Number ED-01-CO-0133 with SRI International. Bernadette Adams Yates served as the contracting officer's representative. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education
Margaret Spellings
Secretary

Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development
Bill Evers
Assistant Secretary

Policy and Program Studies Service
Alan Ginsburg
Director

Program and Analytic Studies Division
David Goodwin
Director

June 2008

To order copies of this summary, write:
ED Pubs
Education Publications Center
U.S. Department of Education
P.O. Box 1398
Jessup, MD 207494-1398

To order via fax, dial 301-470-1244. You may also call toll-free: 1-877-433-7827 (1-877-4-ED-PUBS). If 877 services are not yet available in your area, call 1-800-872-5327 (1-800-USA-LEARN). Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY) should call 1-800-437-0833.

To order online, point your Internet browser to: www.edpubs.ed.gov.

This summary is also available on the Department's Web site at:
www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html.

On request, this publication is available in alternate formats, such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at 202-260-0852 or 202-260-0818.

Contents

Exhibits

Acknowledgments

Many individuals contributed to the completion of this summary. We are particularly grateful to the state, district, and school-level staff, including state educational technology directors, district technology coordinators, and teachers who took time out of their busy schedules to respond to our surveys and requests for information. Without their efforts, this report would not have been possible, and we deeply appreciate their assistance.

We would like to acknowledge the thoughtful contributions of the members of our Technical Working Group in reviewing study methods and materials and prioritizing issues to investigate. The group consisted of Tim Best of the Ohio Board of Regents, Geneva Haertel of SRI International, Alan Lesgold of the University of Pittsburgh, Tammy McGraw of the Virginia Department of Education, Jayne Moore of the Maryland State Department of Education, Michael Russell of Boston College, Fritz Scheuren of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), Linda Tsantis of Johns Hopkins University, Carla Wade of the Oregon Department of Education, and Brenda Williams of the West Virginia Department of Education. We thank them for their expertise and insights so generously shared.

Many U.S. Department of Education staff contributed to the completion of this report. Bernadette Adams Yates served as project manager and provided valuable substantive guidance and support throughout the design, implementation, and reporting phases of this study. We would also like to acknowledge the assistance of other Department staff in reviewing this report and providing useful comments and suggestions, including David Goodwin, Daphne Kaplan, and Nancy Loy.

While we appreciate the assistance and support of all of the above individuals, any errors in judgment or fact are of course the responsibility of the authors.

The National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS) is the result of collaborative work by SRI International (SRI) and the Urban Institute. Barbara Means, SRI, serves as project supervisor. Among the staff who contributed to the design of the study, collection of data, and analysis were Karla Jones, Kathryn Morrison, and Janet Voight-Miro from SRI; Devin Fernandes, Daniel Klasik, and Rob Olsen of the Urban Institute; and Duncan Chaplin of Mathematica Policy Research under contract with the Urban Institute. Layout and editing were performed by Janeula Burt and Tarneisha Gross at SRI. Graphics were produced by Tarneisha Gross.

Introduction

This data summary presents data from the U.S. Department of Education's National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS). NETTS is a multiyear evaluation that documents the implementation of the Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) program from fiscal year (FY) 2002 to FY 2007. This summary briefly reviews the methods used to collect and analyze the NETTS data collected from states in the winter of 2004–05, from districts in the spring of 2005, and from teachers in fall of 2005. It also provides descriptive analyses of district and school implementation of the EETT program, focusing on issues that are central to the program: distribution of funds; EETT district investment in educational technology; teacher and student access to technology; technology-related teacher professional development; and technology integration in teaching and learning.

State subgrant and district survey data are presented by whether districts received formula or competitive subgrants in FY 2003, and teacher survey data are presented by school poverty level. Appendices A and B present the descriptive results by question from the 2005 NETTS District Survey and the 2005 NETTS Teacher Survey, respectively.[1]

[1] Public use files of all NETTS datasets will be released at the end of the project, anticipated in the winter of 2008–09.

Data Sources and Methods

This section of the summary describes the methods that were used to examine how districts invested their EETT and other technology funds in school year (SY) 2003–04 and the ways that teachers and students in high- and low-poverty schools used technology in teaching and learning in school year 2004–05. State educational technology directors provided information about their EETT formula and competitive subgrants to districts in FY 2003. Survey data collected at the district and teacher levels aimed to compile information about EETT funds that were spent and district-provided services that were provided in schools during school year 2004–05. To account for the time it takes for federal funds to be allocated to states, awarded to districts, and distributed to schools, the surveys collected information from different fiscal and school years (Exhibit 1).

Exhibit 1. Data Sources and Analysis Methods

Evaluation Question	Data Source	Analysis Method
To what extent have high-poverty districts been targeted by the EETT program?	Reports of state educational technology directors (FY 2003)	Descriptive statistics
How do EETT districts invest their educational technology dollars?	District Survey (SY 2003–04)	Descriptive statistics
To what extent do K–12 teachers and students have access to hardware, software, and the Internet? Do classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools have similar hardware, software, and Internet access?	Teacher Survey (SY 2004–05)	Descriptive statistics
How much technology-related professional development do teachers receive? Do teachers in high- and low-poverty schools participate in similar amounts of technology-related professional development?	Teacher Survey (SY 2004–05)	Descriptive statistics
How often do teachers integrate technology into curriculum and instruction? Do teachers in high- and low-poverty schools integrate similar amounts of technology into instruction?	Teacher Survey (SY 2004–05)	Descriptive statistics
How do students use technology for learning in school? Do students in high- and low-poverty schools use similar amounts of technology in school?	Teacher Survey (SY 2004–05)	Descriptive statistics

Data Collection

Districts' Grant Awards

State EETT directors provided data about the numbers and sizes of formula and competitive awards that districts received. States supplied lists of the districts to which they made formula and competitive awards, either directly or through consortia, and the amounts of those awards, in FY 2003. In a small number of cases, districts provided FY 2004 award data rather than FY 2003 data.

District Survey

In spring 2005, NETTS researchers surveyed district technology coordinators about their EETT programs and the use of EETT funds for districtwide technology activities. The district survey asked technology coordinators to report on technology spending and support in school year 2003–04. The eight-part survey collected information about the EETT application process, the use of EETT partnership or consortium funds, spending on educational technology, support provided to encourage technology integration in classroom instruction, activities associated with technology-related professional development, the use of student data management systems, and estimates of districts' technology inventories. The final section of the survey gathered information on survey respondents' roles and responsibilities in the district. The district survey also asked districts to report on spending and technology support in school year 2003–04.

NETTS researchers administered the district survey to 1,039 technology coordinators selected from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The survey respondents represented districts that received EETT funds, districts that did not receive EETT funds, and non-districts that were lead entities for competitive EETT awards.

The sampling frames for the survey were populated by using state-provided lists for each entity and were based on data collected from the Common Core of Data (CCD), Internet searches, and phone calls. The sampling strategy considered the type of educational entity (district or non-district), poverty status, student enrollments, and location (urban or rural status). The sampling frames included the 60 largest urban districts, 12,423 other districts that had received EETT funds, and 70 non-district entities that had received EETT competitive awards. From these sampling units, 1,050 entities were stratified in proportion to EETT funding if they received EETT funds, and in proportion to enrollment if they did not. Sample sizes by strata were designed to meet prespecified precision thresholds established by the U.S. Department of Education.

To obtain an adequate survey response rate, district technology coordinators could respond to surveys online, on paper, or by phone. The response rate for the district survey was 99 percent, with 1,029 entities responding. Respondents were weighted to reflect a nationally representative sample of districts for data analysis. Descriptive results of the district survey are reported by survey question in Appendix A.

Teacher Survey

The fall 2005 NETTS teacher survey asked teachers about their use of technology in school year 2004–05. Teachers were asked to describe their access to technology and technical support, their participation in technology-related professional development, their use of technology for instruction, their students' use of technology for learning, and supports for and barriers to technology use in their schools.

The teacher sample was created by drawing a probability sample of 975 schools from respondents to the district survey, stratified by school type (elementary or secondary), and poverty level (high or low).[2] Schools were randomly sampled in proportion to the number of teachers and in inverse proportion to district size to produce a sample of schools whose selection probabilities were roughly independent of the size of their district's enrollment. From these schools, 233 high-poverty schools were randomly sampled for more intensive study.

NETTS researchers obtained teacher rosters for the 975 selected schools. Teachers who did not teach at the same school in school years 2004–05 and 2005–06 and who did not teach in a core subject area were excluded from the sample. Targets of four teachers from each of the schools in the original probability sample (742 schools) and of 25 teachers from each of the high-poverty schools (233 schools) were randomly selected for the teacher sample. The final teacher sample consisted of 6,017 teachers.

NETTS researchers administered the NETTS teacher survey in fall 2005. Teachers could complete their surveys online or on paper. Researchers collected completed surveys from 4,935 teachers for an overall response rate of 82 percent. In analyzing the data, survey respondents were weighted to reflect a nationally representative sample of teachers. Descriptive results by survey question are reported in Appendix B.[3]

Data Analyses

Targeting of EETT Grants

States' reports of their EETT grants to districts were examined for districts that received only formula funds and for districts that received competitive funds, either alone or in combination with formula funds. Grant amounts were summarized for these two types of districts and for districts with different percentages and numbers of students in low-income families.

[2] For elementary schools, the poverty threshold, measured in terms of the percentage of students who were eligible for free and reduced-price lunches (FRPL), was 29.7 percent. For middle schools and high schools, the poverty thresholds were 24.3 percent and 15.9 percent, respectively.

[3] The teacher data presented in the exhibits appear lower than the results shown in Appendix B. The analysis required imputation of zeroes for some missing values to allow comparisons between the same respondent pool for the survey items used to investigate technology access, technology integration, and technology-related professional development. As a result, the exhibits reflect slightly conservative estimates of teacher access to and use of technology in their schools.

Technology Integration in Districts That Received EETT Subgrants

Survey responses from the subsample of teachers in districts receiving EETT subgrants in school year 2003–04 were used to describe the extent to which teachers in these districts used technology at least weekly in instruction, their students used technology in learning at least weekly, and their students used technology for the critical-thinking or decision-making skills related to technology literacy at least once a week.

Teacher and Student Technology Use

Teachers' survey responses from the full nationally representative sample were used to describe the extent to which teachers used technology once a week or more in instruction, students used technology in learning at least once a week, and students used technology for the critical-thinking or decision-making skills related to technology literacy at least weekly (Exhibit 2).

Exhibit 2. Measures of Teacher and Student Technology Use

Teachers' Use of Technology in Instruction	Students' Use of Technology in Learning	Students' Use of Technology for the Critical Thinking and Decision-Making Skills Related to Technology Literacy
Teachers used technology at least once a week to: • Develop curricula or assignments in reading, math or other subjects • Present reading, math, or other subject concepts to students • Create tests or quizzes • Test students • Collaborate with experts or teachers in other locations • Adapt instructional activities to students' individual needs • Do research and lesson planning using the Internet	Students used technology at least once a week to: • Practice or review reading, math, or other subject areas • Extend learning in reading, math, or other subject areas with enrichment activities • Produce media, Web, or presentation products • Conduct online research • Take tests or quizzes using a computer • Prepare for standardized tests	Students used technology at least once a week to: • Communicate electronically about academic content with experts, peers, or others • Solve real-world problems • Visually represent or investigate concepts • Take tests or quizzes using a computer • Create products that had real-world audiences • Work cooperatively or collaboratively with other students • Work with content in multiple disciplines • Use inquiry-based strategies • Use authentic tools

Technology Access and Support

Technology access and support variables describe the extent to which teachers and students had access to technology resources (Exhibit 3). These variables described teachers' access to technology, students' access to technology in the classroom, students' access to technology in labs or media centers in the school, and teachers' completion of technology-related professional development.

Exhibit 3. Measures of Technology Access and Support in Schools

Teachers' Access to Technology	Students' Access to Technology in the Classroom	Students' Access to Technology in Computer Labs or Media Centers	Teachers' Completion of Technology-Related Professional Development
These technologies were available at school for teacher use: • Desktop or laptop computer • PDAs or content-specific technologies • High-speed Internet access • Printers • Device to project computer screen for whole-class viewing • Presentation software • Software for instruction in reading, math, or other subjects • E-mail software	Students had classroom access to: • One computer per student • One computer for every two students • One computer for every three students • One computer for every four students • PDAs or content-specific technologies • High-speed Internet access • Printers • Presentation software • Software for instruction in reading, math, or other subjects	Students had lab or media center access to: • One computer per student • One computer for every two students • One computer for every three students • One computer for every four students • PDAs or content-specific technologies • High-speed Internet access • Printers • Presentation software • Software for instruction in reading, math, or other subjects	Teachers completed professional development that addressed: • Use of technology for new methods of teaching • Use of technology to enhance student learning in reading, math, or other subjects • Improving students' technology literacy • Use of technology to design or administer student assessments • Use of technology for curriculum development and lesson planning • Use of technology to meet the needs of students with disabilities or limited English proficiency • Use of software to tailor tasks to individual student ability • Developing proficiency with online teaching • Effective or ethical use of the Internet

Conceptual Framework

District data on EETT grant amounts were organized to compare districts that reported receiving only formula grants with districts that reported receiving competitive grants, usually in combination with formula monies. District funding was also analyzed by examining median district awards that were above and below the state medians of numbers and percentages of poor students. Cross-tabulations of district funding data by type of award (only formula, and combined formula and competitive) and by student poverty (above or below the state medians of numbers or percentages of poor students) were produced to examine relationships between EETT funding levels and district need.

Data for the nationally representative samples of districts and teachers described teacher and student technology use and technology access and support. Individual item-level data detailed above were used to describe the spending patterns of districts that received only formula grants

and districts that received competitive grants only or in combination with formula grants.[4] Two-tailed t-tests were used to examine the statistical significance of differences between these two types of districts. These descriptive data and analyses are shown in Exhibits 4 through 7.

To address questions about the differences across poverty levels in technology access and use, individual item data from the teacher survey responses were examined for teachers at high-, middle-, and low-poverty schools. High-poverty schools were in the top poverty quartile based on free and reduced-price lunch program rates for each of the three levels of schooling (elementary, middle, and high). Middle-poverty schools were those in the second-highest poverty quartile for their level of schooling, and low-poverty schools were those whose poverty rates were in the bottom 50 percent (i.e., the two least poor quartiles) for their schooling level. Two-tailed t-tests were calculated to determine whether the differences by poverty level in technology access, support, and use were statistically significant. Descriptive statistics for the survey items describing activities involving teacher and student technology integration at least once a week were calculated for the subsample of teachers in districts that received EETT funds (Exhibits 8 through 10). Descriptive data for survey items that describe weekly technology integration activities and technology access and support are shown in Exhibits 11 through 19.

[4] Districts that received only competitive awards were grouped with districts that received both formula and competitive awards because the "competitive only" group size was small (67 districts).

Data Tables

Exhibit 4. Percentage of EETT-Funded Districts Using EETT Funds for Hardware, Software, Web-based Instructional Resources, and Technical Support in SY 2003–04

	Districts With Formula Grants Only (n = 374)	Districts With Competitive and Formula Grants[a] (n=433)	Districts With Any EETT Funding[b] (n= 815)
Software to help integrate technology into reading or math	51%	63%	53%
Hardware to help integrate technology into reading or math	38%	72%*	45%
Activities to improve student technology literacy	27%	53%*	32%
Curriculum development to help integrate technology into any subject	23%	53%*	29%
A technology coordinator in the district	17%	15%	16%
Online tutoring systems for supplemental education in reading or math in schools identified for improvement under *NCLB*	7%	7%	7%
Virtual schools that are alternatives to schools identified for improvement under *NCLB*	0%	1%	1%

Exhibit reads: More districts with both competitive and formula funds than those with formula funds only invested in hardware to help integrate technology in reading and math instruction, curriculum development to integrate technology in learning, and activities to improve student technology literacy in 2003–04.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from districts with formula grants only).

Notes: (a) Sixty-seven districts reported in this category received only competitive grants. (b) This category includes eight districts that reported receiving EETT funds but did not specify grant type. *NCLB* is the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*.

Source: NETTS District Survey.

Exhibit 5. Average Numbers of Computers in Classrooms and Other Instructional Areas in EETT and Non-EETT Districts in SY 2003–04[a]

Type of Technology	Districts With Formula Grants Only (n = 362)	Districts With Competitive and Formula Grants[b] (n = 417)	Districts With Any EETT Funding (n = 788)[c]	Districts Without EETT Grants (n = 136)
Computers	4.72	6.64	5.03	5.05
Computers with LAN/Internet access	4.45	6.51	4.81	4.81

Exhibit reads: Districts with EETT funds and districts without EETT grants have equal numbers of computers in classrooms and other instructional areas.

Notes: (a) These calculations exclude 32 districts that reported anomalous data. (b) Sixty-four districts in this category received only competitive grants. (c) This category includes nine districts that reported receiving EETT funding but did not specify grant type.

Source: NETTS District Survey.

Exhibit 6. Percentage of EETT-Funded Districts Using EETT Funds for Technology-related Teacher Professional Development in SY 2003–04

Use of EETT Funds for Technology-Related Professional Development	Districts With Formula Grants Only (n = 374)	Districts With Competitive and Formula Grants[a] (n = 433)	Districts With Any EETT Funding[b] (n = 815)
On integrating technology into reading or math instruction	59%	81%*	63%
On integrating technology into other subject areas	56%	72%	60%
To develop proficiency with online teaching of any subject	26%	22%	25%
On incentives for training in technology integration	9%	45%*	15%
On initiatives to develop professional online communities and resources	3%	15%*	5%

Exhibit reads: More districts with competitive and formula funds than with formula grants only invested in teacher professional development to integrate technology into reading and math instruction, incentives for participation in technology-related teacher professional development, and initiatives to develop professional online communities in SY 2003–04.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from districts with formula grants only).

Note: (a) Sixty-seven districts in this category received only competitive grants. (b) Eight districts are included in this category that reported receiving EETT funds but did not report grant type.

Source: NETTS District Survey.

Exhibit 7. Percentage of Districts Using EETT Funds for Assessment Technologies and Data-based Decision-making in SY 2003–04

Use of EETT Funds for Assessment and Data-Based Decision-Making	Districts With Formula Grants Only (n = 374)	Districts With Competitive and Formula Grants[a] (n = 433)	Districts With Any EETT funding[b] (n = 815)
Hardware, software, or professional development for data and information management systems	25%	23%	25%
Supports for school staff to analyze available data for instructional improvement	7%	21%*	10%
Technology-based assessments of student academic achievement in reading or math	4%	16%*	7%

Exhibit reads: More districts with competitive and formula funds than with formula grants only invested in technology-based assessments of student achievement in reading or math and in supports for staff to analyze data for instructional improvement in SY 2003–04.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from districts with formula grants only).

Note: (a) Sixty-seven districts in this category received only competitive grants. (b) This category includes eight districts that reported receiving EETT funds but did not report grant type.

Source: NETTS District Survey.

Exhibit 8. Percentage of Teachers in EETT-funded Districts Who Integrated Technology in Their Instruction on At Least a Weekly Basis in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Teachers' Use of Technology for Instruction	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Develop curricula or assignments in math, reading, or other subjects	31%	33%	26%*	33%
Create tests or quizzes	31%	32%	30%	30%
Do research and lesson planning using the Internet	27%	28%	28%	25%
Present math, reading, or other subject concepts to students	22%	24%	18%*	25%
Test students	14%	11%	17%*	17%
Adapt instructional activities to students' individual needs	10%	9%	10%	14%*
Collaborate with experts or teachers in other locations	6%	6%	7%	5%

Exhibit reads: Among districts that received EETT-funding, teachers in high- and low-poverty schools made similar reports about their regular use of technology in instruction, with one exception. Teachers in high-poverty schools reported using technology to adapt instructional activities to individual students' needs more frequently than teachers in low-poverty schools.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 9. Percentage of Teachers in EETT-funded Districts Whose Students Used Technology in Learning on At Least a Weekly Basis in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Students' Use of Technology	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Practice or review topics in math, reading, or other subjects	33%	31%	33%	41%*
Extend learning in math, reading, or other subject areas with enrichment activities	22%	19%	21%	30%*
Take tests or quizzes using a computer	17%	12%	24%*	21%*
Prepare for standardized tests	6%	4%	8%*	10%*
Conduct online research	7%	7%	7%	7%
Produce media, Web, or presentation products	2%	1%	2%	2%

Exhibit reads: Among districts that received EETT funding, teachers in high-poverty schools were more likely to report that their students used technology in a variety of ways on at least a weekly basis than teachers in low-poverty schools.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 10. Percentage of Teachers in EETT-funded Districts With Access to Technology in Their Classrooms in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Type of Technology	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Desktop or laptop computer	95%	95%	97%	92%
E-mail software	87%	88%	89%	83%
Printers	78%	78%	74%	83%
High-speed Internet access	76%	78%	77%	69%*
Presentation software	75%	77%	76%	67%*
Software for instruction in math, reading, or other subjects	60%	61%	61%	54%
Device to project computer screen for whole-class viewing	33%	35%	32%	30%
PDAs or content-specific technologies	20%	21%	20%	18%

Exhibit reads: Among districts that received EETT funds, teachers in high- and low-poverty schools reported similar access to technology. Notable exceptions include high-speed internet access and presentation software, for which teachers in high-poverty schools were less likely to report access.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 11. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Whose Students Used Technology for the Critical-Thinking and Decision-making Skills Related to Technology Literacy on At Least a Weekly Basis in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Students' Use of Technology	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Take tests or quizzes using a computer	17%	12%	24%*	22%*
Work cooperatively or collaboratively with other students	8%	7%	8%	12%*
Communicate electronically about academic content with experts, peers, and/or others	5%	5%	4%	4%
Visually represent or investigate concepts	4%	4%	3%	4%
Use inquiry-based strategies	3%	3%	4%	4%
Solve real-world problems	3%	2%	2%	5%*
Work with content in multiple disciplines	3%	2%	2%	4%
Use authentic tools	2%	2%	2%	3%
Create products that had real-world audiences	1%	1%	1%	2%

Exhibit reads: More teachers in high-poverty than in low-poverty schools reported that their students regularly used technology to take tests or quizzes, work cooperatively with other students, and solve real-world problems in SY 2004–05.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 12. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Whose Students Had Access to Technology in Their Classrooms in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Type of Technology	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
One computer for every 5 or more students in class	64%	60%	68%*	69%*
High-speed Internet access	54%	55%	54%	52%
Printers	48%	50%	45%	49%
Software for instruction in math, reading, or other subjects	45%	44%	43%	49%
Presentation software	41%	44%	39%	36%*
PDAs or content-specific technologies	14%	15%	16%	11%
One computer for every 2 to 4 students in class	12%	13%	8%	14%
One computer per student in class	4%	5%	4%	3%

Exhibit reads: Teachers in high-poverty schools were more likely to report that they had one computer for every five or more students in class. These teachers were less likely to report that they had access to presentation software. Access to other hardware and software was similar between teachers in high- and low-poverty schools.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 13. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Whose Students Had Access to Technology in Computer Labs or Media Centers in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Type of Technology	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Printers	72%	75%	71%	64%*
One computer per student in class	71%	72%	71%	66%
High-speed Internet access	62%	64%	62%	57%
Presentation software	57%	60%	56%	47%*
Software for instruction in math, reading, or other subjects	54%	55%	52%	52%
PDAs or content-specific technologies	21%	22%	21%	18%
One computer for every 2 to 4 students in class	14%	14%	14%	13%
One computer for every 5 or more students in class	6%	5%	6%	8%

Exhibit reads: Teachers in high-poverty schools were less likely to report access to printers and presentation software in computer labs or media centers than teachers in low-poverty schools.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 14. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Reporting Obstacles to Their Technology Use in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Obstacle	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Insufficient hardware in the classroom	61%	61%	63%	59%
Insufficient hardware in labs or resource rooms	46%	46%	49%	42%
Inability to obtain desired software for class	40%	38%	40%	46%*
Difficulty getting access to computers in labs or on carts	40%	40%	42%*	38%*
Insufficient or inadequate technical support for computer use	39%	39%	39%	42%
Out-of-date hardware	34%	32%	38%	36%
Lack of age-appropriate or educationally relevant software or Web sites	30%	28%	32%	32%
Slow or unreliable Internet connections	29%	28%	28%	34%

Exhibit reads: Teachers were most likely to report that insufficient hardware in the classroom presented an obstacle to their use of technology in SY 2004–05. Teachers in high-poverty classrooms were more likely to report that an inability to obtain desired software for class and difficulty getting access to computers in labs or on carts presented obstacles to their technology use in SY 2004–05 than teachers in low-poverty schools.

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 15. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Participating in Professional Development on Different Technology Topics in SY 2004–05 and Summer 2005, by School Poverty Level

Professional Development Technology Topic	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Using technology to enhance student learning in math, reading, or other subjects	49%	49%	49%	50%
Using technology for curriculum development and lesson planning	34%	33%	34%	38%
Using technology to design or administer student assessments	29%	30%	27%	28%
Using technology for new methods of teaching	24%	22%	25%	26%
Improving students' technology literacy	16%	16%	14%	20%
Effective or ethical use of the Internet	15%	16%	13%	15%
Using software to tailor tasks to individual student ability	13%	12%	9%	18%*
Using technology to meet the needs of students with disabilities or limited English proficiency	10%	9%	11%	13%
Developing proficiency with online teaching	4%	3%	5%	3%

Exhibit reads: Teachers in high- and low-poverty schools reported similar participation in technology-related professional development, although teachers in low-poverty schools reported having more professional development training in using software to tailor tasks to individual student abilities.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 16. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Who Integrated Technology in Their Instruction on At Least a Weekly Basis in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Teachers' Use of Technology for Instruction	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Develop curricula or assignments in math, reading, or other subjects	31%	32%	27%	32%
Create tests or quizzes	31%	31%	30%	28%
Do research and lesson planning using the Internet	28%	28%	28%	25%
Present math, reading, or other subject concepts to students	22%	22%	19%	24%
Test students	14%	11%	18%*	17%
Adapt instructional activities to students' individual needs	10%	8%	10%	13%*
Collaborate with experts or teachers in other locations	6%	7%	7%	5%

Exhibit reads: Teachers' reports about their regular use of technology in their instruction were similar across poverty-levels, although teachers in high-poverty schools were more likely to report using technology adapting instructional activities to students' individual needs in SY 2004–05.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 17. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Who Used Technology for Classroom Management and Other Administrative Purposes on At Least a Weekly Basis in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Teachers' Use of Technology for Administrative Purposes	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
E-mail teachers in the school	63%	69%	62%	49%*
Maintain student grades	51%	52%	54%	43%
E-mail school and district administrators	39%	41%	41%	31%*
Increase parental and family involvement	18%	23%	16%*	7%*
Track other measures of student progress	12%	11%	12%	12%
Post homework assignments or schedule information on the Web	12%	15%	11%	4%*
Track individual student test scores	11%	11%	10%	12%
Create and maintain web pages for the class	8%	10%	7%	4%*
E-mail students	6%	7%	5%	2%*

Exhibit reads: Teachers in high-poverty schools used technology less frequently than teachers in low-poverty schools for several different administrative tasks, including to e-mail teachers and administrators and students in the school, to increase parental and family involvement, to post homework assignments or schedule information on the Web, and to create and maintain web pages for the class.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 18. Percentage of Teachers in All Districts Who Reported Students' Use of Technology in Learning on At Least a Weekly Basis in SY 2004–05, by School Poverty Level

Students' Use of Technology	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Practice or review topics in math, reading, or other subjects	33%	31%	32%	41%*
Extend learning in math, reading, or other subject areas with enrichment activities	22%	19%	21%	31%*
Take tests or quizzes using a computer	17%	12%	24%*	22%*
Prepare for standardized tests	6%	4%	8%*	10%*
Conduct online research	7%	7%	6%	6%
Produce media, Web, or presentation products	2%	1%	2%	2%

Exhibit reads: More teachers in high-poverty schools reported that their students used technology once a week or more to practice or review content-related topics, extend learning, take tests or quizzes, or prepare for standardized tests than teachers in low-poverty schools.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Exhibit 19. Average Numbers of Different Technologies Available to Teachers and Students, Technology-related Professional Development Topics Completed, and Technology Uses by Teachers and Students in SY 2004–05

Summary Measure	All	School Poverty Group		
		Low	Medium	High
Student access to technology in a computer lab or media center	6.62	6.79	6.63	6.07*
Teachers' access to technology	5.09	5.18	5.08	4.82
Student access to technology in the classroom	3.10	3.14	3.02	3.07
Teachers' administrative uses of technology	1.95	2.12	1.95	1.39*
Technology topics on which teachers completed professional development	1.80	1.78	1.71	1.97
Teachers' use of technology in instruction	1.36	1.36	1.34	1.39
Students' use of technology in learning	0.85	0.74	0.93*	1.11*
Students' use of technology for critical-thinking and decision-making skills	0.44	0.38	0.49*	0.58*

Exhibit reads: Summary measures of key concepts related to technology integration suggest that students on average have access to several technologies in computer labs or media centers, but student use of technology for critical-thinking and decision-making skills is relatively infrequent. Overall, teachers in high-poverty schools reported slightly less access to technology but were more likely to report students' use of technology for critical-thinking than teachers in low-poverty schools.

* $p < .05$ (significant difference from teachers in low-poverty schools).

Note: Summary measures are calculated from teacher responses using the measures presented in Exhibits 2 and 3.

Source: NETTS Teacher Survey.

Appendix A: NETTS District Survey

Results by Question

PART I. EETT APPLICATION PROCESS (FOR ALL LEAS[5])

Technology integration into the classroom refers to the routine use of digital tools and resources in the planning and delivery of teaching, the development of instructional environments and the evaluation and assessment of student performance.

Digital tools and resources may include but are not limited to computers and computer peripherals, software applications, the Internet, handheld devices, presentation or projection devices, online or video distance learning tools, network-based communication systems, learning management systems, content management systems, online databases, content repositories or collections of text, graphics, multimedia or videos as well as other related materials, equipment and infrastructure.

1. a. Did your LEA apply for or receive **Formula or Competitive** EETT funding for the school year[6] (SY) 2003–04 school year and if so, how much was received?

SY 2003–04 GRANTS	APPLIED Individually or in Partnership[7]		RECEIVED For Your District[8]	
	YES	*NO*	*Amount*	*NO*
a. Formula	97%	3%	$32,568.34	32%
b. Competitive	61%	39%	$120,570.44	78%

[5] An LEA is a Local Educational Agency and includes all regular school districts with students as well as other government entities that provide services to regular school districts (e.g. educational service units or intermediate service agencies).

[6] If you do not have data that covers a complete school-year, please use data that overlaps as much as possible with the nine-month 2003–04 school-year. For example, if you have financial data corresponding to federal fiscal years please use Federal Fiscal Year 2004 data (which goes from October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004) when reporting on SY 2003–04.

[7] Please mark "Yes" if your LEA applied individually, as a lead Fiscal Agent for a partnership or consortium, or as a non-lead entity in a partnership or consortium.

[8] Please include all funds directly awarded to your LEA from individual awards and any funds (not services) received through a partnership or consortium. **If your LEA was a lead Fiscal Agent** for a partnership or consortium, please **do not** include those funds awarded to other LEAs in the partnership or consortium or funds used for partnership-wide services.

b. **If you did not apply for Formula and/or Competitive funds** for the 2003–04 school year, please select the reason(s) why. Please check all that apply for each type of grant.

Reason For Not Applying for SY 2003–04	Formula		Competitive	
	NO	YES	NO	YES
a. Did not know EETT funding was available	84%	16%	53%	47%
b. Did not think my LEA was eligible	78%	22%	73%	27%
c. Did not have the resources to apply	84%	16%	54%	46%
d. Did not expect to get funds if applied	73%	27%	77%	23%
e. Had funds remaining from a previous multi-year award	99%	1%	98%	2%
f. Other. Please describe. _____ _____ _____	94%	6%	89%	11%

If your LEA did not apply for EETT funding, either individually or in a partnership, for SY 2003–04, **please skip to Part III on page 9 of this survey**.

Otherwise, **please continue with Question 2**.

2. Did your LEA apply for **Competitive** funds for the 2003–04 school year to target instructional content areas?

75% ☐ Yes

25% ☐ No. **Skip to Question 4.**

3. Which instructional content areas were targeted in your LEA's **Competitive** applications for the 2003–04 school year? Check all content areas that apply.

Targeted Instructional Content Areas	**YES**	**NO**
a. English/Language Arts	60%	40%
b. Foreign Languages	6%	94%
c. Mathematics	54%	46%
d. Sciences	28%	72%
e. Social Studies	30%	70%
f. Technology Literacy	69%	31%
g. Career/Technical Education (not including technology literacy)	16%	84%
h. Special Education	23%	77%
i. LEP Education	13%	77%
j. Other. Please describe (e.g., Reading; Physical Education; Drug Free, Truancy, and Bilingual education)[9]_____	17%	83%

4. Did your LEA's **Competitive** applications for the 2003–04 school year target specific grades?

25% ☐ Yes

75% ☐ No. **Skip to Question 6.**

[9] The parenthetical statements included in the sub-items referring to "other" categories are provided as illustrations of the types of responses received from respondents. The examples provided do not necessarily include all of the most common responses nor do they reflect the full range of responses. These are included in this summary to give the reader a general sense of the types of responses received.

5. Which grades were targeted in your district's **Competitive** applications for the 2003–04 school year? Check all that apply.

Targeted Grades	**Yes**	**No**
a. Pre-kindergarten	14%	86%
b. Kindergarten	31%	69%
c. 1st Grade	36%	64%
d. 2nd Grade	40%	60%
e. 3rd Grade	48%	52%
f. 4th Grade	53%	47%
g. 5th Grade	56%	44%
h. 6th Grade	56%	44%
i. 7th Grade	55%	45%
j. 8th Grade	63%	37%
k. 9th Grade	34%	66%
l. 10th Grade	29%	71%
m. 11th Grade	20%	80%
n. 12th Grade	18%	82%
o. Ungraded	1%	99%

Part II. Fiscal Agent Use of Partnership or Consortium Funds for SY 2003–04

6. Did your LEA serve as the Fiscal Agent for a **partnership or consortium** that 1) had at least one other LEA and 2) received **formula and/or competitive** funds for SY 2003–04?

   5% ☐ Yes. Please continue with this section.

   95% ☐ No. **Please skip to Part III on page 9.**

Technology integration into the classroom refers to the routine use of digital tools and resources in the planning and delivery of teaching, the development of instructional environments and the evaluation and assessment of student performance.

A **virtual school** refers to a complete education institution that enrolls students and delivers its core academic instruction primarily through online means.

7. How much EETT funding did your **partnership or consortium** receive for SY 2003–04?

   a. Formula $ 23,355.83 (average amount)

   b. Competitive $ 143,022.98 (average amount)

If your partnership or consortium only received Formula funding, not Competitive, for SY 2003–04, please skip to Part III on page 9 of this survey.

8. What did your LEA do with the **Competitive** EETT funds it received as part of partnerships or consortia for 2003–04? Please **estimate** the % of total funds going to each use.

Use of Funds	If Used		% of Partnership Award
	Yes	No	
a. Pay for services in your own district.	84%	16%	31%
b. Provide funds to other districts in the partnership.	74%	26%	35%
c. Provide funds for services to be used partnership-wide.	74%	26%	34%
Total Award Received by Partnership			**100%**

9. What **partnership-wide** activities were supported with the **Competitive** EETT funds that were received by your partnership or consortium? Please indicate which partnership-wide activities were supported and then rank the **top 5**, by level of EETT funding for each activity, starting with 1 for the activity that received the most funding.

Use of Funds	**Partnership-Wide Activities**		
	If EETT Funds Used		**Rank (by Funding Level)**
	Yes	**No**	
a. Pay for a *technology coordinator* within your consortia to help with integration of technology into the classroom.	33%	67%	4.98
b. Pay for a *program facilitator, administrator, or evaluator*.	45%	55%	5.28
c. Pay for *professional development* for teachers to assist them with integrating technology into math and/or reading.	11%	89%	2.71
d. Pay for *professional development* for teachers to assist them with integrating technology into *other subject areas*.	81%	19%	3.18
e. Pay for *professional development* for teachers to assist them develop proficiency with the *online teaching* of any subject.	26%	74%	5.64
f. Pay for *software* to help with integration of technology into math and/or reading.	64%	36%	5.28
g. Pay for *hardware* to help with the integration of technology into math and/or reading.	72%	28%	4.63
h. Pay for *curriculum development* activities to help with the integration of technology into any subject.	69%	31%	5.10
i. Pay for activities to improve *student technology literacy*.	62%	38%	4.77
j. Pay for hardware, software, or professional development in support of *data and information management systems*.	17%	83%	5.83
k. Pay for *online tutoring systems* to provide supplemental education services in math and/or reading for students in schools that have been identified for improvement under *NCLB*.	8%	92%	5.99
l. Pay for *virtual schools* that can be used as alternatives to schools identified for improvement under *NCLB*.	1%	99%	6.00

Use of Funds	Partnership-Wide Activities		
	If EETT Funds Used		Rank (by Funding Level)
	Yes	No	
m. Pay for *assessments of student academic achievement* in math and/or reading via Internet or other computer-based systems.	20%	80%	5.81
n. Pay for *incentives* for teachers to use or obtain training in the integration of education technology.	51%	49%	5.46
o. Pay for *supports* (i.e. time, substitutes, etc.) for school staff *to analyze available data* with the goal of improving how the school educates children.	45%	55%	5.38
p. Pay for *email or Internet-based methods to communicate with students*.	6%	94%	6.00
q. Pay for initiatives to increase *parental and family involvement*.	29%	71%	5.64
r. Pay for initiatives to develop professional *online communities and resources.*	20%	80%	5.77
s. Other. Please describe. (e.g., pay for teachers to develop Curriculum Maps)._____ _____	6%	94%	5.80

PART III. USE OF FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY IN SY 2003–04

10. Did your LEA receive **Formula and/or Competitive** EETT funding in SY 2003–04?

97% ☐ Yes.
3% ☐ No. **Please skip to Part IV on page 15 of this survey**.

11. Does your LEA have students?

99% ☐ Yes, my LEA has students. **Please continue with this section.**
1% ☐ No, my LEA has no students. My LEA is or is like an Educational Service Unit or Intermediate Service Agency that only serves students indirectly by helping other LEAs. **Please skip to Part VIII on page 26 of this survey**.

Technology integration into the classroom refers to the routine use of digital tools and resources in the planning and delivery of teaching, the development of instructional environments and the evaluation and assessment of student performance.

A **virtual school** refers to a complete education institution that enrolls students and delivers its core academic instruction primarily through online means.

12. Did your LEA transfer any of its SY 2003–04 funds INTO or OUT of the EETT program?

10% ☐ Yes. Please **estimate** the amount(s) transferred below.
90% ☐ No. **Please skip to the next question.**

Funds Transferred INTO EETT	Program	Funds Transferred OUT of EETT
$14,517.46	a. Title I	$15,901.46
$3,442.45	b. Section 2113(a)(3)—Training and Recruitment	$27,876.15
$900.00	c. Section 4112(a)(1)—Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Governor's funds	$17,569.87
	d. Section 4112(c)(1)—Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Governor's SEA funds	
	e. Section 4202(c)(3)—21st Century Community Learning Centers	
$4,780.26	f. Section 5112(b)—Innovative Programs	$2,145.49
$6,835.35	g. Other. Please specify.	$342,626.51

13. We are interested in knowing how your EETT funding for the 2003–04 school year (**formula and competitive, after transfers**) was distributed. Please indicate how funding was spent and also **estimate** the percent of funds used for each purpose.

Use of EETT Funds	If EETT Funds Used		Percentage of EETT Funds, after transfers
	Yes	No	
a. Provide funds directly to *schools.*	46%	54%	32%
b. Pay for services to be used in or by one or more targeted schools.	32%	68%	17%
c. Pay for services to be used districtwide	62%	38%	51%
Total			**100%**

14. Please indicate the **funding source** with which your district supported any of the following activities during the 2003–04 school year.

Please also **rank the top 5** activities supported by EETT funds, starting from 1 for the activity that received the most funding. **Do not rank if EETT funds were not used** to support the activity.

Use of Funds	If EETT Funds Used			If Non-EETT Funds Used	
	Yes	No	Rank	Yes	No
a. Pay for a *technology coordinator* in your district to help with integration of technology into the classroom.	16%	84%	5.23	69%	31%
b. Pay for a *program facilitator, administrator, or evaluator.*	9%	91%	5.81	31%	69%
c. Pay for *professional development* for teachers to assist them with integrating technology into math and/or reading.	63%	37%	3.63	67%	33%
d. Pay for *professional development* for teachers to assist them with integrating technology into *other subject areas.*	60%	40%	4.18	59%	41%
e. Pay for *professional development* for teachers to assist them develop proficiency with the *online teaching* of any subject.	25%	75%	5.45	20%	80%
f. Pay for *software* to help with integration of technology into math and/or reading.	53%	47%	4.34	60%	40%
g. Pay for *hardware* to help with integration of technology into math and/or reading.	45%	55%	4.28	66%	34%
h. Pay for *curriculum development* activities to help with the integration of technology into any subject	29%	71%	5.38	53%	47%
i. Pay for activities to improve *student technology literacy*.	32%	68%	5.35	59%	41%

Use of Funds	If EETT Funds Used			If Non-EETT Funds Used	
	Yes	No	Rank	Yes	No
j. Pay for hardware, software, or professional development in support of *data and information management systems*.	25%	17%	5.33	57%	43%
k. Pay for *online tutoring systems* to provide supplemental education services in math and/or reading for students in schools that have been identified for improvement under *NCLB*.	7%	93%	5.90	17%	83%
l. Pay for *virtual schools* that can be used as alternatives to schools identified for improvement under *NCLB*.	1%	99%	6.00	10%	90%
m. Pay for *assessments of student academic achievement* in math and/or reading via Internet or other computer-based systems.	7%	93%	5.91	28%	72%
n. Pay for *incentives* for teachers to use or obtain training in the integration of education technology.	15%	85%	5.73	1%	49%
o. Pay for *supports* (i.e. time, substitutes, etc.) for school staff *to analyze available data* with the goal of improving how the school educates children.	10%	90%	5.85	48%	52%
p. Pay for *email or Internet-based methods to communicate with students.*	4%	96%	5.92	39%	61%
q. Pay for initiatives to increase *parental and family involvement*.	9%	91%	5.91	41%	59%
r. Pay for initiatives to develop professional *online communities and resources.*	5%	95%	5.96	22%	78%
s. Other. Please describe. (e.g., employee benefits; equipment, monitoring tools, and materials for technical staff; network security assessment)_____ _____	10%	90%	5.84	2%	98%

15. Out of your LEA's SY 2003–04 EETT funds **(formula and competitive)** that were distributed to schools in your district, please **estimate** the percent of funds (not services) distributed to the poorest half of schools (i.e. those with free and reduced price lunch eligibility above the district median). Please exclude funds used for districtwide services or those given to other districts if received as a partnership or consortium. 53.19 %

> **High poverty schools** refer to the poorest half of schools in the district. This can be estimated using the schools where the percent of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch is above the approximate district median.

16. To what types of schools, if any, was EETT funding (**formula and competitive**) directed during the 2003–04 school year? Check all that apply.

In my district, EETT funding supported activities targeted to:	YES	NO
a. Schools that showed initiative in application process	21%	79%
b. Schools receiving Title I funds	69%	31%
c. Schools with a large number of LEP students	28%	72%
d. Schools with a large number of students with disabilities	25%	75%
e. Low performing schools	40%	60%
f. High performing schools	15%	85%
g. High poverty schools	42%	58%
h. Schools demonstrating high technology need	54%	46%
i. Other. Please specify: _____	22%	78%

17. Do you **estimate** there is a substantial gap in the degree of technology integration into the classroom between the poorest half of schools (i.e. those above district median on poverty) and the rest of schools in your district?

2% ☐ Yes.

98% ☐ No. **Skip to Question 20 on page 15 of this survey.**

18. Does your district use formula and/or competitive EETT funds to reduce this difference?

63% ☐ Yes.

37% ☐ No. **Skip to Question 20 on page 15 of this survey.**

19. If so, in what ways?

47% ☐ Funds go disproportionately to high poverty schools

21% ☐ Funds go disproportionately to teachers in high poverty schools

32% ☐ Other. Please describe. _____

Part IV. Classroom Integration

The following questions ask about your general use of education technology, regardless of the funding source.

Technology integration into the classroom refers to the routine use of digital tools and resources in the planning and delivery of teaching, the development of instructional environments and the evaluation and assessment of student performance.

20. Please tell us what your district is doing to increase teachers' skills in using education technology.

Method used in the district for increasing teachers' ability to effectively use educational technology:	**If Used**	
	Yes	**No**
a. Partnering with another district	35%	65%
b. Partnering with an institution of higher education	33%	67%
c. Contracting with a software vendor or other for-profit company that provides professional development in the use of technology in instruction. Please specify vendor: _____	32%	68%
d. Providing teachers with the opportunity to participate in courses about the use of technology in instruction	95%	5%
e. Having teachers or teacher teams develop new curriculum units that incorporate technology	85%	15%
f. Hiring building level technology coordinators to work with teachers on incorporating technology into teaching	45%	55%
g. Hiring district technology coordinator(s) to work with teachers on incorporating technology into teaching	64%	36%
h. Paying for professional development for teachers to assist them with integrating technology into math and/or reading	89%	11%
i. Paying for email or Internet-based methods to communicate with students or parents	68%	32%
j. Paying for incentives for teachers to use or obtain training in the integration of education technology	39%	61%
k. Other. Please specify: (e.g., offering a technology academy for teachers; requiring a specific amount of time for staff development, providing teachers with laptops.)_____	11%	89%

21. Please **estimate** how often, on average, technology is integrated into each of your district's **elementary school classrooms** in the following instructional content areas?

Elementary School Subjects	**Daily**	**Weekly**	**Monthly**	**Not At All**
a. English/Language Arts	40%	45%	11%	4%
b. Mathematics	27%	49%	19%	4%

22. Please **estimate** how often, on average, technology is integrated into each of your district's **secondary school classrooms** in the following instructional content areas?

Secondary School Subjects	**Daily**	**Weekly**	**Monthly**	**Not At All**
a. English/Language Arts	31%	39%	18%	11%
b. Mathematics	29%	37%	18%	16%

23. Please **estimate** the percent of students in your district that took credit-granting courses via distance learning, including but not limited to online courses and video- or audio-learning, during the 2003–04 school year?

2.8 %

24. To what degree have the following been barriers to the expanded use of educational technology in your district?

	NOT A BARRIER	MINOR BARRIER	MAJOR BARRIER
Hardware Resources			
a. Insufficient hardware (computers, peripheral devices, graphing calculators, TVs, etc.)	33%	41%	25%
b. Out-of-date hardware	25%	48%	27%
Internet Resource Quality			
c. Internet connections aren't fast or reliable enough for use during instruction	66%	26%	8%
d. Lack of age-appropriate or educationally-relevant Web sites for students	69%	29%	2%
Software Resources			
e. Lack of age-appropriate or educationally-relevant software resources	53%	41%	6%
f. Lack of software products aligned with State standards	36%	42%	22%
Logistical/Other Barriers			
g. Lack of trained technical staff available for product and service acquisition, installation, or equipment maintenance	36%	40%	24%
h. Lack of district-level trained instructional or support specialists available to assist the integration of technology into the classroom and curriculum	25%	38%	37%
i. Lack of school-level trained instructional or support specialists available to assist the integration of technology into the classroom and curriculum	20%	44%	36%
j. Lack of emphasis on student technology literacy in standards and assessments	25%	52%	23%
k. Electric power supply and wiring, heating, ventilation, or air conditioning	55%	36%	9%
l. Building security	70%	28%	3%
m. Lack of space in school buildings	48%	34%	18%
n. Lack of adequately trained administrators	32%	54%	14%
o. Lack of adequately trained teachers and other instructional staff	14%	68%	18%
p. Other. Please specify: (e.g., lack of time for teachers to integrate technology into lessons; lack of support from school and/or district administration; lack of partnership funding; lack of interest in technology)._____	89%	1%	10%

	NOT A BARRIER	MINOR BARRIER	MAJOR BARRIER
_____			

PART V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Technology integration into the classroom refers to the routine use of digital tools and resources in the planning and delivery of teaching, the development of instructional environments and the evaluation and assessment of student performance.

25. How do you monitor the adequacy and effectiveness of your professional development activities designed to promote technology integration into the classroom?

We monitor professional development through….	**YES**	**NO**
a. Formal evaluations by external evaluators	11%	89%
b. Formal evaluations by district staff	54%	46%
c. Informal observations by district staff	96%	4%
d. Teacher reports (i.e. workshop evaluations, teacher surveys, etc.)	95%	5%
e. Other. Please specify (e.g., student and teacher projects or artifacts; project-based homework; roundtable discussions)._____ _____	12%	88%
f. My district does not monitor our professional development activities.	4%	96%

26. Has the district established minimum technology skills standards for teachers?

28% ☐ Yes.

59% ☐ No, but the district recognizes the State Standards.

13% ☐ No.

27. Please **estimate** the percentage of staff that received professional development in using technology in math and/or reading instruction during the 2003–04 school year.

47.21 %

28. Do you have a Training/Professional Development lab at the district level?

26% ☐ Yes.

74% ☐ No. **Skip to Question 30 on page 19 of this survey.**

29. Who uses the Training/Professional Development lab? Please check all that apply and **estimate** their amount of use in hours per month.

	YES	NO	Use (Hrs. Per Month)[10]
a. Principals	76%	24%	
b. Teachers	99%	1%	
c. Instructional Support Staff	83%	17%	
d. Non-district Educators	53%	47%	

30. Do you support online professional development for teachers (e.g. online learning communities, video broadcast formats, individualized, self-paced instruction, etc.) in the following areas If so, do you support these activities using **formula and/or competitive** EETT funds?

Does your District Support Online Professional Development for Teachers To:	Support in Any Way		Support with EETT Funds	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Earn a Bachelors degree?	30%	70%	2%	98%
b. Earn a Masters or PhD?	42%	58%	4%	96%
c. Obtain full state certification or licensure?	35%	65%	5%	95%
d. Build or demonstrate content-area knowledge and expertise?	73%	27%	20%	80%
e. Learn to integrate technology into the classroom?	84%	16%	39%	61%
f. Do other things? Please explain. (e.g., meet the Reading Endorsement requirement; develop basic technology skills; obtain certification in specific areas such as gifted, ESOL, First Aid)._____	5%	95%	1%	99%

[10] The "hours per month" items on Question 29 presented some confusion to survey respondents. Because of the large number of ambiguous responses, this item was not included in any further analysis.

31. Are the following sources of funding used in your district for teacher professional development activities that integrate technology into the classroom? Check all that apply and rank each source used by level of funding, starting with 1 for the largest source of professional development funding.

Source of Funding	If Used		Rank (by Level of Funding)
	YES	NO	
a. Title II, Part D, Funds, EETT	61%	39%	3.47
b. Title I Funds	55%	45%	3.78
c. Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund	39%	61%	3.91
d. State, district or school operating funds	95%	5%	2.13
e. Vendor or service provider contributions	28%	72%	5.51
f. Other: Please Describe (e.g., Title V funds; State Professional Learning funds; private grants)._____	10%	90%	5.52

32. Have you offered in the last 12 months or do you **plan** to offer within the next year any professional development in any of the following areas or of the following types? **(Check all that apply.)**

Areas of Professional Development	**Offered in last 12 mo.**	**Plan to offer within next yr.**	**No Plans**
a. None	4%	5%	N/A
b. **Technology-related** State certification requirements	16%	19%	77%
c. **Technology-related** State re-certification requirements	17%	19%	78%
d. **Technology-related** District in-service requirements	57%	59%	30%
e. Using computers, i.e. Word, spreadsheets, create web pages, to enhance student learning in math and/or reading	89%	68%	2%
f. Using other technologies to enhance student learning in math and/or reading	86%	67%	4%
g. Using a specific educational software package to enhance student learning in math and/or reading	79%	59%	14%
h. Developing your own curriculum resources to enhance student learning in math and/or reading	68%	61%	20%
i. Design of student assessment instruments	53%	57%	29%
j. Using software to track student achievement	72%	73%	5%
k. Using software to tailor tasks to student ability	56%	52%	27%
l. Using student data to tailor tasks to student ability	73%	76%	7%
m. Improving schools through other data-driven decision-making techniques	70%	69%	13%
n. Follow-up or advanced training in technology use	66%	72%	9%
o. Teaming with other teachers to use technology across disciplines	68%	62%	18%
p. Other. Please describe (e.g., using technology to collaborate online, developing and using an open source Web Portal, integrating software used by administrators for professional evaluations). _____	2%	1%	98%

Types of Professional Development	**Offered in last 12 mo.**	**Plan to offer within next yr.**	**No Plans**
q. Technology-focused study group that meets regularly	42%	31%	48%
r. Traditional workshop or conference session on technology use that was 3 or less hours in duration	70%	56%	18%
s. Traditional workshop or conference session on technology use that was more than 3 hours but less than one day in duration	72%	57%	22%
t. Traditional workshop or conference session on technology use that was more than one day in duration	44%	32%	50%
u. One-on-one mentoring on technology use to enhance student learning in core subject areas	51%	43%	39%
v. Using computer-based resources such as CD-ROM, online course, or other web-based resources, designed to improve instruction in the core subject areas	68%	65%	16%

w. Other. Please describe_____	1%	1%	98%

Part VI: Student Data Management Systems

33. Does your district currently maintain any of the following types of information electronically? If yes, please indicate whether the data are interoperable[11]?

Type of Information	Stored Electronically		Part of Interoperable Data System	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Student attendance	99%	1%	82%	18%
b. Student standardized test scores	69%	31%	46%	54%
c. Student grades	89%	11%	70%	30%
d. Student course enrollment histories	93%	7%	73%	27%
e. Student demographics	94%	6%	78%	22%
f. Teacher qualifications	49%	51%	23%	77%
g. Teacher professional development	43%	57%	21%	79%
h. Special Education information	92%	8%	62%	38%
i. Participation in educational programs (i.e. innovative classroom curricula, after school learning programs, tutoring, etc.)	37%	63%	26%	74%
j. Other: Please Describe (e.g., student medical information; hardware inventory and maintenance, customer service, and usage profiles)._____	3%	97%	97%	3%

[11] An interoperable data system or framework is one that allows for the seamless and efficient electronic exchange of data within a school or district.

34. Who can access these data?

Type of Person who can access data	YES	NO
a. Local school administrators	99%	1%
b. Other school administrators	45%	55%
c. Local district administrators	93%	7%
d. Other district administrators	44%	56%
e. Teachers (school-wide)	62%	38%
f. Parents	19%	81%
g. Researchers	12%	88%
h. General public	3%	97%
i. Other: Please Describe (e.g., nurses and counselors; students)._____ _____	7%	93%

35. Does your district perform the following activities *using an electronic data management system*? If yes, please indicate which activities were supported with formula and/or competitive EETT funds.

Activity	If Activity is Performed		If Supported by EETT Funds	
	YES	**NO**	**YES**	**NO**
a. Tracking student test scores by school.	74%	26%	10%	90%
b. Tracking student graduation rates by school.	59%	41%	5%	95%
c. Tracking other measures of student progress.	80%	20%	19%	81%
d. Using data to inform student placement in courses or special programs.	69%	31%	9%	91%
e. Informing parents about student progress.	63%	37%	9%	91%
f. Using data to inform curriculum changes.	61%	39%	17%	83%
g. Using data to evaluate teacher performance.	28%	72%	3%	97%
h. Using data to evaluate promising classroom practices.	41%	59%	16%	84%
i. Using data to inform professional development offerings.	54%	46%	21%	79%
j. Using data to inform resource allocation.	45%	55%	6%	94%
k. Using data for other purposes. Please explain. _____	5%	95%	1%	99%

Part VII: Infrastructure Inventory

36. In your district, please **estimate** the total number of computers that are located within classrooms or instructional settings (i.e. libraries, media centers, laboratories, etc.).

    924.74 number of computers in classrooms or instructional settings (average)

37. In your district, please **estimate** the total number of LAN/Internet-accessible computers located within classrooms or instructional settings.

    877.03 number of LAN/internet accessible computers in classrooms or instructional settings (average)

38. Please **estimate** the total number of classrooms or instructional areas in your district.

    217.65 number of classrooms in district (average)

Part VIII: Respondent Background (for all LEAs)

39. Which of the following most closely describes your job title? Check as many as apply.

- 18% ☐ District Superintendent
- 11% ☐ Assistant Superintendent
- 35% ☐ Technology Coordinator
- 13% ☐ Instructional Technology Coordinator
- 10% ☐ Division Director
- 17% ☐ Principal
- 7% ☐ Teacher
- 1% ☐ Researcher/Evaluator
- 5% ☐ Professional Development Specialist
- 7% ☐ Finance Officer
- 16% ☐ Other

40. Is your primary responsibility to serve as a technology coordinator?

- 36% ☐ Yes
- 64% ☐ No

41. How long have you been in your current job? 6.84 number of years

Appendix B: NETTS Teacher Survey

Results by Question

OMB No. 1875-0233 Approval expires 11/30/2007

U.S. Department of Education
National Educational Technology Trends Study:
Teacher Survey

Introduction

This Teacher Survey is part of the National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS), the official federal evaluation of the Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) program authorized under Title IID of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The evaluation of the EETT program includes surveys of teachers in approximately 850 districts across the country. Participation of EETT (Title II) districts and their schools in this study is required under Section 9306 (a)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The majority of the Teacher Survey items focus on your use of technology during the last full school year, 2004–2005. It asks about the technology-related professional development activities in which you participated, your access to and use of technology for instruction, the factors that facilitated or impeded your use of technology, and the changes in teaching and learning that may have occurred as a result of your and your students' use of technology.

Thank you, in advance, for your expertise and time needed for the success of the study.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this survey is 1875-0233.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average about 35 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1875-0233, Washington, DC 20503.

This project is being conducted under Section 2404(b)(2) and Section 2421(a) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (*NCLB*, Public Law 107-110). Your cooperation is needed to make the results of the study comprehensive, accurate, and timely. Additionally, grantees are required by law to cooperate with federal evaluations under the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR Section 76.591). The information you provide is being collected for research purposes only and will be kept strictly confidential.

I. TEACHING BACKGROUND

1. What was the grade level of the students you taught in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**
   (all teachers: n=4935).

Multiple grade levels – Elementary: **6.0%**	1st: **10.0%**	5th: **6.4%**	9th: **2.4%**	Ungraded: **0.3%**
Multiple grade levels - Jr. High or Middle School: **4.0%**	2nd: **8.9%**	6th: **5.6%**	10th: **1.0%**	
Multiple grade levels - High School: **17.1%**	3rd: **9.8%**	7th: **4.2%**	11th: **1.9%**	
Kindergarten: **9.3%**	4th: **7.8%**	8th: **4.2%**	12th: **1.2%**	

2. In what subject was your **primary** teaching assignment in school year 2004–2005? Mark the box for that subject in the list below. If you taught more than one subject in 2004–2005, mark "No primary affiliation with a single subject." **(Mark one.)**

No primary affiliation with a single subject (e.g., self-contained classroom): **51.8%**

Reading/Language Arts/English: **14.2%**

History/Social Studies: **9.7%**

Mathematics**: 11.7%**

Science: **9.3%**

Art/Music: **0.0%**

Vocational Field: **0.1%**

Health/Physical Education: **0.1%**

Special Education: **1.5%**

English as a Second Language: **0.4%**

Computers or Technology: **0.1%**

Foreign/World Languages: **0.1**%

Other, please specify: **1.0**%

3. In addition to your primary duties, did you have any **secondary** teaching assignments in school year 2004–2005?

Yes: **14.4%** ***(Continue with question 4.)*** No: **85.6%** ***(Skip to question 5)***

4. Mark the subject(s) for your **secondary** teaching assignment(s) in school year 2004–2005 in the list below. **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Reading/Language Arts/English: **21.9%**
b. History/Social Studies: **20.4%**
c. Mathematics: **13.0%**
d. Science: **17.0%**
e. Art/Music: **1.4%**
f. Vocational Field: **2.9%**
g. Health/Physical Education: **5.3%**
h. Special Education: **3.9%**
i. English as a Second Language: **4.3%**
j. Computers or Technology: **11.9%**
k. Foreign/World Languages: **1.4**%
l. Other, please specify: **26.6%**

5. What type(s) of teaching certificate(s) did you hold in the state where you taught in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark all that apply.)**

   a. Regular or standard state or advanced professional certificate: **91.9%**

   b. Probationary certificate (the initial certificate issued after satisfying all requirements except the completion of a probationary period): **2.9%**

   c. Provisional or other type of certificate given to persons who are still participating in what the state calls an "alternative certification program": **3.1%**

   d. Temporary certificate (requires some additional college coursework and/or other student teaching before regular certification can be obtained): **0.8%**

   e. Emergency certificate or waiver (issued to persons with insufficient teacher preparation who must complete a regular certification program in order to continue teaching): **0.2%**

   f. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certificate**: 2.0%**

   g. Specific certificate for teaching bilingual, multicultural, limited-English, or special education students**: 6.5%**

   h. No certificate **(Skip to Question 7): 0.2 %**

6. In what subject(s) did you hold a certificate in the state where you taught in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark all that apply.)**

   a. No primary affiliation with a single subject (e.g., self-contained classroom): **55.6%**

   b. Reading/Language Arts/English: **19.0%**

   c. History/Social Studies: **14.7%**

   d. Mathematics: **13.1%**

   e. Science: **11.4%**

   f. Art/Music: **1.4%**

   g. Vocational Field**: 1.0%**

   h. Health/Physical Education**: 3.1%**

   i. Special Education: **5.7%**

   j. English as a Second Language: **4.3%**

   k. Computers or Technology: **1.3%**

   l. Foreign/World Languages: **1.1%**

   m. Other, please specify: **8.5%**

7. What was the highest degree you held in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**

   Associate degree: **0.2%**

   Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., B.E., etc.): **52.7%**

   Master's degree (M.A., M.A.T., M.B.A., M.Ed., M.S., etc.): **42.0%**

   Education specialist or professional diploma (at least one year beyond master's level): **4.5%**

   Doctorate or first professional degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.): **0.6%**

   Did not have a degree beyond a high school Diploma: **0.0%**

8. How would you classify your teaching position in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**

   Full-time: **98.0%** Part-time: **2.0%**

9. Including this school year (2005–2006), how many years have you worked either as a FULL-TIME or at least a HALF-TIME elementary, middle, or secondary school teacher? **(Mark one.)**

0-2 years: **2.9%**
3-5 years: **14.2%**
6-8 years: **16.1%**
9+ years: **66.8%**

10. Did you teach in your current school during the majority of school year 2004–2005? (Please answer "No" if your primary responsibility in 2004–2005 was as a teacher substitute.)

Yes: **99.6%** *(**Continue with question 11.**)*

No: **0.4%** ***(Skip to questions 56 and 57 on page 20).***

II. ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY AND SUPPORT

11. Were the following technologies available to you and/or your students in school year 2004–2005? For each technology, please indicate whether the item was available in your classroom and/or in a computer/media center or other area. Also indicate whether the technology was available to teachers and/or students. **(Mark all that apply.)**

	In your classroom		In a center or other area		
	For teacher use	For student use	For teacher use	For student use	Not available
Computers and Connectivity					
a. Desktop computer	**91.6%**	**70.3%**	**65.5%**	**76.3%**	**0.9%**
b. Laptop computer	**26.2%**	**10.4%**	**26.6%**	**23.2%**	**47.4%**
c. Personal digital devices (e.g., PDA, tablet computer, or AlphaSmart/DANA)	**7.9%**	**5.3%**	**10.2%**	**11.4%**	**76.6%**
d. Technologies specific to your content area (e.g., Geometer's Sketchpad, probeware**)**	**16.2%**	**10.7%**	**13.5%**	**12.3%**	**74.2%**
e. Internet access via telephone modem	**36.8%**	**24.7%**	**25.8%**	**27.7%**	**60.7%**
f. High-speed Internet access (e.g., through a cable modem or DSL)	**76.5%**	**54.0%**	**56.7%**	**62.5%**	**18.8%**
g. School intranet access (i.e., electronic communication exclusively within the school)	**69.0%**	**21.9%**	**44.7%**	**24.8%**	**27.1%**
Computer Peripherals and Software					
h. Printers	**77.2%**	**48.5%**	**73.9%**	**72.3%**	**1.0%**
i. CD-ROM or DVD drive	**87.9%**	**56.9%**	**65.6%**	**64.4%**	**4.2%**
j. A device to project a computer screen for class viewing (LCD projector)	**33.9%**	**9.4%**	**62.3%**	**19.0%**	**19.8%**
k. Digital photography and/or video equipment	**30.2%**	**8.9%**	**65.6%**	**22.6%**	**17.6%**
l. Word processing software	**91.2%**	**60.4%**	**69.4%**	**71.4%**	**2.3%**
m. Spreadsheet software (e.g., Excel)	**85.7%**	**41.6%**	**63.4%**	**54.3%**	**6.4%**
n. Statistical analysis software (e.g., SPSS)	**16.5%**	**4.9%**	**16.8%**	**8.5%**	**75.8%**
o. Presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)	**75.7%**	**41.6%**	**67.0%**	**57.0%**	**8.4%**
p. Database software (e.g., Access)	**50.1%**	**18.3%**	**40.1%**	**26.1%**	**39.8%**
q. Software for grading	**74.5%**	**2.5%**	**41.2%**	**3.6%**	**19.7%**
r. Software for classroom management (e.g., Blackboard)	**27.7%**	**4.1%**	**18.6%**	**5.1%**	**67.4%**
s. Software for instruction in math and/or reading	**54.4%**	**43.1%**	**50.5%**	**51.5%**	**21.8%**
t. Software for instruction in other subjects	**43.7%**	**32.2%**	**44.4%**	**41.5%**	**32.3%**
u. Multimedia editing or authoring tools (e.g., HyperStudio)	**30.1%**	**16.6%**	**35.9%**	**28.3%**	**50.0%**
v. E-mail software	**88.1%**	**14.1%**	**54.9%**	**18.9%**	**7.2%**
w. Internet search tools	**89.5%**	**52.4%**	**67.3%**	**64.2%**	**3.9%**
x. Web page creation software (e.g., Dreamweaver)	**32.2%**	**8.3%**	**36.7%**	**21.0%**	**49.4%**

12. In school year 2004–2005, approximately how many computers were available for students in **your classroom**? **(Mark one.)**

The computer for each student: **4.2%**

One computer for every two students: **2.4%**

One computer for every three students**: 3.0%**

One computer for every four students: **6.4%**

One computer for every five or more students: **63.4%**

Did not have computers in your classroom: **20.6%**

13. In school year 2004–2005, approximately how many computers were available for your students in the **computer/media center** or other area you commonly used? **(Mark one.)**

Did not have a computer/media center or other area with computers in the school**: 3.0%**

One computer for each student**: 71.2%**

One computer for every two students**: 9.3%**

One computer for every three students**: 2.7%**

One computer for every four students**: 2.0%**

One computer for every five or more students**: 5.8%**

Did not use a school computer lab or media center**: 6.0%**

14. In school year 2004–2005, how often did you get helpful information on the use of educational technology for instruction from the following individuals? **(Mark one box per row.)**

Individual(s)	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more	Not applicable
a. Your **school** technology coordinator	**10.9%**	**45.4%**	**21.8%**	**13.3%**	**8.6%**
b. Your school library/media specialist	**25.1%**	**40.4%**	**18.3%**	**8.4%**	**7.8%**
c. Other teachers	**11.6%**	**53.8%**	**21.1%**	**11.5%**	**2.0%**
d. Your district technology specialist(s)	**30.9%**	**49.0%**	**11.6%**	**3.7%**	**4.9%**
e. Representative from a hardware or software vendor	**68.8%**	**16.9%**	**1.2%**	**0.1%**	**13.1%**
f. The Internet (i.e., a technical support Web site or chat room)	**55.2%**	**22.7%**	**7.0%**	**6.9%**	**8.2%**
g. Family and friends	**21.1%**	**48.9%**	**16.8%**	**10.6%**	**2.6%**
h. Students	**47.2%**	**36.4%**	**7.2%**	**4.5%**	**4.7%**

15. In school year 2004–2005, how often were the following types of technology-related support helpful to you? **(Mark one box per row.)**

Type of support	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more	Not applicable
a. Support with hardware, software, and the Internet	**14.1%**	**51.3%**	**15.2%**	**15.9%**	**3.5%**
b. Support integrating technology into instruction	**19.7%**	**50.0%**	**15.7%**	**10.1%**	**4.5%**
c. Support using technology for student assessment	**26.7%**	**44.7%**	**12.6%**	**10.1%**	**5.8%**
d. Help working with students as they use technology	**27.1%**	**41.2%**	**14.1%**	**12.9%**	**4.8%**

III. TECHNOLOGY-RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

16. To what extent were the following instructional components included in your pre-service teacher preparation program? **(Mark one box per row.)**

	Not at all	A little	A moderate amount	A lot
a. Instruction in the use of particular educational software programs or Web sites	**36.4%**	**37.3%**	**21.5%**	**4.9%**
b. Instruction on the use of e-mail, word processing, spreadsheet, and other common applications	**36.2%**	**35.5%**	**21.8%**	**6.6%**
c. Instruction on the effective use of educational technology	**34.1%**	**39.6%**	**21.0%**	**5.4%**
d. The requirement that pre-service teachers demonstrate proficiency using educational technology	**48.3%**	**28.7%**	**17.6%**	**5.4%**

17. Please indicate all formal technology-related professional development that you participated in or led during school year 2004–2005 and summer 2005. For each activity, please indicate the number of hours. ONLY report professional development activities in specific subject areas (e.g., teaching reading) if they included instruction on how to use educational technology in the particular subject. **(Mark one box per row.)**

	Did not participate	<4 hours	4-8 hours	9-32 hours	>32 hours	Not available
a. Traditional workshops or conference sessions on technology use, provided by or within the district	**23.2%**	**37.2%**	**20.9%**	**10.3%**	**1.6%**	**6.8%**
b. Traditional workshops or conference sessions in a specific subject area, provided by or within the district	**29.8%**	**28.2%**	**16.6%**	**10.3%**	**2.4%**	**12.8%**
c. Traditional workshops or conference sessions provided outside of the district	**62.6%**	**11.7%**	**8.6%**	**5.3%**	**1.4%**	**10.4%**
d. College course(s)	**76.4%**	**4.4%**	**3.5%**	**4.9%**	**4.7%**	**6.1%**
e. Online course(s)	**82.7%**	**3.7%**	**1.9%**	**2.6%**	**2.9%**	**6.2%**
f. Committee or task force	**65.7%**	**9.7%**	**6.3%**	**4.7%**	**1.7%**	**11.8%**
g. Technology-focused study group that meets regularly	**71.1%**	**4.3%**	**2.7%**	**1.4%**	**0.3%**	**20.2%**
h. Activities resulting from a partnership between your school and another school	**67.9%**	**5.0%**	**2.4%**	**0.7%**	**0.5%**	**23.4%**
i. Mentoring and/or peer observation and coaching as part of a formal arrangement	**61.6%**	**10.2%**	**3.0%**	**2.8%**	**2.6%**	**19.8%**
j. Observational visit to another school	**70.1%**	**5.2%**	**2.3%**	**0.1%**	**0.1%**	**22.3%**
k. Other, please specify:	**67.9%**	**0.9%**	**0.9%**	**1.5%**	**1.0%**	**27.8%**

If you answered "did not participate" for all professional development activities, skip to #22.

18. Which of the following types of incentives were available to you during school year 2004–2005 or summer 2005 for participation in technology-related professional development? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Release time from classes and/or other responsibilities**: 24.6%**

b. Scheduled time in contract for professional development**: 34.1%**

c. Stipends or tuition or fee reimbursement**: 27.8%**

d. Credits toward certification or recertification: **31.7%**

e. Salary increments or pay increases**: 9.3%**

f. Recognition or higher ratings on an annual teacher evaluation**: 6.5%**

g. Additional resources for you or your classroom (e.g., hardware, software)**: 22.4%**

h. Option to use new school technology**: 21.0%**

i. Free products from vendors**: 7.4%**

j. Other, please specify: **3.8%**

k. None of the above: **17.4%**

19. Considering all of the professional development activities in which you participated during school year 2004–2005 and summer 2005, did any of them have the following topics as a major focus? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Basic computer skills**: 23.0%**

b. Use of technology for new methods of teaching (e.g., cooperative learning)**: 24.0%**

c. Using technology to enhance student learning in math and/or reading**: 39.8%**

d. Using technology to enhance student learning in other subject(s)**: 26.6%**

e. Improving students' technology literacy**: 16.2%**

f. Using technology to design or administer student assessments**: 28.7%**

g. Using technology for curriculum development and lesson planning: **34.9%**

h. Using technology for grading: **39.5%**

i. Using technology for classroom management: **10%**

j. Using technology to meet the needs of students with disabilities or limited English proficiency**: 10.4%**

k. Using software to tailor tasks to individual student ability**: 12.6%**

l. Developing proficiency with online teaching**: 3.8%**

m. Effective/ethical use of the Internet**: 15.2%**

20. Think about the most useful technology-related teacher professional development activity in which you participated during school year 2004–2005 and summer 2005. Which of the following characterized that activity? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. It was directly related to the content you taught**: 46.0%**

b. It addressed different levels of teachers' knowledge, skills, and interests**: 34.4%**

c. Topics received detailed coverage: **16.3%**

d. It was delivered over multiple sessions (not a one-time experience)**: 28.8%**

e. It was followed by planning time during the workday to implement new practices in the classroom**: 13.6%**

f. It was consistent with the technology goals in your district**: 39.7%**

g. It included other members of your school community**: 40%**

h. It was delivered during school hours (i.e., substitutes were provided for you to attend)**: 26.5%**

i. It was delivered during evening/weekend hours**: 19.1%**

j. It was planned or developed with input from teachers in your district**: 20.5%**

k. It provided an opportunity for meaningful engagement with colleagues and materials:**35.6%**

l. It was designed so that teachers who attended were encouraged or expected to teach what they learned to other teachers in their schools**: 19.5%**

m. Other, please specify (e.g., It provided training on grading software; it aided in communication with parents; it counted toward a degree): **7.1%**[12]

[12] The parenthetical statements included in the sub-items referring to "other" categories are provided as illustrations of the types of responses received from respondents. The examples provided do not necessarily include all of the most common responses nor do they reflect the full range of responses. These are included in this summary to give the reader a general sense of the types of responses received.

21. Which of the following **increased substantially** as a result of the technology-related professional development activities in which you participated during school year 2004–2005 and summer 2005? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Your integration of technology into math and/or reading instruction**: 32.8%**

b. Your integration of technology into instruction on other subjects**: 25.9%**

c. Your knowledge about computers in general**: 46.7%**

d. Your use of computers in general**: 49%**

e. Your use of technology for curriculum development and lesson planning**: 35.3%**

f. Your development of computer-based activities for student use**: 32.1%**

g. Your use of new teaching methods involving technology (e.g., online projects, simulations)**:**

23.7%

h. Your use of technology to teach basic skills and facts through drills, tutorials, and learning games**: 25.4%**

i. Your use of technology to individualize instruction**: 20.5%**

j. The effectiveness of your classroom management strategies during students' technology use**: 9.4%**

k. Your use of computers to find resources such as lesson plans on the Internet**: 36.4%**

l. Your use of technology in student assessment: **28.4%**

m. Other, please specify (e.g., Your ability to use grading software; your ability to communicate with parents, students, and colleagues; your use of calculators, PDA's, and other handheld devices): **6.7%**

22. On which of the following topics would you like additional professional development? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Basic computer skills**: 18.4%**

b. Use of technology for new methods of teaching (e.g., cooperative learning)**: 43** %

c. Using technology to enhance student learning in math and/or reading**: 52.1%**

d. Using technology to enhance student learning in other subject(s)**: 36.1%**

e. Improving students' technology literacy**: 31.6%**

f. Using technology to design or administer student assessments**: 36.2%**

g. Using technology for curriculum development and lesson planning**: 36.8%**

h. Using technology for grading**: 25.2%**

i. Using technology for classroom management: **27.1%**

j. Using technology to meet the needs of students with disabilities or limited English proficiency**: 32.5%**

k. Using software to tailor tasks to individual student ability: **42.9%**

l. Developing proficiency with online teaching**: 19.3%**

m. Effective/ethical use of the Internet**: 17.4%**

The next question refers to informal technology-related professional development activities. "Informal" refers to activities not led or planned by an individual or group, not scheduled in advance, and that require no commitment to participate for a specific time period.

23. During school year 2004–2005 or summer 2005, did you participate in any of the following types of **informal** technology-related professional development activities? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Read educational journals or other professional publications**: 39.9%**

b. Used computer-based resources such as CD-ROM, online course, or other Web-based Resources**: 48.9%**

c. Informally worked with teacher peers, family, or friends on skills related to technology in teaching**: 60.6%**

d. Participated in a teacher collaborative or network**: 16.2%**

e. Visited a teacher resource center or professional development center**: 17.2%**

f. Consulted with a subject matter specialist: **17.9%**

IV. TECHNOLOGY USE BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

24. During school year 2004–2005, how often did you use technology in the following ways? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once week or more
a.	To develop curricula or assignments in math and/or reading	**26.1%**	**31.8%**	**18.4%**	**23.7%**
b.	To develop curricula or assignments in other subjects	**31.9%**	**29.4%**	**18.3%**	**20.5%**
c.	To present math and/or reading concepts to your students	**34.5%**	**33.0%**	**17.0%**	**15.5%**
d.	To deliver instruction in other subjects	**44.5%**	**28.3$**	**15.2%**	**12.0%**
e.	To create tests or quizzes	**18.2%**	**23.5%**	**27.4%**	**30.9%**
f.	To test students	**45.9%**	**25.4%**	**14.8%**	**14.0%**
g.	To collaborate with experts or teachers in other locations	**58.1%**	**27.1$**	**8.3%**	**6.5%**
h.	To adapt instructional activities to students' individual needs	**38.6%**	**37.6%**	**14.0%**	**9.8%**
i.	To do research and lesson planning using the Internet	**13.5%**	**30.9%**	**28.0%**	**27.6%**
j.	To create and maintain Web pages for your class	**76.9%**	**10.7%**	**4.4%**	**8.0%**
k.	To post homework assignments or schedule information on the Web	**75.3%**	**8.1%**	**4.5%**	**12.2%**
l.	To maintain student grades	**34.3%**	**6.7%**	**7.5%**	**51.5%**
m.	To prepare or maintain Individualized Education Plans (IEPs)	**81.1%**	**10.5%**	**4.7%**	**3.8%**
n.	To e-mail teachers in your school	**10.8%**	**13.7%**	**11.9%**	**63.6%**
o.	To e-mail school and district administrators	**16.9%**	**22.3%**	**21.6%**	**39.3%**
p.	To e-mail students	**67.3%**	**18.4%**	**8.7%**	**5.6%**
q.	To increase parental and family involvement	**35.6%**	**27.4%**	**18.9%**	**18.1%**
r.	To participate in professional online communities	**75.1%**	**16.4%**	**5.7%**	**2.9%**

25. By the end of school year 2004–2005, how skillful were you in using the following technologies? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Not at all	A little	Moderately	Very
a.	Computers in general	**0.2%**	**8.2%**	**55.1%**	**36.5%**
b.	Personal digital devices (e.g., PDA, tablet computer, or AlphaSmart/DANA)	**65.1%**	**17.3%**	**12.3%**	**5.4%**
c.	Technologies specific to your content area (e.g., Geometer's Sketchpad, probeware)	**60.9%**	**20.1%**	**13.6%**	**5.4%**
d.	Digital photography and/or video equipment	**21.6%**	**36.2%**	**38.4%**	**13.9%**
e.	Word processing software	**4.0%**	**10.2%**	**35.3%**	**50.6%**
f.	Spreadsheet software (e.g., Excel)	**20.7%**	**30.7%**	**28.9%**	**19.7%**
g.	Statistical analysis software (e.g., SPSS)	**79.1%**	**13.9%**	**5.0%**	**2.0%**
h.	Presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)	**24.2%**	**29.6%**	**24.9%**	**21.4%**
i.	Database software (e.g., Access)	**62.8%**	**21.2%**	**10.9%**	**5.1%**
j.	Software for grading	**31.2%**	**11.8%**	**19.3%**	**37.7%**
k.	Software for classroom management (e.g., Blackboard)	**72.6%**	**15.6%**	**7.1%**	**4.7%**
l.	Software for math and/or reading instruction	**29.8%**	**30.5%**	**27.2%**	**12.6%**
m.	Software for instruction on other subjects	**40.0%**	**30.2%**	**20.7%**	**9.1%**
n.	Multimedia editing or authoring tools (e.g., HyperStudio)	**67.3%**	**21.2%**	**7.6%**	**3.9%**
o.	E-mail software	**10.3%**	**15.6%**	**30.5%**	**43.6%**
p.	Internet search tools	**5.1%**	**14.2%**	**36.5%**	**44.3%**
q.	Web page creation software (e.g., Dreamweaver)	**66.2%**	**19.9%**	**9.2%**	**4.7%**

26. To what extent did you use technology during school year 2004–2005 for the following general purposes? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Not at all	A little	A moderate amount	A lot
a.	Plan instruction	**14.0%**	**30.1%**	**30.2%**	**25.7%**
b.	Deliver instruction	**25.4%**	**41.7%**	**22.6%**	**10.2%**
c.	Organize the instructional environment	**33.1%**	**38.2%**	**18.7%**	**10.1%**
d.	Assess student performance	**28.2%**	**32.2%**	**22.6%**	**17.0%**

27. During school year 2004–2005, to how often did you require your students to use the following technologies? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a.	Computers in general	**6.9%**	**25.5%**	**22.7%**	**44.8%**
b.	Personal digital devices (e.g., PDA, tablet computer, or AlphaSmart/DANA)	**89.9%**	**6.4%**	**2.4%**	**1.3%**
c.	Technologies specific to your content area (e.g., Geometer's Sketchpad, probeware)	**81.7%**	**10.7%**	**4.9%**	**2.6%**
d.	Digital photography and/or video equipment	**75.9%**	**19.4%**	**3.8%**	**0.9%**
e.	Word processing software	**30.0%**	**33.1%**	**24.5%**	**12.5%**
f.	Spreadsheet software (e.g., Excel)	**81.7%**	**13.7%**	**3.8%**	**0.8%**
g.	Statistical analysis software (e.g., SPSS)	**96.3%**	**3.0%**	**0.5%**	**0.3%**
h.	Presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)	**65.0%**	**25.1%**	**8.5%**	**1.4%**
i.	Database software (e.g., Access)	**94.5%**	**4.4%**	**0.8%**	**0.3%**
j.	Classroom management software (e.g., Blackboard)	**94.3%**	**3.0%**	**1.0%**	**1.7%**
k.	Software for math and/or reading instruction	**39.5%**	**21.0%**	**15.3%**	**24.2%**
l.	Software for instruction on other subjects	**54.5%**	**24.2%**	**12.7%**	**8.6%**
m.	Multimedia editing or authoring tools (e.g., HyperStudio)	**86.8%**	**9.1%**	**3.1%**	**1.1%**
n.	E-mail software	**78.7%**	**13.1%**	**4.7%**	**3.6%**
o.	Internet search tools	**33.7%**	**30.9%**	**24.8%**	**10.6%**
p.	Web page creation software (e.g., Dreamweaver)	**95.5%**	**3.5%**	**0.6%**	**0.4%**

28. How often did your 2004–2005 students use technology in the following ways? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a.	Practice or review math and/or reading topics	**25.6%**	**25.6%**	**17.9%**	**30.9%**
b.	Practice or review topics in other subjects	**35.6%**	**35.2%**	**17.1%**	**12.1%**
c.	Extend math and/or reading learning with enrichment activities	**29.2%**	**29.8%**	**20.5%**	**20.6%**
d.	Extend learning in other subjects with enrichment activities	**37.2%**	**35.7%**	**17.6%**	**9.4%**
e.	Communicate electronically about academic content with experts, peers, and/or others	**74.8%**	**15.5%**	**5.1%**	**4.7%**
f.	Solve real-world problems (i.e. those involving situations, issues, and tasks that people actually tackle in the outside world)	**67.1%**	**24.0%**	**6.3%**	**2.7%**
g.	Produce media, Web, or presentation products	**67.6%**	**24.6%**	**6.1%**	**1.7%**
h.	Conduct online research	**34.6%**	**37.0%**	**21.5%**	**6.9%**
i.	Visually represent or investigate concepts (e.g., through concept mapping, graphing, reading charts)	**58.2%**	**28.6%**	**9.4%**	**3.8%**
j.	Take tests or quizzes using a computer	**50.1%**	**22.0%**	**11.5%**	**16.5%**
k.	Prepare for standardized tests	**61.6%**	**23.0%**	**9.1%**	**6.3%**
l.	Participate in formal distance learning via the Internet or other interactive media	**90.4%**	**6.6%**	**2.2%**	**0.8%**
m.	Improve their technology literacy	**40.7%**	**33.5%**	**15.4%**	**10.5%**
n.	Create products that had real-world audiences	**78.9%**	**15.9%**	**4.1%**	**1.0%**
o.	Work cooperatively or collaboratively with other students	**41.3%**	**35.8%**	**14.6%**	**8.3%**
p.	Work with content in multiple disciplines	**62.6%**	**26.8%**	**8.0%**	**2.7%**
q.	Use inquiry-based strategies (i.e., asking and answering questions using multiple sources)	**62.9%**	**25.1%**	**8.6%**	**3.4%**
r.	Use authentic tools (i.e., the tools that professionals use in their fields)	**76.3%**	**17.5%**	**4.1%**	**2.1%**

We are also interested in learning about which specific software packages are used in selected grades. During the 2004–2005 school year, if you taught 1st grade, 4th grade, 6th grade, or algebra, please answer the questions below about your instruction and use of software. Respond only to those sections addressing the classes you taught or facilitated.

If you did not teach 1st grade, 4th grade, 6th grade, or algebra in 2004–2005, skip to question 45.

29. Did you teach reading to 1st graders in school year 2004–2005?

Yes	(***Continue with question 30.***)	**13.8%**
No	(***Skip to question 33.***)	**86.3%**

30. For how many months did you teach reading to 1st graders in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**

1 - 3 months	**0.6%**	7 - 9 months	**54.0%**
4 - 6 months	**1.8%**	10 + months	**43.6%**

31. During these months, how many hours of formal reading instruction did a typical student receive in a typical week? **(Mark one.)**

Less than 3 hours	**2.9%**
At least 3 hours, but less than 5 hours	**18.3%**
At least 5 hours, but less than 7 hours	**21.1%**
7 or more hours	**57.7%**

32. Please indicate which, if any, of the following products you used with at least one of your Grade 1 reading groups or classes during school year 2004–2005 and how often you used the products. If you used any of the products in more than one Grade 1 reading group or class, please report on the **average per student use across all groups or classes in which you used them. (Mark one box per row.)**

		Didn't have product	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a.	Academy of Reading, AutoSkill International, Inc.	**95.9%**	**2.7%**	**0.5%**	**0.5%**	**0.5%**
b.	Destination Reading, Riverdeep, Inc.	**96.5%**	**1.9%**	**0.2%**	**0.1%**	**1.3%**
c.	Waterford Early Reading Program, Pearson Digital Learning	**93.8%**	**1.3%**	**1.0%**	**0.6%**	**3.4%**
d.	Headsprout Early Reading, Headsprout	**97.9%**	**1.7%**	**0.2%**	**N/A**	**0.2%**
e.	PLATO Focus, PLATO Learning, Inc.	**96.2%**	**2.7%**	**0.5%**	**0.5%**	**0.1%**
f.	Other, please describe: (e.g., Accelerated Reader, Wiggle Works, Starfall)	**57.5%**	**2.1%**	**1.2%**	**4.1%**	**35.1%**

33. Did you teach reading to 4th graders in school year 2004–2005?

Yes	*(**Continue with question 34.**)*	**11.4%**
No	*(**Skip to question 37.**)*	**88.7%**

34. For how many months did you teach reading to 4th graders in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**

1 - 3 months	**1.6%**
4 - 6 months	**3.2%**
7 - 9 months	**53.1%**
10 + months	**42.2%**

35. During these months, how many hours of reading instruction did a typical student receive in a typical week? **(Mark one.)**

Less than 3 hours	**3.6%**
At least 3 hours, but less than 5 hours	**12.8%**
At least 5 hours, but less than 7 hours	**40.7%**
7 or more hours	**42.9%**

36. Please indicate which, if any, of the following products you used with at least one of your Grade 4 reading groups or classes during school year 2004–2005 and how often you used the products. If you used any of the products in more than one Grade 4 reading group or class, please report on the **average per student use across all groups or classes in which you used them. (Mark one box per row.)**

	Didn't have product	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a. Academy of Reading, AutoSkill International, Inc.	**96.2%**	**1.6%**	**0.4%**	**1.0%**	**0.9%**
b. Read 180, Scholastic Inc.	**90.5%**	**2.4%**	**1.2%**	**1.0%**	**4.9%**
c. KnowledgeBox, Pearson Digital Learning	**97.5%**	**2.0%**	**0.4%**	**0.0%**	**N/A**
d. LeapTrack, LeapFrog SchoolHouse	**93.3%**	**2.2%**	**0.9%**	**1.3%**	**2.4%**
e. Other, please describe: (e.g., Accelerated Reader, Reading Counts, Success Maker).	**51.8%**	**3.1%**	**6.4%**	**4.4%**	**34.3%**

37. Did you teach math to 6th graders in school year 2004–2005?

Yes	***(Continue with question 38.)***	**4.2%**
No	***(Skip to question 41.)***	**95.8%**

38. For how many months did you teach math to 6th graders in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**

1 - 3 months	**3.6%**
4 - 6 months	**0.8%**
7 - 9 months	**58.5%**
10 + months	**37.2%**

39. During these months, how many hours of mathematics instruction did a typical student receive in a typical week? **(Mark one.)**

Less than 3 hours	**7.5%**
At least 3 hours, but less than 5 hours	**31.7%**
At least 5 hours, but less than 7 hours	**42.0%**
7 or more hours	**18.8%**

40. Please indicate which, if any, of the following products you used with at least one of your Grade 6 math groups or classes during school year 2004–2005 and how often you used the products. If you used any of the products in more than one Grade 6 math group or class, please report on the **average per student use in all groups or classes in which you used them.** **(Mark one box per row.)**

	Didn't have product	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a. SmartMath, CompuTaught, Inc.	**92.9%**	**5.3%**	**0.6%**	**1.2%**	**N/A**
b. Achieve Now, PLATO Learning, Inc.	**90.7%**	**5.5%**	**2.8%**	**0.3%**	**0.8%**
c. Larson's Prealgebra, Larson Learning, Inc.	**92.2%**	**7.4%**	**0.1%**	**0.1%**	**0.3%**
d. Other, please describe: (e.g., Accelerated Math, Success Maker).	**49.4%**	**11.4%**	**9.5%**	**9.6%**	**20.2%**

41. Did you teach algebra in school year 2004–2005?

Yes	***(Continue with question 42.)***	**11.7%**
No	***(Skip to question 45.)***	**88.3%**

→

42. For how many months did you teach algebra in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**

1 - 3 months	**26.2%**
4 - 6 months	**6.3%**
7 - 9 months	**32.0%**
10 + months	**35.6%**

43. During these months, how many hours of algebra instruction did a typical student receive in a typical week? **(Mark one.)**

Less than 3 hours	**19.4%**
At least 3 hours, but less than 5 hours	**48.1%**
At least 5 hours, but less than 7 hours	**23.2%**
7 or more hours	**9.3%**

44. Please indicate which, if any, of the following products you used with at least one of your algebra groups or classes during school year 2004–2005 and how often you used the products. If you used any of the products in more than one algebra group or class, please report on the **average per student use across all groups or classes in which you used them. (Mark one box per row.)**

		Didn't have product	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a.	Cognitive Tutor, Carnegie Learning, Inc.	**96.8%**	**1.7%**	**0.4%**	**0.1%**	**0.9%**
b.	Algebra, PLATO Learning, Inc.	**91.3%**	**4.2%**	**2.2%**	**1.0%**	**1.3%**
c.	Larson's Algebra, Larson Learning, Inc.	**93.6%**	**3.2%**	**2.3%**	**0.4%**	**0.6%**
d.	Other, please describe:	**69.4%**	**5.3%**	**8.1%**	**5.1%**	**12.1%**

V. POTENTIAL VALUE OF TECHNOLOGY

45. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about educational technology? **(Mark one box per row.)**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
a. Formal professional development can improve teachers' use of educational technology	**3.1%**	**1.0%**	**3.4%**	**52.1%**	**40.4**%
b. Educational technology can be used to improve instructional practice	**3.1%**	**1.0%**	**6.1%**	**54.5%**	**35.4%**
c. Educational technology can be used to improve teachers' subject matter knowledge	**3.2%**	**1.4%**	**8.7%**	**53.6%**	**33.1%**
d. Educational technology can be used to improve student learning	**3.2%**	**0.5%**	**3.9%**	**53.2%**	**39.1%**
e. Educational technology can be used to students' performance on standardized tests	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
f. Educational technology can be used to narrow the achievement gap between traditionally underserved and other students	**3.2%**	**4.4%**	**25.1%**	**43.1%**	**24.2%**

46. To what extent did educational technology improve your teaching in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one.)**

Not at all	**9.2%**
A little	**41.8%**
A moderate amount	**38.8%**
A lot	**10.2%**

VI. USE OF TECHNOLOGY-SUPPORTED DATABASES

47. In school year 2004–2005 and summer 2005, did you have access to an electronic data management system that provided you with student data?

Yes		**48.2%**
No	***(Skip to question 53.)***	**37.3%**
Don't know	***(Skip to question 53.)***	**14.5 %**

48. Who made this system available to you? **(Mark one.)**

Your state	**4.5%**	Don't know	**4.4%**
Your district	**75.4%**	Other, please specify (e.g., A regional	
Your school	**14.8%**	service director; a private company):	**1.0%**

49. What kinds of data and supports did you have access to through the electronic data management system(s)? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Standardized test scores by grade from 2003–04**: 46.8%**

b. Standardized test scores by grade from years prior to 2003–04**: 31.1%**

c. Standardized test scores by grade from 2004–2005**: 44%**

d. Standardized test scores from 2003–04 for individual students**: 37.1%**

e. Standardized test scores from years prior to 2003–04 for individual students**: 29.6%**

f. Standardized test scores from 2004–2005 for individual students**: 38.4%**

g. Attendance data**: 72.6%**

h. Student grade data**: 65.6%**

i. Course enrollment histories for students**: 21.7%**

j. Students' prior school(s) attended**: 14.6%**

k. Students' participation in supplementary education programs (e.g, tutoring)**: 6.2%**

l. Software for the analysis and interpretation of student data**: 16.6%**

m. Links between your students' assessment results and instructional resources tailored to their learning needs**: 11.4%**

n. Online instruction that your students could use**: 12.8%**

o. Online assessments that your students could use**: 16.3%**

p. Estimations of achievement of adequate yearly progress (AYP) **: 17.8%**

50. In school year 2004–2005, how often did you use an electronic data management system for each of the following purposes? **(Mark one box per row.)**

	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a. Used data to inform curriculum changes	**49.9%**	**33.1%**	**12.6%**	**4.3%**
b. Identified individual skill gaps for individual students so that you could give each student material tailored to his/her skill profile	**45.1%**	**34.5%**	**14.2%**	**6.2%**
c. Determined whether your class or individual students were ready to move on to the next instructional unit	**50.8%**	**28.9%**	**14.3%**	**6.1%**
d. Used data to evaluate promising classroom practices	**59.2%**	**25.7%**	**11.1%**	**4.1%**
e. Decided whether to give your students test-taking practice	**64.0%**	**22.0%**	**9.9%**	**4.1%**
f. Estimated whether your students would make adequate yearly progress (AYP)	**63.2%**	**23.7%**	**9.9%**	**3.2%**
g. Tracked standardized test scores by grade	**56.1%**	**31.6%**	**9.0%**	**3.3%**
h. Tracked individual student test scores	**35.1%**	**37.9%**	**16.0%**	**11.0%**
i. Tracked other measures of student progress	**39.9%**	**33.6%**	**14.7%**	**11.9%**
j. Used data to inform student placement in courses or special programs	**57.7%**	**28.9%**	**9.1%**	**4.3%**
k. Informed parents about student progress	**29.8%**	**34.4%**	**22.3%**	**13.5%**

51. In school year 2004–2005, how often did you work with an electronic data management system in the following contexts to make instructional decisions? **(Mark one box per row.)**

	Never	A few times	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more
a. On your own	**23.7%**	**37.3%**	**18.3%**	**20.7%**
b. Working with colleagues in your department or grade	**29.4%**	**47.6%**	**18.4%**	**4.7%**
c. As part of a district-level activity for your school staff	**42.5%**	**45.8%**	**9.3%**	**2.4%**
d. As part of a district-level activity with staff from other schools	**72.9%**	**22.0%**	**4.1%**	**1.1%**
e. In another setting. Please describe:	**95.4%**	**3.3%**	**0.9%**	**0.4%**

52. What kinds of support did you receive in 2004–2005 in using student data to guide decisions about instruction? **(Mark all that apply.)**

a. Professional development on data-driven decision making at your school**: 62.2%**

b. Professional development on data-driven decision making offered outside your school**:17.6%**

c. Support from a consultant or mentor teacher skilled in data analysis**: 27.5%**

d. Paid time set aside for examining student data and using the data to guide decisions about practice: **16.1%**

e. Your principal's encouragement for using data in instructional decision making**: 60.5%**

f. Formal coursework covering data-driven decision making**: 7.9%**

VII. SUPPORTS AND BARRIERS FOR TECHNOLOGY USE

53. How important were the following influences on your use of educational technology in 2004–2005? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Not at all	A little	Moderately	Very
a.	Other teachers shared examples of how they used computers with their students	**17.6%**	**37.2%**	**29.3%**	**15.9%**
b.	The fact that the district or school put computers in your classroom and administrators encouraged you to use them with your students	**24.1%**	**22.9%**	**27.6%**	**25.5%**
c.	The technology director and/or specialist demonstrated uses that you adapted to your classroom	**37.4%**	**31.5%**	**20.4%**	**10.7%**
d.	You worked with your colleagues to design lessons that required classroom use of computers	**47.9%**	**28.1%**	**16.2%**	**7.8%**
e.	Professional development workshops led by someone outside of the school demonstrated uses that you adapted to your classroom	**44.6%**	**31.5%**	**17.6%**	**6.3%**

54. To what extent were the following conditions **obstacles** to your use of technology in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Not at all	A little	A moderate amount	A lot	Not applicable
a.	Insufficient hardware (e.g., computers, peripheral devices) in labs or resource rooms	**30.1%**	**21.2%**	**17.9%**	**28.1%**	**2.7%**
b.	Insufficient hardware (e.g., computers, peripheral devices) in your classroom	**17.2%**	**19.7%**	**18.4%**	**42.7%**	**1.9%**
c.	Difficulty getting access to computers in labs or on carts	**34.3%**	**19.9%**	**17.3%**	**23.0%**	**5.5%**
d.	Out-of-date hardware	**34.7%**	**26.2%**	**15.2%**	**18.7%**	**5.2%**
e.	Lack of professional development that prepared you to use software					
f.	Lack of time to practice using software on which you received professional development	**26.3%**	**27.7%**	**19.7%**	**24.5%**	**1.9%**
g.	Inability to obtain software you wanted for your class	**15.6%**	**21.4%**	**19.2%**	**37.8%**	**6.1%**
h.	Insufficient or inadequate technical support for computer use	**31.2%**	**23.0%**	**16.5%**	**23.1%**	**6.2%**
i.	Your students' lack of technology skills	**29.8%**	**29.4%**	**18.1%**	**20.9%**	**1.8%**
j.	Difficulty making room for technology use, given the large amount of course material to cover in a year	**31.6%**	**37.8%**	**17.7%**	**9.8%**	**3.1%**
k.	Difficulty making technology relevant to your subject	**11.2%**	**15.8%**	**22.5%**	**47.7%**	**2.8%**
l.	Difficulty managing your class during computer use	**40.0%**	**29.5%**	**18.4%**	**9.1%**	**3.0%**
m.	Lack of emphasis on student technology literacy in standards and assessments	**53.6%**	**24.6%**	**9.2%**	**7.8%**	**4.8%**
n.	Slow and/or unreliable Internet connections	**39.1%**	**28.7%**	**15.5%**	**11.0%**	**5.8%**
o.	Lack of age-appropriate or educationally relevant software or Web sites	**41.2%**	**26.1%**	**14.3%**	**14.4%**	**4.0%**
p.	Lack of software products aligned with state standards	**40.4%**	**25.2%**	**16.4%**	**13.3%**	**4.6%**

55. How much emphasis did the following individuals place on the use of technology to support teaching and learning in school year 2004–2005? **(Mark one box per row.)**

		Not at all	A little	A moderate amount	A lot
a.	Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent	**24.4%**	**32.8%**	**29.4%**	**13.4%**
b.	Principal	**13.9%**	**31.5%**	**34.7%**	**19.9%**
c.	Department Head	**36.9%**	**28.2%**	**24.2%**	**10.7%**
d.	Yourself	**5.8%**	**34.9%**	**39.8%**	**19.5%**
e.	Other teachers	**18.1%**	**44.6%**	**31.8%**	**5.6%**
f.	Parents	**52.6%**	**35.4%**	**10.2%**	**1.9%**
g.	Students	**28.8%**	**39.7%**	**24.1%**	**7.4%**

VIII. TEACHER DEMOGRAPHICS

In closing, we would like to ask a few questions to ensure that we surveyed a representative sample of teachers.

56. Are you ...

Male	**19.7%**
Female	**80.3%**

57. How do you describe yourself? **(Mark one.)**

American Indian or Alaska Native (refers to someone who is from one of the American Indian tribes or is one of the original people of Alaska)	**0.8%**
Asian (refers to someone who is from a Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, or other Asian background)	**1.3%**
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (refers to someone who is from one of the Hawaiian or other Pacific Islands or is Filipino)	**0.5%**
Hispanic or Latino (refers to someone from a Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish, Hispanic or Latino background)	**4.8%**
Black or African American	**7.0%**
White	**83.9%**
Biracial or multiethnic	**1.0%**
Other	**0.9%**

You have now completed the National Educational Technology Trends Study Survey of Teachers. Thank you for your time!

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

www.ed.gov