

## Oakland Unified School District's Urban Dreams Technology Challenge Grant Overview of Project Evaluation Activities 2003-2004

The following is an overview of the major evaluation activities for each component area:

### **1. Student Academic Achievement and Technology Proficiency:**

*Objective 1.1 Language Arts and Social Studies:* By June of 2002, Oakland high school graduates who have participated in the Technology Integration Program for three years will demonstrate statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) pre and posttest gains in district, state and national performance standards in social studies and language arts as prescribed by NESIC and the California Frameworks Committees, and/or as measured in district and state assessments, including but not limited to the state-prescribed standardized assessment (Stanford Achievement Test 9).

*Objective 1.2 Technology Systems:* By June 2002, Oakland high school graduates who have participated in the Technology Innovation program for three years will demonstrate literacy and proficiency in the use of technological systems, operations, communications, research resources, problem-solving and decision-making tools as measured by pre- and post- program Likert-style questionnaires, projects produced, and a limited number of interviews and demonstrations.

*Evaluation Questions:* The evaluation questions for student academic achievement and technology proficiency are:

Do students (in the “experimental group”) who were enrolled in at least one course taught by a teacher who participated in the Urban Dreams program, on average, perform better on the CAT/6 subtests (reading, language arts, and social studies) and state content standards subtests (English language arts and history) than students who were not taught by such teachers (the “comparison” group)?

What is the correlation between program participation and standardized test scores?

Do students who perform better on the CAT/6 and state content standards subtests also self-report higher levels of technology proficiency?

Is there a statistically significant difference between the experimental and comparison groups’ standardized test performance after controlling for background factors (i.e., those that are not attributed to program impact) between groups that might influence the attainment of technology competencies (an intermediate outcome hypothesized to impact achievement) and/or represent a selection threat that gives one group an initial advantage with regard to standardized test performance?

Activities	Products	Timelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect student standardized testing data from the district for 2003 (fall 2003 – currently underway) and for 2004 (August 2004)</li> <li>• Development of a comparison group of district students based on teacher participation in UD professional development</li> <li>• Analysis of student assessment information</li> </ul>	Matched score (pre/post) analysis of changes for UD students; comparison of UD students with other non project students in the district	<p>Fall 2003</p> <p>August 2004</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modification and administration of student technology surveys of technology skills</li> <li>• Development of a comparison group of district students</li> <li>• Analysis of student survey of technology skills</li> </ul>	Matched score (pre/post) analysis of changes for UD students; comparison of UD students with other non project students in the district	<p>Fall 2003</p> <p>April through August 2004</p>

## **2. Professional Development:**

*Objective 2.1 Curriculum Development:* By June 2001 and annually thereafter, Oakland teachers who have participated in the Technology Integration Professional Development Program for at least two years will produce interdisciplinary, multicultural curricula reflecting the cultures and languages of Oakland’s student body through the themes of human and civil rights.

*Objective 2.2 Staff Development II:* By June 2002, 100% of social studies, language arts teachers and other staff members, as appropriate, working in project high schools will have completed year I staff education activities delineated in the “Technology Integration Professional Development Program.”

*Objective 2.3 Staff Development I:* By June 2001 and annually thereafter, each cohort of Oakland teachers who have participated in the Technology Integration Professional Development Program for at least two years will demonstrate augmented content knowledge in the disciplines of social sciences and literature, technology uses in the classroom, and constructivist pedagogy as assessed through pre-, post- and ongoing professional development surveys, and through participant-developed curriculum units, thematic lessons and demonstration lessons.

*Evaluation Questions:* Professional Development

To what extent did teachers participate in the project? Why did certain teachers choose not to participate?

How did teachers use the technology they were given? How did it affect their teaching?

What kind of activities (curricula) did the participating teachers develop?

To what extent did teachers use the recycled computers in their classrooms ?

How did the home computer program impact how teachers’ taught

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Products</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of a survey to be used with Cohort 1-4 teachers – the survey questions teachers about their technology proficiency and instructional usage</li> </ul>	A final survey to measure program impact	January 2004
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formatting, printing, distribution (stipend provided), collection, and analysis of survey</li> </ul>	Final reports on teacher knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to technology disaggregated by teacher participation level	March 2004
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of curricula and instructional materials developed by participating teachers</li> </ul>	Collection of curriculum and instructional materials that illustrate promising practices	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of project sponsored workshops</li> </ul>	Measurement of the participant attitudes and perceived benefit of project sponsored workshops	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classroom observations</li> </ul>	One to two page case studies of a sample of participating teachers focusing on how the impact of the project on teaching.	December 2003 through January 2004
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher video project</li> </ul>	A summary of the spring teacher video technology activities	January through March 2004
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CTAP Surveys – analysis of online survey results of UD teachers compared to the same survey results for non-UD teachers</li> </ul>	Matched results analysis of UD teacher responses with a comparison with non-UD teachers and state results	Spring 2004

**3. Technology Access and 4. Parent Involvement:**

Objective 3 .1 Parent Involvement: By June 2001, 75% of program participants' parents and/or guardians will participate in at least one parent activity appropriate to their parenting situation.

Objective 3.2 Community Engagement: By June 2002, members from collaborating Institutes for Higher Education (IHEs) and identified community partners in business and/or social service agencies will participate in at least one school-community activity appropriate to improvement of instructional service delivery to students.

Objective 4.1 Equal Access to Technological Instructional Tools: By June 2004, every high school student in Oakland Unified School District will have consistent access to computer technology as instructional and learning tools in their social studies and language arts classes and classrooms.

Evaluation Questions – Parent and Community Participation

To what extent do parents and their children use the refurbished computers to support the educational needs of the family?

How have community partnerships evolved over the course of the grant cycle? How has sustainability been addressed?

How effective are the community-based trainings in supporting parents of families receiving computers?

Activities	Products	Timelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structured interviews with project staff and collaborating partners</li> </ul>	Interview transcriptions and follow-up summaries with project staff and collaborating partners	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of community-based technology trainings</li> </ul>	Pre and post assessments and summative evaluation summaries	Fall 2003 and Spring 2004
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow-up telephone interviews with families who have received refurbished computers.</li> </ul>	Report on family usage of computers	Winter 2004

**4. Dissemination Activities**

The evaluators will work on dissemination activities including the development of at least one paper outlining the results of the analysis.

Other evaluation activities include: 1) assistance with the annual TIGC performance report database; 2) direct contacts with teachers and project collaborators; 3) planning and co-development of final review in Washington; 4) maintenance of project website; 5) payment of stipends to teachers for participation in evaluation activities