A. Grant Information
1a. Grant Award/PR number: <u>P342A000075</u>
1b. Grant Type: ☒ Implementation ☐ Catalyst
1c. Are you a partner in another PT3 grant? ☐ Yes ☒ No
1d. If yes, list the Grant Award/PR number(s) of any other grant(s) you are a partner in:
_____

B. Identification Information
1a. Name of the lead institution/organization: <u>Purdue University</u>
1b. Address: <u>Beering Hall of Liberal Arts and Education, 100 N. University St.</u>
1c. City: <u>West Lafayette</u>   1d. State: <u>IN</u>   1e. Zip+4: <u>47907-2098</u>
Note: The lead organization is responsible for reviewing all entries in this form. See section VII, item 2.

2a. Name of Person Completing Form: <u>James D. Lehman</u>
2b. Title: <u>Project Director</u>
2c. Name of your institution/organization: <u>Purdue University</u>
2d. Telephone number: <u>765-494-7935</u>   2e. Fax number: <u>765-496-1622</u>
2f. Email address: <u>lehman@purdue.edu</u>
2g. Is your organization/institution an SCDE? ☒ Yes ☐ No

C. SCDE Descriptive Information (If B.2g. was answered Yes)

School, college, department of education (SCDE)
1a. Total number of SCDE faculty (including those not directly involved in grant activities): <u>70</u>
1b. Total number of students in your institution's SCDE: <u>1100</u>
1c. Number of SCDE students that graduated during the reporting period: <u>288</u>
1d. Number of courses in SCDE: <u>352</u>
    (Total possible number of courses that would be redesigned)

School, college, department of arts and science (SCD of arts and science)
2a. Is an SCD of arts and science participating in grant activities with you?   ☒ **Yes**   ☐ **No**
2b. If yes, total number of undergraduate faculty in SCD of arts and science (including those not directly
    involved in grant activities): <u>622</u>
2c. If yes, number of undergraduate courses in SCD of arts and science: <u>1660</u>
    (Total possible number of courses that would be redesigned)

K-12 partners
3a. Is a K-12 school or district one of your partners in this grant?   ☒ **Yes**   ☐ **No**
If yes, name and total number of teachers in partner K-12 schools *(or total number within certain
grades/subject areas, if grant activities are limited to those grades/subject areas)*:
   3b. School name: <u>SCHOOL CITY OF EAST CHICAGO</u>   3c. Number: <u>365</u>
   3b. School name: <u>CRAWFORDSVILLE COMM. SCHOOLS</u>   3c. Number: <u>158</u>
   3b. School name: <u>LAFAYETTE SCHOOLS</u>   3c. Number: <u>519</u>
   3b. School name: <u>MSD LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS</u>   3c. Number: <u>925</u>

Other partners
4a. What other (non-arts-and-science) <u>SCDs at your institution</u> are part of the partnerships (e.g., SCDs of business, engineering, computer science)?
1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

C. Non-SCDE Descriptive Information (If B.2g. was answered No)

1. How many schools, colleges or departments of education (SCDEs) are partners in this PT3 grant? ☐
   (enter single digit)

School, college, department of arts and science (SCD of arts and science)
2a. Is an SCD of arts and science participating in grant activities with you?   ☐ **Yes**   ☐ **No**
[IF YES, GO TO 2b. IF NO, GO 3a.]

2b. If yes, does this SCD of arts and science partner directly with an SCDE in your grant?
☐ **Yes**   ☐ **No**
[IF YES, GO TO 3a. IF NO, GO TO 2c.]

2c. If no, total number of undergraduate faculty in SCD of arts and science (including those not directly involved in grant activities): _____

2d. If no, number of undergraduate courses in SCD of arts and science:
   (Total possible number of courses that would be redesigned)

K-12 partners
3a. Is a K-12 school or district one of your partners in this grant?   ☐ **Yes**   ☐ **No**
[IF YES, GO TO 3b. IF NO, GO TO 4b.]

3b. If yes, do these K-12 schools or districts partner directly with an SCDE in your grant?
☐ **Yes**   ☐ **No**
[IF YES, GO TO 4a. IF NO, GO TO 3c.]

If no, name and total number of teachers in partner K-12 schools *(or total number within certain grades/subject areas, if grant activities are limited to those grades/subject areas)[list only those schools that do not partner directly with an SCDE]*:
3c. School name:_____   3d. Number: _____
3c. School name:_____   3d. Number: _____
3c. School name:_____   3d. Number: _____
3c. School name:_____   3d. Number: _____

Other partners
4a. List any other (non-arts-and-science) SCDs that are part of the grant if they do not partner directly with an SCDE (e.g., SCDs of business, engineering, computer science)?
1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

II. Teacher Education Programs

Objective 1: Strengthen teacher preparation programs so that they provide high-quality training in the use of technology for instructional purposes.

A. Curriculum Redesign

Indicator 1.1 Curriculum redesign: The percentage of funded teacher preparation programs that redesign their curriculum to incorporate best practices in the use of technology in teacher education will increase.

1. During the reporting period:

Did *SCDE* (school, college, department of education) faculty redesign curricula to integrate technology?	☒ **Yes, as a grant activity** ☐ **Yes, but NOT as a grant activity** ☐ **No**

2. During the reporting period:

Did *SCD of arts and science* (school, college, department of arts and science) faculty redesign curricula to integrate technology?	☒ **Yes, as a grant activity** ☐ **Yes, but NOT as a grant activity** ☐ **No**

---

3. **OPTIONAL.** Please provide a brief description of a unique or interesting model of field experience for preservice students related to the integration of technology in teaching.

As reported previously, our project is using two-way video conferencing to link Purdue pre-service teachers and classrooms with partner K-12 students and classrooms for virtual or distance early field experiences. Many colleges of education face difficulties placing candidates in field situations that provide for needed experiences such as access to diverse student populations and examples of exemplary technology use. This problem is particularly acute for Purdue University, which is not located near a major metropolitan center. Particularly promising are new IP-based videoconferencing systems, which support relatively high quality video conferencing over the Internet. These newer technologies are more flexible and less expensive than preceding video technologies. They provide an opportunity for pre-service teachers to observe K-12 classrooms, under the direction of a faculty member, and to interact with K-12 teachers and students at a distance. Several experiments in the use of this technology have been pilot tested, and models for use have been developed. Our experiences suggest that the technology is a viable option for some types of candidate observations and interactions, and the flexibility and low-cost of the technology make it an attractive option compared to earlier video technologies.

---

4. **CATALYST GRANTEES: OPTIONAL.** Please provide a brief description of support provided to encourage teacher preparation programs to redesign their curricula to incorporate best practices in the integration of technology in teaching.

B. Technology-Proficient Faculty

Indicator 1.2: Technology-proficient faculty: The percentage of faculty members in funded teacher preparation programs that effectively use technology in their teaching will increase.

1. During the reporting period:

a. Were *SCDE* faculty assessed on their level
of technology proficiency?

☒ **Yes, as a grant activity**
☐ **Yes, but NOT as a grant activity**
☐ **No**

b. If *SCDE* faculty were assessed as a grant activity,
please list the total number assessed: <u>47</u>

c. If they were assessed as a grant activity, how many *SCDE* faculty
who participated in professional development to integrate technology
were rated as technologically proficient using the
assessment tool identified below?

....

Data not available

1) Self-assessment:	<u>45</u> SCDE faculty	☐
2) Observation (e.g., by dean,		
3) technology coordinator, facilitator):	____ SCDE faculty	☒
4) Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test):	____ SCDE faculty	☒
5) Portfolio assessment:	____ SCDE faculty	☒
6) Other (specify):_____	____ SCDE faculty	☒

2. During the reporting period:

a. If an SCD of arts and science is participating in grant activities,
were *SCD of arts and science* faculty assessed
on their level of technology proficiency?

☒ **Yes, as a grant activity**
☐ **Yes, but NOT as a grant activity**
☐ **No**

b. If *SCD of arts and science* faculty were assessed as a grant activity,
please list the total number assessed: <u>7</u>

c. If they were assessed as a grant activity, how many
SCD of arts and science faculty who participated in
professional development to integrate technology
were rated as technologically proficient using the
assessment tool identified below?

Data not available

1. Self-assessment:	<u>7</u> SCD of arts and science faculty	☐
2. Observation (e.g., by dean,		
3. technology coordinator, facilitator):	____ SCD of arts and science faculty	☒
4. Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test):	____ SCD of arts and science faculty	☒
5. Portfolio assessment:	____ SCD of arts and science faculty	☒
6. Other (specify):_____	____ SCD of arts and science faculty	☒

3. **CATALYST GRANTEES: OPTIONAL.** Please provide a brief description of support provided to encourage teacher preparation programs to foster the effective use of technology in teaching by faculty members.

C. Graduation Requirements

Indicator 1.3 Graduation requirements: The number of funded teacher preparation programs that will require teacher candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the effective use of technology in teaching and learning will increase.

1. During the reporting period:
a. Did you add or expand a graduation   ☐ **Yes, as a grant activity**
requirement for preservice students to   ☒ **Yes, but NOT as a grant activity**
demonstrate proficiency in the use of   ☐ **No**
technology in teaching and learning

2. **CATALYST GRANTEES: OPTIONAL.** Please provide a brief description of support provided to encourage teacher preparation programs to require teacher candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the effective use of technology in teaching and learning.

D. Learning Resources

Indicator 1.4 Learning resources: The percentage of teacher preparation programs that use Web-based, multimedia learning resources, course materials, and teaching tools will increase.

1. During the reporting period:

a. Did faculty integrate technology
in their courses?   ☒ **Yes, as a grant activity**
                                             ☐ **Yes, but NOT as a grant activity**
                                               ☐ **No**

b. If yes as a grant activity, for the course and program activities incorporating technology, what proportion used technology to enhance the following functions:

	None	Less than Half	Half or more	All	Data not available
1) Communications…………………………………..	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
2) Discussion	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
3) Access to information resources and media	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
4) Instructor information presentation	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
5) Assessment…..…………………………………….	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
6) Data collection or analysis…...……………………..	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
7) Collaborative learning…………………………......	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
8) Student projects or presentations…………………......	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
9) Other (specify): __videoconferencing and lab probes__ .	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

III. Technology Skills and Proficiency of New Teachers

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

A. Technology-Proficient New Teachers

Indicator 2.1 Technology-proficient new teachers: The percentage of new teachers who are proficient in using technology and integrating technology into instructional practices will increase.

1. During the reporting period:

   a. Did preservice students have to demonstrate proficiency in using technology in teaching?

   ☒ **Yes, as a grant activity**
   ☐ **Yes, but NOT as a grant activity**
   ☐ **No**

b. If students' proficiency was assessed as a grant activity, how many preservice students demonstrated proficiency in using technology in the following ways:

	Number of preservice students	**Not assessed**	**Data not available**
1) To apply computers and related technologies to support instruction in preservice students' grade level and subject area focus?	849 students	☐	☐
2) To plan and deliver instructional units that integrate a variety of software applications and learning tools?	849 students	☐	☐
3) To develop technology lessons that reflect effective grouping and assessment strategies for diverse populations?	849 students	☐	☐
4) Other (specify):	_____ students	☐	☐

c. If students' proficiency was assessed as a grant activity, what was the total number (unduplicated count) of preservice students that demonstrated proficiency in using technology?

    849 **students**
    ☐ **Not assessed**
    ☐ **Data not available**

d. If students' proficiency was assessed as a grant activity, how many of the preservice students that demonstrated proficiency in using technology were in their graduating year? .... 20 **students**
    ☐ **Not assessed**
    ☐ **Data not available**

e. If students' proficiency was assessed as a grant activity, how were students' technology proficiency assessed?

	Yes	**No**
1) In-class demonstration/observation	☒	☐
2) Exam (e.g., multiple choice test, short answer test)	☒	☐
3) Self-assessment	☒	☐
4) Portfolio assessment	☒	☐
5) Performance assessment	☒	☐
6) Other (specify): _____	☐	☐

---

2. **CATALYST GRANTEES: OPTIONAL.** Please provide a brief description of support provided to encourage teacher preparation programs to use web-based, multi-media learning resources, course materials, and teaching tools.

IV. Institutional Change

Objective 3: Create Institutional Change in the Preparation of Future Teachers to Use Technology

A.   Interdisciplinary Partnership

Indicator 3.1 Interdisciplinary partnerships: The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate, and partner together with schools of arts and sciences on a regular and formal basis will increase.

1. If you have an SCD of arts and science as a partner, in which of the following activities was the **SCD of arts and science** *(school, college, department of arts and science)* involved?..

		Yes	No	Don't Know
a.	Curriculum redesign to incorporate best practices in the use of technology for preservice students	☒	☐	☐
b.	Integration of web-based, multi-media resources in preservice education courses	☒	☐	☐
c.	Faculty development workshops in technology	☒	☐	☐
d.	Providing technical consultants/educators for the SCDE	☐	☐	☒
e.	Development of student assignments reflecting use of technology	☒	☐	☐
f.	Other (specify): _____	☐	☐	☐

---

2. **OPTIONAL:**   Please describe any unique partnership models or interesting partnership activities in which your consortium engaged with other SCDs at your institution.

B . K-16 Partnerships Populations

Indicator 3.2 K-16 partnerships: The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate, and partner together with the K-12 community on a regular and formal basis will increase.

1. If you have a K-16 school or district as a partner, in which of the following activities were the K-12 schools involved? ....

	Yes	No	Don't Know
1. Providing clinical opportunities for preservice students.........................	☒	☐	☐
2. Modeling effective use of technology in instruction by K-12 teachers for SCDE faculty...	☐	☐	☒
3. Modeling effective use of technology in instruction by K-12 teachers for preservice students..	☒	☐	☐
4. Providing mentors for preservice students	☐	☐	☒
5. Designing and developing of high-quality induction programs for program graduates...	☐	☒	☐
6. Designing and developing of curriculum and/or graduation requirements for preservice students that reflect the technology needs of K-12 teachers	☐	☒	☐
7. Assessing the technology proficiency of preservice students...............	☐	☒	☐
8. Sharing of software, multi-media, and other technology tools.............	☒	☐	☐
9. Providing professional development opportunities for current teachers to improve their technology skills through training at the SCDE..	☒	☐	☐
10. Other (specify): _____	☐	☐	☐

2. **OPTIONAL:** Please describe below any unique partnership models or interesting partnership activities in which your consortium engaged with K-12 partners.

V. Verification of Accuracy

1. I verify that the information submitted in this report is accurate:

    Please sign below

    Name of person completing report:

    _____

2. Check box to indicate lead organization has reviewed report: ☒

    Reviewed by: _____

Comments:

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING PART II. ANNUAL GPRA PERFORMANCE REPORT.