

Executive Summary

The University of Florida Teaching and Technology Initiative (UFTTI) was designed to facilitate and accelerate systemic change related to technology integration in our teacher education program. Because the UFTTI involves diffusing an innovation (the use of educational technologies) into a large system, a variety of strategies are being used to facilitate our goals of (1) establishing a vision of technology use in the teacher education program, (2) implementing diverse faculty development opportunities, (3) developing stronger technology-based field experiences, and (4) enhancing the electronic portfolio project.

An interesting aspect of year two of the UFTTI is that project directors have developed an even stronger and broader understanding of the scope of this grant. Our participating in two Collaborative Exchange visits along with our hosting of a CE visit has allowed us to understand more of what is happening in PT3 grants throughout the nation. We have developed a sense of how we are progressing with respect to other institutions and have built a strong network of support and ideas for sustaining the integration of educational technologies into the teaching and learning process. We have also developed a better understanding of the need for evaluating the work of the UFTTI in a broader perspective. In his 1967 article, Stake remarks “It is a great misfortune that the best trained evaluators have been looking at education with a microscope rather than a panoramic view finder.” (p. 536) We continue to meet virtually with our evaluation team on a regular basis and have hosted two evaluation visits. The evaluation plan we designed in our original proposal allows us to accurately report our activities to the US Department of Education because it provides data that shows how we are being accountable (i.e. are we doing what we said we would do?), effective (i.e. how well was the project implemented?), and making an impact (i.e. has the project made a difference?). However, this evaluation plan does not allow us to fully account for the complexities within the College of Education’s teacher education program. This realization has prompted us to search for an additional encompassing evaluation strategy for year three of the grant.

In addition to searching for a broader evaluation plan, we are also conducting research in specific components of the grant. For example, we have begun a study to provide insight into whether projects undertaken in specific areas of the teacher education curriculum benefit our students in their attempt to integrate educational technologies.

Before sharing some major highlights from the grant, it is important to note some interesting events occurring in the College of Education and the University of Florida that are influencing the work of the UFTTI. These events include: (1) the arrival of a new dean to the College of Education, (2) the upcoming accreditation visits from NCATE, the Florida Board of Regents, and the Florida Department of Education, (3) the changing vision, mission, and priorities for the University of Florida, and (4) the changing tenure and promotion guidelines at the college and university levels.

During the second year of the UFTTI, we have made substantial progress in meeting our project and US DOE goals. Some of these highlights include:

- Establishing the Mentor Team to allow the 13 graduate students participating in the grant and project personnel to better understand educational change models, strategies for faculty mentoring, and how to support one another through a collaborative community.
- Adding four new Teaching and Technology Teams (partnerships between graduate students with knowledge in selected core content areas and in educational technology and faculty from both the College of Education and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences). These partnerships provide faculty with content-specific, individualized professional development opportunities. These new partnerships bring the total to eight and have influenced over 1,000 students in the past two years.
- Supporting ten new inservice/preservice partnerships in six local elementary schools.
- Hosting two student portfolio showcases, two faculty retreats, two administrative retreats, 23 workshops, 40 consulting hours, 14 class presentations and 10 presentations at faculty meetings related to the electronic portfolio project.

- Adding two new partners to our grant. These new partners, Lawton Chiles Elementary School and IntelliTools, Inc., allow us to bring new and different elements of using educational technologies to our teacher education program.
- Sponsoring 42 faculty workshops and 126 hours of individual consultations related to helping faculty integrate educational technologies and electronic portfolios into their courses.
- Starting a research study to assess the effectiveness our beginning level educational technology courses for elementary and secondary teacher education students. This work is done in conjunction with the PT3 project at the University of North Texas and seeks to determine how our courses influence students' attitudes, skills and abilities and how our courses compare to others across the nation.
- Creating and implementing an online database that allows faculty and students to checkout educational technology resources for their courses. (<http://pt3.coe.ufl.edu>)
- Redeveloping the UFTTI website to better tell the story of our grant.
- Participating in two Collaborative Exchanges and hosting our own CE visit.

Additional information about the University of Florida Teaching and Technology Initiative can be found at <http://www.coe.ufl.edu/school/pt3> . The Year One evaluation report can be found on this site by accessing the Evaluation link.

Project Status

The University of Florida Teaching and Technology Initiative is designed to address the following five goals:

1. To develop a comprehensive **institutional vision** for technology integration that will consider new state and national technology standards, involve a variety of major stakeholders and enable effective technology integration in our traditional and nontraditional education programs. (GPRA 3.1)
2. To design and implement innovative **faculty development** efforts that will enable COE and CLAS professors in our traditional and nontraditional programs to effectively implement content-specific, technology-based instructional strategies in their courses and model uses of instructional technology in their teaching. (GPRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.2)
3. To create opportunities for **technology-based field experiences** that will enable students in the Unified Elementary ProTeach and Project SITE to observe and implement curriculum-focused, technology-based instructional strategies. (GPRA 2.1, 3.3)
4. To facilitate and support college-wide implementation of **electronic portfolios** designed to promote student-centered assessment and reflection. (GPRA 1.1, 1.4, 2.1)
5. To effectively **disseminate project results and resources** to our faculty and other teacher education institutions.

Progress in Meeting Project Objectives

Goal One: To develop a comprehensive institutional vision for technology integration that will consider new state and national technology standards, involve a variety of major stakeholders and enable effective technology integration in our traditional and nontraditional teacher education programs. (GPRA 3.1)	
<i>Objective One:</i> Appoint an advisory board to develop an institutional vision for technology integration and to monitor the project's progress	
Definition of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Formation of an actively involved Advisory Board whose primary responsibilities include providing guidance related to project activities, monitoring project progress and planning for sustainability following the grant period. •Development of a comprehensive vision for technology integration in our teacher education programs.

Progress	<p><i>Partially accomplished (on target)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our Advisory Board continues to be a tremendous source of support and guidance. We are in frequent communication with members of the Board and will have our official end-of-year meeting on April 24. • We have added two new Advisory Board members to represent our two new consortium partners, Lawton Chiles Elementary School and Intellitools. • Our technology vision for the College was revised for the upcoming NCATE visit. (See Appendix A) • A new dean, Catherine Emihovich, was hired for our COE this year and she has appointed a new associate dean for technology, John Kranzler. Dr. Kranzler has created a technology committee that includes representatives from throughout the College. •The committee is currently working on refining the College’s technology vision and one of our PT3 personnel is a committee member. •The College Faculty Policy Council added a technology committee to the faculty governance system.
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This goal has been more challenging than anticipated, however, our College’s current technology vision (developed for the upcoming NCATE visit) contains several of our recommendations including explicit consideration of ISTE’s Essential Conditions for technology integration and the NETS*T. This suggests that the project is having an impact. •We will continue to work to facilitate faculty ownership and buy-in related to the technology vision.
Use of Evaluation Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The CBAM results from Year One have been used to guide our faculty development efforts. Follow-up data will be collected in Year Three. • Analysis of the current technology vision and its emphasis on ISTE’s Essential Conditions and the NETS*T enabled us to submit an application for an <i>ISTE’S Distinguished Achievement Award</i>. The online component of this award application can be found at: http://www.coe.ufl.edu/school/proteach/NETS/index.html •Results of the study being conducted in conjunction with the University of North Texas will provide additional guidance as we continue to develop the vision. This work seeks to determine how our courses influence students’ attitudes, skills and abilities and how our courses compare to others across the nation.

<p>Goal Two: To design and implement innovative faculty development efforts that will enable COE and CLAS professors in our traditional and nontraditional programs to effectively implement content-specific, technology-based instructional strategies in their courses and model uses of instructional technology in their teaching. (GPRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.2)</p>	
<p><i>Objective One:</i> Teaching and Technology Fellows: Develop a cohort of interdisciplinary students majoring in the core content areas and specializing in educational technology to work with individual faculty members as “reciprocal mentors”.</p>	
Definition of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Partnerships in which faculty are able to receive content-specific, individualized professional development opportunities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnerships that result in the integration of technology in instruction.
Progress	<p><i>Substantially accomplished (on target)</i></p> <p>Four new partnerships have been added during Year Two and four partnerships continued from Year One. New faculty participants include a Children’s Literature professor and an Early Childhood professor from the College of Education and a Mathematics professor and Chemistry professor from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.</p>
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These partnerships have led to, among other things, faculty creating and integrating online databases, video case studies, and new curricular units in their instruction. It has also led to design and implementation of three new courses and the creation of several supplemental products designed to support student learning in an asynchronous fashion. Please see our website for details on each partnership. Faculty and student interviews reveal the importance of content specific support in relation to educational technology integration, that substantial effort is required by both graduate student and faculty member to ensure success and that a positive rapport among the graduate student and faculty member is essential. The total number of students impacted during the second year of the project is approximately 500. This brings to total for both years to over 1,000. See Appendix A for an article about these Teams entitled <i>Teaching and Technology Teams: Analysis of a Faculty Development Strategy</i> (in press, <u>Information Technology, Education and Society.</u>)
Use of Evaluation Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation results suggest that the Teaching and Technology Teams are a successful component of our faculty development efforts. Consequently, we are developing a new course, derived from a similar course at Iowa State University, entitled “Educational Change Models and Mentoring.” This course will enable us to sustain these partnerships. One component of this course will involve students working with selected faculty to integrate technology in their courses.
<p><i>Objective Two: Teaching and Technology Incentive Programs (TTIP): Implement a program that provides incentives to faculty members to explore innovative uses of technology in teaching.</i></p>	
Definition of Success	<p>Distribution of mini-grants that facilitate innovative uses of technology by faculty members.</p>
Progress	<p><i>Partially Accomplished (on target)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two additional mini-grants were awarded to faculty this year bringing the total to five awards.
Analysis	<p>One of three mini-grants resulted in recognizable, innovative uses of technology. We have highlighted this mini-grant on our website and requested assistance to improve this area from our external evaluators. They suggested requiring more artifacts from future mini-grant recipients. Formal reports from the faculty are not due until the end of May. In addition, due to budget cuts within the</p>

	College of Education, the College has not been able to fund any of these mini-grants as originally planned.
Use of evaluation findings	If reports on the effectiveness of the mini-grants show little impact in the use of integrating technology into the teacher education program, we will have to determine whether this aspect of the grant is worth keeping for year 3.
1. <i>Objective Three: Consulting-on-Demand: Design and implement a system that allows faculty to receive curricular support for technology integration whenever needed.</i>	
Definition of Success	Implementation of and faculty satisfaction with curricular support for technology integration.
Progress	<i>Substantially Accomplished (on target)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 42 workshops (totally 84 hours) for faculty have been offered during Year Two (for a current calendar, see http://www.coe.ufl.edu/OET/calendar/index.html) • Interest in one-on-one consulting has increased substantially this year. 126 hours of consultations have been conducted resulting in faculty redesigning their courses, adding curriculum-based, technology-enhanced components to their courses and improving asynchronous opportunities for student learning throughout the semester.
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Evaluation of faculty workshops and one-on-one consulting sessions are consistently high. •Some faculty are still not taking advantage of the opportunities.
Use of evaluation findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In order to better inform all faculty about these opportunities brochures are being made and the Director will visit each department individually to ensure all faculty know about these opportunities. •OET will begin to focus more on one-on-one consulting activities since our faculty seem to be moving away from a need for workshops to more individualized support needs.
<i>Objective Four: COE On-line support center: Design a flexible on-line support center that will evolve to reflect the changing needs of our faculty.</i>	
Definition of Success	Creation and maintenance of an effective on-line support center.
Progress	<i>Substantially Accomplished (on target)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Office of Educational Technology has developed a support center for faculty containing online tutorials, information about computer capabilities of Norman Hall classrooms, and frequently asked questions. (http://www.coe.ufl.edu/oet/facsupport.htm)
Analysis	Creating an on-line support center that meets the needs of a diverse faculty is always a challenge. We are continuously soliciting feedback from users and making appropriate revisions based on this feedback.
Use of Evaluation Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The OET is currently in the planning phase of designing a searchable interface for the support center. This will allow faculty to quickly located desired materials. •Including a counter and other more formal ways to gather data will be considered during Year Three.

<i>Objective Five:</i> The Mentor Team: Coordinate a team of graduate students from the project to help develop a shared culture encouraging change in the COE with respect to technology. Mentor Team will promote similar goals among team members.	
Definition of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A cohort of graduate students who collaborate and work together to help integrate technology in our teacher education program
Progress	<p><i>Partially Accomplished (on target)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •For the fall semester, the Mentor Team met every other week to study educational change models and discuss their relevance to our PT3 initiative. •For the spring semester, the Mentor Team met monthly and helped each other deal with obstacles and celebrate accomplishments. The Team was also actively involved in planning the CE visit.
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal analysis of the Mentor Team meetings suggest that a collaborative culture has been developed. Observations of students working together and giving each other support as well as comments to the PIs support this assertion. • Results of the faculty development opportunities and technology-based field experiences suggest the graduate students are developing a working knowledge of educational change and making an impact in the component of the grant to which they are assigned.
Use of Evaluation Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mentor Team will continue and, as suggested by members of the Team, will be opened to faculty participating in the grant during selected meetings. •We will encourage students to considering conducting research related to the Mentor Team.

Goal Three: To create opportunities for technology-based field experiences that will enable students in Elementary ProTeach and “Project SITE” to observe and implement curriculum-focused, technology-based instructional strategies. (GPRA 2.1, 3.3)	
<i>Objective One:</i> Design, develop and coordinate a course that provides Elementary ProTeach and “Project SITE” students an opportunity for technology-based field experiences.	
Definition of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Inservice/preservice partnerships that result in curriculum-based, technology-enhanced lessons and activities in the classroom. •Inservice/preservice partnerships that provide professional development opportunities for inservice teachers and authentic opportunities to integrate technology in K-12 classrooms for preservice teachers.
Progress	<p><i>Substantially Accomplished (on target)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An end-of-year meeting with principals occurred during June 2002. • Ten new inservice/preservice partnerships in six local schools were supported this year. In addition, project personnel worked in one middle school and an at-risk elementary school. This brings the total number of schools influenced to 8, the total number of inservice teachers to 24, and the total number of K-12 students to approximately 800. (See Appendix C)
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research emphasis for Year Two is on the technology-based field experiences. Data, including documents, student projects, teacher, principal and preservice interviews, observations and

	student reflections have been and will continue to be collected through May 2003. Results of this research will be made available on our web page and will be included in our next report.
Use of Evaluation Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial evaluation findings suggest that these experiences are having a positive impact on inservice teachers, preservice teachers and K-12 students but a relatively low impact on school wide change. This finding emerged last year and continues to hold true. Consequently, we will be consulting our Advisory Board in April about increasing the number of teachers at each school while decreasing the total number of schools in order to influence more systemic change.

Goal Four: To facilitate and support college-wide implementation of electronic portfolios designed to promote student-centered assessment and reflection (GPRA 1.1, 1.4,2.1)	
<i>Objective One:</i> Develop a culture of faculty buy-in that promotes similar beliefs about and compatible strategies for implementation of electronic portfolios.	
Definition of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Faculty buy-in related to the electronic portfolio process •Integration of the electronic portfolio process into the majority of teacher education courses.
Progress	<p><i>Partially Accomplished (on target)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Over 60% of faculty have integrated the electronic portfolios into their courses and faculty have put more thought into the types of assignments given so students can more fully express their ideas and thoughts about their growth as educators in the electronic portfolio illustrations. •The Florida Accomplished Practices have been mapped to the courses in our program to assist students in creating their portfolio. (http://www.coe.ufl.edu/school/portfolio/support.htm) •Resources to assist faculty and students and links to exemplary portfolios are maintained on a comprehensive web page (http://www.coe.ufl.edu/school/portfolio/index.htm) •23 electronic portfolio related workshops for students have been provided •40 portfolio consultation hours per week available to students •14 guest presentations about the electronic portfolios in teacher education course •10 faculty department meeting presentations dealing with electronic portfolios
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year One of the grant focused more on overall faculty buy-in while Year Two focused on helping individual faculty integrate the electronic portfolio into their courses. Therefore, more effort was given to individualized work with faculty. •We moved to smaller workshops on how to build electronic portfolios due to the variety of the technical skills our students possess. This allows us to more appropriately serve and assist students in this process.
Use of Evaluation Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Introducing an innovation will follow an innovation curve over time. Therefore, we need to continue our efforts and dissemination strategies with respect to electronic portfolio works. •We need to continue smaller workshops and working with

	individual faculty.
<i>Objective Two:</i> Develop an infrastructure that prepares faculty and students to evaluate electronic portfolios for mastery of the Florida Accomplished Practices	
Definition of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Every student in COE demonstrates mastery of the Florida Accomplished Practices via an electronic portfolio. •Every faculty member is able to evaluate electronic portfolios
Progress	<p><i>Partially Accomplished (on target)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hired two faculty during the summer to create a draft rubric to begin discussions on how to formatively evaluate student portfolios •Two planning retreats for electronic portfolios with administrators •Two retreats for faculty, adjuncts, and teaching assistants dealing with how we can best evaluate our electronic portfolios for teacher education students. •Three showcases for evaluations of student electronic portfolios.
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Results from the summer work were a good start but not sufficient. Faculty had major concerns with the rubric developed and with the amount of time required for these formative evaluations. Developing a rubric that addressed the complexities associated with teaching and measuring preservice teachers' growth is a faculty concern.
Use of Evaluation Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •We are continuing discussions with different groups of faculty in order to devise plans to allow assessment of the electronic portfolios to parallel the richness of the program and experiences students have.

Goal Five: To effectively disseminate project results and resources to our faculty and other teacher education institutions.	
<i>Objective 1:</i> Share projects and resources with UF faculty through faculty meetings, web-based resources, annual reports and informal conversations.	
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Teaching and Technology Initiative Showcase •Participated in two CE visits and hosted a CE visit •Participated in two state-wide PT3 meetings •Continued to share the work of our grant at faculty meetings •Nominated for College-wide Scholarship of Engagement Award for PT3 work (See Appendix D) •Nominated for ISTE's Distinguished Achievement Award •Teaching and Technology Initiative brochure distributed at state, national, and international conferences •Faculty Professional Development brochure created for COE and CLAS faculty.
<i>Objective 2:</i> Plan presentations for local, state and national conferences	
Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Presentations have been made at SITE, the International Conference on Teaching & Learning, National Council of Teachers of English, SEAT, Sunshine State TESOL, CALICO, APA, NECC, and EdMedia
<i>Objective 3:</i> Maintain a project-related website	
Progress	<p>http://www.coe.ufl.edu/school/pt3</p> <p>Our website is now section 508 compliant. Revisions to the website</p>

	are continual.
<i>Objective 4: Publish journal articles, book chapters and other written pieces.</i>	
Progress	•3 articles published directly related to the grant and 3 articles published indirectly related to the grant, 2 manuscripts submitted, 5 articles in progress