

Title II.D (EETT) Competitive Grant Evaluation Guidance

Title II.D competitive grant recipients are required to submit final evaluation reports that describe fully the impact of the projects in the participating schools. This guidance document includes details regarding the information that must be included in the final report, suggested study questions to guide the evaluation, sample format for writing project objectives, and sample evaluation plan matrix to help districts and external evaluators identify the data and information to be collected over the course of the projects, who (district staff and/or an external evaluators) administers and scores assessments, and who analyzes and reports assessment data, when, etc.

Final Report Format

- I. Summary
 - a. Abstract (one-page)
 - b. Executive Summary
- II. Background Information
 - a. Problem(s) or educational need(s) addressed by project
 - b. Project participants (teachers and students receiving intervention, those in comparison or control group, if appropriate)
 - c. Project's goal(s) and objectives
 - d. Activities and components
 - e. Building(s) and planned longevity of the project
 - f. Resources used to implement the project
 - g. Project's expected measurable outcomes
 - h. Constraints
- III. Evaluation study questions
 - a. Questions addressed by study
 - b. Questions that could not be addressed by the study
- IV. Evaluation Procedures
 - a. Sample
 - i. Selection procedures
 - ii. Representativeness of the sample (use of comparison or control groups, if applicable)
 - b. Data Collection
 - i. Methods
 - ii. Instruments
 - c. Summary
 - i. Evaluation questions
 - ii. Variables
 - iii. Data gathering approaches
 - iv. Respondents
- V. Findings
 - a. Results of the analyses organized by study question
 - i. Implementation questions
 - ii. Impact (outcome) questions
- VI. Conclusions
 - a. Broad-based, summative statements
 - b. Recommendations

Suggested Study Questions

- I. How is the district using grant funding?
- II. How are grant-supported initiatives consistent with state and district program goals related to Technology Access (reduce equity issues), Educator Proficiency (effective teaching and tech literacy), and Student Proficiency (academic achievement and tech literacy)?

In what ways and to what extent is the competitive grant supporting:

- initiatives designed to help close the gap between high- and low-poverty schools in students' and teachers' **access to and use of technology**?
 - Questions: What percentages of classrooms in the district and in the participating school building(s) have adequate technology? (whether number and placement are appropriate and sufficient to support powerful teaching and learning practices) How is the district addressing and monitoring equitable distribution of resources?
 - Data sources: surveys (Census of Technology), needs assessments, inventories
 - initiatives designed to help teachers, principals, and school administrators in **effective integration of technology into curricula and instruction**?
 - Questions: What percentages of teachers in the district and in the participating school building(s) report being prepared to integrate technology into core subject areas? How is the district addressing and monitoring technology integration?
 - Data sources: curriculum review, administrator observation, teacher surveys, student artifacts
 - **professional development** in the use of educational technology **that influences classroom practice** as reported by teachers?
 - Question: How is the district monitoring the adequacy and effectiveness of the district professional development programs? (provided to teachers in and outside of the grant project)
 - Data sources: teacher surveys, administrator survey, principal observations
- III. How successful is the grant project implementation in meeting desired goals and objectives?

To what extent does the project improve teaching and learning, with regards to:

- teachers' **effective instructional strategies** and **tech literacy**?
 - Question: Are teaching practices improving as a result of the professional development and use of technology? (curriculum integration, educator proficiency in meeting targeted skills levels, instructional strategies grounded in research and emerging/best practices, etc.)
 - Data sources: teacher surveys, portfolios, observations
- students' **high academic achievement** and **tech literacy**?
 - Question: Is student academic achievement improving where technology is being used effectively? (by grade, curriculum area, student population, technology practices, etc.) Are students demonstrating proficiency in tech literacy? (increased productivity, frequency and use of technologies for research and problem solving in real-world context)
 - Data sources: student surveys, portfolios, local and state assessments

Suggested Format for Writing Competitive Grant Objectives

Format:

WHO, **WILL DO WHAT**, **HOW WELL**,
HOW MEASURED, by **WHEN**?

Example:

Students in grades 4-8 will increase reading performance as measured by district STAR assessment by 5% for each year of the project (May 2010 and May 2011).

Example:

70% of teachers will develop 2 lesson plans that successfully integrate technology (meet eMINTS standards) by April 1 of each year of the project.

Suggested Evaluation Plan Matrix

Objective 1. Improved student academic achievement and technology literacy

	Year 1 (by June 30)		Year 2 (by June 30)		End-of-Project (by September 30)	
	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?
1.A. By the end of the project, there will be evidence of improved student academic achievement, grades [XX], as measured by Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) testing.	<p>While MAP data are used primarily for pre- and post-project comparison and evaluation, projects need to consider from the beginning the evaluation/research design that will be used for data analyses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • same students compared to selves? • eMINTS and non-eMINTS (within or across LEAs)? • grade level data in base year to project reporting year data? <p>NOTE: Items highlighted in yellow indicate variables, to be determined by district projects</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative and/or charts & graphs? • By grade level and subject area? • Disaggregated by any student subgroups (SES, IEP, other special status)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who collects and analyzes data? • Who reports findings & recommendations (evaluator to district, within district, and/or district to DESE)?
1.B. Percentage of students [grades 4-8] will increase performance on [STAR, Rigby Benchmark, SRI, or local/common assessment] by at least [5%] each year of project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What test(s) will be administered? what grade level(s)? • Will data be reportable June 30? • Is the level of expectation the same for all tests, grades, students? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who owns and collects data? • Who analyzes data? • Who reports findings, makes recommendations to drive instructional changes for Year 2? 	Repeat at end of Year 2... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same students; same tests? • Grade level comparisons? 	Depends on what and how measured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative and/or charts & graphs? • By grade level and subject area? • Disaggregated by any student subgroups (SES, IEP, other special status)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who collects and analyzes data? • Who reports findings & recommendations (evaluator to district, within district, and/or district to DESE)?
1.C. Students [grades 4-8] will report [meeting standard or showing increase] in technology literacy skills as measured by [a pre- and post-project survey]. <<and/or>>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When administered to set baseline? • What instrument? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who administers and/or scores? • Who owns data? • Who analyzes data? • Who reports findings, makes recommendations to drive instructional changes? 	Repeat at end of Year 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same students; same tests? • Grade level comparisons? 	Depends on what and how measured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative and/or charts & graphs? • By grade level and subject area? • Disaggregated by any student subgroups (SES, IEP, other special status)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who collects and analyzes data? • Who reports findings & recommendations (evaluator to district, within district, and/or district to DESE)?
1.C. At least [80%] of students [grades 4-8] will demonstrate [proficiency/improvement] on the NETS*S indicators, each year of project, as measured by [project-based student work].	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When administered to set baseline at end of Year 1? • What project(s)? • What scoring instrument/method? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who administers and/or scores? • Who owns data? • Who analyzes data? • Who reports findings, makes recommendations to drive instructional changes? 	Repeat at end of Year 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same students; same project(s)? • Grade level comparisons? 	Depends on what and how measured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative and/or charts & graphs? • By grade level and subject area? • Disaggregated by any student subgroups (SES, IEP, other special status)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who collects and analyzes data? • Who reports findings & recommendations (evaluator to district, within district, and/or district to DESE)?

TITLE II.D PROJECT EVALUATION MATRIX

Objective 1. Improved student academic achievement and technology literacy (continued)

	Year 1 (by June 30)		Year 2 (by June 30)		End-of-Project (by September 30)	
	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?
1.E. [Other student objective]						

Objective 2. Improved teacher technology literacy and integrated teaching strategies

	Year 1 (by June 30)		Year 2 (by June 30)		End-of-Project (by September 30)	
	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?
2.A. Teachers – in Comp and/or eMINTS4All – will develop and implement constructivist lesson plans – 2 in Year 1 and 4 in Year 2 – that meet [eMINTS, district, other] standards [explain criteria].	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will lessons be collected? What scoring method/instrument(s)? Any baseline observation information? Any other corroborating information? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who administers and/or scores? Who owns and analyzes data? Who reports findings, makes recommendations for changes? Who handles other (corroboration) information? when? 	Repeat for Year 2 – same questions	Depends on what and how measured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrative and/or charts & graphs? Disaggregated by any teacher subgroups (PD type, grade or subject level)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who collects and analyzes data? Who reports findings & recommendations (evaluator to district, within district, and/or district to DESE)?
2.B. Teachers – in Comp and/or eMINTS4All – will report [at least an 80%] increase in technology integration and enhanced instructional and assessment strategies, as measured by [administrative learning walk, pre-post survey].	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When taken (baseline data)? What measures/instrument(s)? Individual surveys only or use of focus groups, group interviews? Any other corroborating information? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who administers and/or scores? Who owns and analyzes data? Who reports findings, makes recommendations for changes? Who handles other information? when? 	repeat at end of Year 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same teachers; same surveys? 	Depends on what and how measured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrative and/or charts & graphs? Disaggregated by any teacher subgroups (PD type, grade or subject level)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who collects and analyzes data? Who reports findings & recommendations (evaluator to district, within district, and/or district to DESE)?
2.C. [Other]						

Objective 3. Optional (e.g., developing school-based instructional technology leader, improved parent involvement, equitable technology access, etc.)

	Year 1 (by June 30)		Year 2 (by June 30)		End-of-Project (by September 30)	
	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?	What data and how measured?	By whom?
3.A. [other outcomes]						