

Enhancing Education Through Technology Competitive Grant Performance Report 2 (Reporting Period *July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011*)

Due Date: September 10, 2011

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name: Greenfield Union School District
LEA CDS Code: 15-63503
Schools Participating in the EETT Program: Greenfield Middle School, Ollivier Middle School, McKee Middle School, Plantation School, Planz School, R. Palla School, Fairview School, Valle Verde School, Horizon School, W.A. Kendrick School, and Granite Pointe School

Performance Report Prepared by: Barbara Houser
Date Report Prepared: September 19, 2011
Title: Director of Categorical Funds Telephone: (661) 837-6000
E-mail: houserb@gfusd.k12.ca.us Fax: (661) 837-6015

Filing Instructions: This is the second filing of four EETT C Performance reports (two optional semi-annual and two required annual reports) to be filed with the California Department of Education, Education Technology Office during the duration of the two year grant period. All performance reports will be submitted by email to the CDE at edtech@cde.ca.gov by the specified due date. For more information about this report, contact the Education Technology Office at 916-323-5715.



Section I: Program Profile

Complete items 1 through 19. The information reported here will be used by the state to identify and share promising or best practices with other districts and schools. If your LEA is selected for this purpose, the LEA will receive notification from the California Department of Education (CDE). Additional information may be requested from the LEA at that time.

The CDE encourages the LEA to use the information provided under Program Profile to report to stakeholders, such as the school board; to spotlight promising or best practices; and for press releases to the local media.

1. Name of LEAs EETT C Program: Rising With the Cloud
Name of LEAs Target Teacher Program in EdTechProfile, if different: Greenfield Union School District
2. Name of LEAs EETT C Program Coordinator: Barbara Houser
3. EETT C Program Coordinator's Phone Number: (661) 837-6000
4. EETT C Program Coordinator's e-mail: houserb@gfusd.k12.ca.us
5. Name & Title of EETT C Program Evaluator: Lori A. Aragon, Ed. D, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum
6. List EETT C Oversight / Advisory Team Members' Names & Titles: **Lori Aragon** – Asst. Superintendent of Curriculum, **Bret Holthe** - Director of Technology, **Barbara Houser** – Director of Categorical Funds, and **Karri Fogle** – Technology Specialist
7. EETT C Round 8 Funding Amount: \$300,000.
8. EETT C Curricular Focus Area(s): Language Arts
9. EETT C Technology Literacy Focus Area(s): Research and Information Fluency, Digital Citizenship, and Technology Operations and Concepts.
10. Grade Levels Served: 4th – 8th Grades
11. List Electronic Learning Resources* Used: Smart Boards, Data Director
12. List Electronic Productivity Resources** Used: Smart Notebook, Word, Powerpoint, Excel

**electronic learning resources - digital software and online standards aligned electronic resources that contain content.*

***electronic productivity tools - digital productivity software, online tools, and peripherals such as Word, PowerPoint, online blogs, wikis, etc.*

Section I: Program Profile *(continued)*

13. How will the results of this report be disseminated to stakeholders? To other educators? To the media?

The results of this report will be presented to the district's Management Team and District Board. The October Technology Committee will receive an overview of this report as well as post EETT-C Performance Report 2 on the district's website. A Technology Parent Night will be held in May 2012 at the district office to provide parents with an overview of fund expenditures and implementation of program. GUSD will also distribute a District-wide Newsletter (March 2012) focusing student achievement using technology.

If this project is highlighted in the school or district web site, indicate the URL address: <http://www.gfusd.k12.ca.us/>

14. Has the LEA conducted experimental or quasi experimental* research on this program? X NO YES

*Experimental research involves the manipulation of one or more independent variables and the measurement of a dependent variable. The major difference between true experimental and quasi-experimental designs is the random assignment of participants. Experimental research assigns people **randomly** from a common pool of people into two similar groups; an experimental and a control group. Quasi-experimental research looks like an experimental design comparing groups but lacks the key ingredient -- random group assignment.

If YES, briefly describe the experiment and outcomes.

15. Complete the following Program Profile Chart for Year 1:

Insert #	
5	Total # of EETT C Program Oversight / Advisory Meetings
69	Total # of Target Teachers
2	Total # of Hours of Required Professional Development for Target Teachers
4,521	Total # of Target Students
0	Total # of New Desktop Computers Purchased for Student Use
0	Total # of New Laptop Computers Purchased for Student Use
0	Total # of New Desktop Computers Purchased for Teacher Use
0	Total # of New Laptop Computers Purchased for Teacher Use
0	Total # of LCD Projectors Purchased
6	Total # of Interactive Electronic White Boards Purchased
18	Total # of Handheld Electronic Device(s) Purchased
0	Total # of Other Peripheral(s) Purchased

Section I: Program Profile *(continued)*

16. Target Teachers: Professional Development Opportunities

Identify professional development opportunities implemented and the total hours spent on each type of activity. Check the “N/A” column if the PD activity does not apply.

Professional Development Opportunities	N/A	PD Duration /in Hours
1. Adopted Textbook Publisher Electronic Learning Resource* Training	N/A	
2. Supplemental or CLRN Reviewed Electronic Learning Resource* Training	N/A	
3. Technology Integration Training of Mentors	N/A	
4. Technology Integration Teacher Training (PD workshops)		16
5. Technology Integration Teacher Coaching / Mentoring		16
6. Electronic Resources for Academic Intervention Training		2
7. Electronic Learning Assessment Resource Training		16
8. Electronic Productivity Tool** Training		6
<i>List any other types of training offered by the LEAs EETT C program on additional row(s).</i>		

**electronic learning resources - digital software and online standards aligned electronic resources that contain content.*

***electronic productivity tools - digital productivity software, online tools, and peripherals such as Word, PowerPoint, online blogs, wikis, etc.*

17. Target Teachers: Professional Development Incentives

Identify incentives offered to Target Teachers to encourage participation in EETT C Professional Development and the integration of technology in curriculum activities. Check the “N/A” column if the incentive listed does not apply.

Program Incentives to Encourage Technology Integration	N/A	YES
1. Release time from classes and/or other responsibilities		YES
2. Scheduled time in teacher contracts for professional development		YES
3. Stipends for training or collaboration time outside the school day	N/A	
4. Credits toward certification or recertification	N/A	
5. Hardware or software to staff that completed training		YES
6. Course credits arranged with local colleges or universities	N/A	
7. Salary credit increases or pay increases	N/A	
8. Recognition or higher ratings on an annual teacher evaluation		YES
9. Other <i>(please describe)</i> _____		

Section I: Program Profile *(continued)*

18. Briefly describe the LEA and the targeted student population for the EETT-C program.

(i.e. Significant Subpopulations, Poverty Level, Urban, Rural, Underserved, PI, High Priority, API, APR, etc.)

The District educates a diverse ethnic population including 77% Hispanic, 11% Caucasian, 8% African American, and 4% other. We have 50% of the population English Learners, 11% mobility rate, 6% migrant, 1% homeless, and 84% on free or reduced-priced meals. We are a Program Improvement district. District is focusing on 4th – 8th grade students to improve technology literacy, and achievement in English Language Arts. Professional Development on Interactive Whiteboard technology is being implemented so teachers can build engaging standards-based lessons.

19. Describe the impact on the LEA that the EETT C program has made on each program goal and related objectives. If applicable, support the descriptions with multiple measure growth data, as reported in Section II.

Goal 1: Program for Students

Objective 1A: Technology Literacy- The Ed Tech Profile Survey category: Computer Knowledge and Skills was used to measure growth. Although the target was not met we did make growth. For 4th through 8th pre-survey, GUSD baseline was 2% Proficient (Performance Level) and 9% on the post-survey. In comparing Intermediate (Performance Level), GUSD had a 37% baseline, they increased to 57% in the post survey for a net of 20%. We were unable to compile NETS data since the survey was not administered due to receiving notification of the grant award in April 2011 and this conflicted with STAR Testing.

Target students received appropriate Internet Use and Cyber-bullying training by media clerks. GUSD had 100 % of the 4th through 8th Grade Language Arts classes (69 classes) that completed this training for the 2010-11 school year. Teachers and media clerks provided Accelerated Reader and Read Naturally intervention programs to improve reading comprehension and fluency skills.

Through the implementation of Data Director district-wide, all sites received training in running student reports, by content standard, performance levels, clusters, etc. to analyze data and identify gaps in student achievement. This data is used to identify students who receive additional instruction and remedial intervention during the school day.

Selected teachers, administrators, and Curriculum Specialists (formally Academic Coaches) received initial instruction on creating Common Grade Level Assessments aligned to revised pacing guides.

GUSD negotiated contract with Kern County Superintendent for the C3 online observation tool during the 2010-11 school year. All site administration received iPads and received initial training during the summer of 2011.

Web-based Portal (Cloud) expected to be implemented during 2011-12.

Objective 1B: Student Academic Achievement –Although the Cloud technology is not yet in place, we continue to transform the collaborative culture of the district by focusing on student achievement through Professional Learning Communities and Explicit Direct Instructional strategies which focuses on improving Smartboard lessons and student engagement. Smartboards have been installed in 96% of 4th – 8th classrooms with the remaining boards being purchased in Year 1. Refer to Performance Goal 1B 2010-11 GUSD ELA Teachers 4th – 8th Grades and Smartboards Table.

The district Benchmark tests were the sole instrument used for the initial RFA performance goal. During the summer, district pacing guides and all grade level district Benchmark tests were revised to improve alignment of the standards to the core curriculum. We will be using the CST scores as our performance instrument for yearly comparative data analysis. We have included performance data from the California State Test results that was administered in May 2011. Refer to the table in Performance Goal 1B.

CST data for 4th-8th grades, growth was made as follows:

1. District -2% gains in English Language Arts with a 1.2% gain in our target group.
2. Sites – With the implementation of Smartboard technology, data analysis training using Data Director, and having the ability to view immediate results students at Granite Pointe, Horizon, and Kendrick showed consistent academic achievement gains in Language Arts. When looking at the percentage of students that were advanced and proficient on the CSTs, certain schools show consistent growth in English Language Arts.
3. Subgroups – Our EL Group grew 7.4% overall in English Language Arts

Objective 1C: Eight Grade Student Technology Literacy – Although the target was not met on this objective we did make 2% growth overall. GUSD had 8% Proficient on the pre-survey and 10% on the post-survey. We experienced higher gains in the Intermediate grades 6th – 8th which increased from a 48% baseline to 64%; a net increase of 16%. The baseline used was gathered from the district-wide EdTech Survey which did not allow us to disaggregate the data by grade level. GUSD will create a student assessment using Data Director's item bank to create a pre and post assessment to measure the growth of Technology Literacy within Year 2. We will submit the Program Modification Request with this information.

Goal 2: Professional Development

Objective 2A: Teacher Technology Integration in Curriculum – The initial EdTech survey was implemented district-wide and did not have the ability to disaggregate data for the 4th – 8th grade target teachers. Overall, district showed growth with 19% Proficient baseline and at 30% post survey; a net of 11% gained. Intermediate, 6th – 8th, increased from 45% to 50%. GUSD will create a teacher assessment using Data Director's item bank to create a pre and post assessment to measure the growth of Technology Literacy within Year 2. We will submit the Program Modification Request with this information.

Objective 2B: Teacher Technology Literacy – Referencing the EdTech Survey data, GUSD remained flat at 13% pre/post survey for this objective, however, we showed an increase in the number of teachers improving levels from N/A-Beginning to Intermediate-Proficient by 5% (from 37% to 42%). GUSD will create a teacher assessment using Data Director's item bank to create a pre and post assessment to measure the growth of Technology Literacy within Year 2. We will submit the Program Modification Request with this information.

Goal 3: Expanded Access To Technology & Support

Objective 3A: Decrease target student to computer ratios – Greenfield Union School District's CBEDS 2010-11, shows 1,145 computers that are Less than 48-months-old. The RFA reserved \$3,000 for student computer purchases and planned on having sites purchase additional computers with their Smartboards. However, many of our student computers are going to age out, the sites will not be able to purchase additional computers given the current budget constraints. The district has not purchased new student computers in the last few years and instead has chosen to upgrade the RAM in the older machines. The district plans on purchasing new student tablets with EETT-C monies. We will submit the Program Modification Request with this information.

Objective 3B: Technology Support - Technology support will improve technical support response time – In the past year, GUSD has been hit hard with the budget reductions and support staff in technology support has been reduced. The district had previously operated with one FTE media clerk at each school site; however, staff hours have reduced these positions to only two FTEs and 9 PTEs working between 3.5 and 5.5 hours per day. We do not foresee having the ability to meet this goal in light of the staff reductions and current budget constraints. GUSD will recalculate a more realistic projected growth target and submit the Program Modification Request with this information.

Goal 4: Communication and Collaboration Among Home, School, and Community

Objective 4A: Improve communications and collaboration with home/school/community – Using the EdTech survey the district baseline was 8% for Proficient (initial baseline per RFA) which has been combined with 12% baseline for Intermediate. The data reflects an increase of 11% for Proficient and 18% for Intermediate, for an overall gain of 29% for these two performance levels. The Program Modification Request will be submitted with this information.

Section II: Accountability Measures

Provide the projected and outcome benchmark data collected for each of the program's goals and related objectives as well as the data instruments used to collect the data for each objective. The CDE encourages the LEA to use this section as a basis for determining if a program modification is needed.

For each objective listed on grantee's EETT Competitive application, *Form 3: Program Goals, Objectives, Data Collection, and Evaluation*, the projected *Growth Target* is calculated by subtracting the *Baseline* percent or number from the projected *End of Year* benchmark percent or number ($Growth\ Target\ \% = Projected\ End\ of\ Year\ \% - Baseline\ \%$). The *Actual Growth* is calculated by subtracting the *Actual End of Year* benchmark percent or number from the *Baseline* percent or number ($Actual\ Growth\ \% = Actual\ End\ of\ Year\ \% - Baseline\ \%$).

A one-time follow up grant of \$45/ student will be awarded, if funds become available. To be eligible to receive one-time follow up EETT Competitive funding, the EETT Competitive Grant Conditions and Grant Assurances require the LEA to have made significant progress for each benchmark included in the grant application. ***Significant progress is defined as the grantee meeting a minimum of 70 percent of the growth targets between the baseline percentages and the projected outcomes as stated on Form 3.***

Performance Goal 1 - Program for Students

Targeted students will increase grade level proficiency with technology literacy and will use technology as a tool to improve academic achievement of the state content standards as follows:

Program Objective 1a: Targeted students will increase grade-level proficiency with technology literacy* by an average of 20 percentage points. *Proficiency with Technology Literacy as specified by LEA in the EETT C Project Narrative.

Program Objective 1b: Targeted students will improve academic achievement of the state content standards* by an average of 2 percentage points. *Academic content focus area(s) and achievement as specified by LEA in the EETT C Project Narrative.

Program Objective 1c, if your program targeted students in multiple grade levels that included 8th grade, complete Objective 1c below: Targeted students in the 8th grade will increase grade-level proficiency with technology literacy* by an average of 10 percentage points. *Proficiency with Technology Literacy as specified by LEA in the EETT C Project Narrative.

Other Objectives: List other objectives for this Performance Goal that was listed in your EETT C application.

Complete the Benchmark Data Chart for each of the objectives in Performance Goal 1:

Goal 1 –Program for Students	Baseline %	Projected End Year %	Growth Target %*	70% of Growth Target	Baseline + 70% Growth	Actual End Year %	On Target? Y / N
Objective 1a: Student Technology Literacy Proficiency**	39	59	20	14	53	57	Y
Objective 1b: Student Academic Achievement**	43	45	2	1.4	44.4	45	Y
Objective 1c: Grade 8 Student Technology Literacy Proficiency**	56	66	10	7	63	66	Y

*Growth Target % = Projected End Year % minus Baseline %.

**If the original LEA EETT C grant application benchmark data has been revised, the CDE must have an approved Program Modification Request on file.

Performance Goal 1 – Program for Students

List the Data Instruments used to measure Performance Goal 1 for each objective

Objective 1a: List the data instruments used to support Goal 1 – Student Technology Literacy Proficiency
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>EdTechProfile Teacher Technology Assessment Profile – CCTC Program Standard 9: Using Technology in the Classroom.</i> <i>Classroom Observations– C3 observation tool was not implemented until Year 2</i>
Objective 1b: List data instruments used to support Goal 1 – Student Academic Achievement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>STAR – CST data on Target Students (4th – 8th Grades) scoring proficient and above in English Language Arts.</i>

LEA is on target to meet all the objectives for Performance Goal 1?

X	YES
	NO

Refer to the following CST Proficient and Advanced table and API Table below for Student Academic Achievement gains.

ELA Growth 4 th – 8 th Proficient and Advanced Percentages		
Grade Levels	2009-2010	2010-2011
4 th Grade	56%	55%
5 th Grade	43%	50%
6 th Grade	39%	39%
7 th Grade	44%	43%
8 th Grade	42%	43%
4 th – 8 th Average Growth	44.8%	46%
District Average Growth	43%	45%

Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced in Language Arts		
Selected School Sites and Grade Levels	2009-2010	2010-2011
Granite Point 4 th Grade	61%	65%
Granite Pointe 5 th Grade	38%	50%
Horizon 4 th Grade	52%	59%
Horizon 5 th Grade	37%	68%
Kendrick 4 th Grade	63%	68%
Kendrick 5 th Grade	53%	61%
3 School Average	50.7%	54.3%

In comparing to the other elementary schools, these 3 sites received additional training on creating Common Assessments using Data Director's Item Bank questions and using existing assessments that are scored in Data Director for immediate feedback. In Year 2, we plan on providing training to the remainder of the school sites. Significant gains were made by those sites receiving additional training with a 3.6% growth which was 1.6% higher than the district growth rate.

API Data Comparisons Greenfield Union School District	Number of Students included in the 2009 API	2009 Base API	2010 Target	2010 - 11 API	2 Year Growth from 2009 to 2011
Elementary Schools					
Fairview	256	752	757	767	15
Granite Pointe	455	749	754	784	35
Horizon	417	752	757	806	54
Plantation	367	768	773	822	54
Planz	401	724	729	780	56
Raffaello Palla	577	762	767	755	-7
Valle Verde	437	773	778	774	1
W. A. Kendrick	375	829	800	870	41
Middle Schools					
Greenfield	805	709	714	732	23
Leon H. Ollivier	869	748	753	772	24
McKee	724	738	743	763	25
District Wide	5,683	747	710	770	28

Reviewing the 2009 API Base and 2011 Growth, all sites showed gains except for Palla Elementary. We attribute this to significant layoffs of certificated staff and some classified staff. Palla laid-off 9 teachers in 2009-2010 with 6 out of 9 affecting 4th/5th grades. In 2010-2011, Palla laid-off another 10 teachers with 6 out of 10 affecting 4th/5th grades and 100% turnover in 4th grade. The replacement teachers in these grades moved from other sites and/or changed grade levels.

GUSD ELA Teachers 4th - 8th and Smartboards 2010-2011

Site	4-8th Gr. Teachers	Smartboards by Grade					SB Totals	Smart Boards	Computer Lab / Library SBs
		4th Gr.	4/5th combo	5th Gr.	6th Gr.	7th & 8th Gr.			
Fairview	5	2	1	2			5	100%	1
Granite Point	9	5		4			9	100%	0
Horizon	8	4		4			8	100%	2
Kendrick	7	3		4			7	100%	0
Palla	10	5		5			10	100%	1
Plantation	7	3	1	0			4	57%	0
Planz	7	3	1	3			7	100%	1
Valle Verde	7	3	1	3			7	100%	1
Greenfield	18				10	8	18	100%	1
McKee	14				7	6	13	93%	0
Ollivier	19				11	8	19	100%	0
Total	111	28	4	25	28	22	107	96%	7

In Year 2, GUSD will purchase 4 additional Smartboards with EETT-C grant funds to meet 100% implementation for the target group teachers.

Performance Goal 2 – Professional Development

Targeted teachers will increase proficiency with technology literacy and will use technology to improve student achievement in the academic content areas specified in the Project Narrative as follows:

Program Objective 2a: Targeted teachers will increase proficiency with technology literacy* by an average of **20** percentage points. * *Proficiency with Technology Literacy for Teachers as specified by LEA in the EETT C Project Narrative.*

Program Objective 2b: Targeted teachers will increase proficiency with integrating technology in their standards-aligned curriculum* by an average of **10** percentage points. * *Efficacy with Curriculum Integration for Teachers as specified by LEA in the Project Narrative.*

Other Objectives: List other objectives for this Performance Goal that was listed in your EETT C application.

Complete the Benchmark Data Chart for each of the objectives in Performance Goal 2:

Goal 2 – Professional Development	Baseline %	Projected Year End %	Growth Target %*	70% of Growth Target	Baseline + 70% Growth	Actual Year End %	On Target? Y / N
Objective 2a: Teacher Technology Literacy Proficiency**	64	84	20	14	78	80	Y
Objective 2b: Teacher Integrating Technology Proficiency**	37	47	10	7	44	42	N

*Growth Target % = Projected End Year % minus Baseline %.

**If the original LEA EETT C grant application benchmark data has been revised, the CDE must have an approved Program Modification Request on file.

Performance Goal 2 – Professional Development

List the Data Instruments used to measure Performance Goal 2 for each objective

Objective 2a: List the data instruments used to support Goal 2 – Teacher Technology Literacy Proficiency
1. <i>EdTechProfile Teacher Technology Assessment Profile – Category: Computer Knowledge and Skills</i>
Objective 2b: List the data instruments used to support Goal 2 – Teacher Integrating Technology Proficiency
1. <i>EdTechProfile Teacher Technology Assessment Profile – Standard 9, Question 2: Knowledge of student level of technology use and academic accomplishment.</i>
2. <i>Classroom Observations– C3 observation tool was not implemented until Year 2</i>

LEA is on target to meet all the objectives for Performance Goal 2?

<input type="checkbox"/>	YES
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO

Objective 2b: *GUSD did make growth with a net gain of 5% including Intermediate and Proficient performance levels. The district fell short of the initial 10% projected growth. This goal will be adjusted to reflect the results of the 4th-8th target teachers rather than use district-wide data/goals. The Continued professional development will be provided on data analysis and common assessments using Data Director, and lesson design utilizing Smartboards in Year 2. These trainings will be provided by the district’s Technology Specialist and Curriculum Specialists.*

Performance Goal 3 – Expanded access to Technology and Support

All students and teachers in the target group will have expanded access to up-to-date technology and will have access to the technical support necessary to implement the EETT Competitive program.

Program Objective 3a: The average student-to-computer will remain flat at **10:1** ratio for target students in target classrooms. However, we plan to reprioritize the cloud money to purchase \$38,000 toward 64 student tablets and 2 portable carts.

Program Objective 3b (Required – Technology Support): Technology support will improve technical support response time by an average of **13** percentage points as specified in the Expanding Access to Technology and Technology Support in project narrative.

Complete the Benchmark Data Chart for each of the objectives in Performance Goal 3:

Goal 3– Expanded Access to Technology & Support	Baseline Ratio	Projected End Year Ratio	Difference in Ratio	70% of Difference	Current Ratio	On Target ? Y / N	
Objective 3a: Student to Computer Ratio**	10:1	8:1	2:1	1.4:1	10:1	N	
Goal 3 – Technology Support	Baseline %	Projected Year End %	Growth Target %*	70% of Growth Target	Baseline + 70% Growth	Actual Year End %	On Target? Y / N
Objective 3b: Technology Support	37	32	-5	-3.5	33.5	33	Y

***If the original LEA EETT C grant application benchmark data has been revised, the CDE must have an approved Program Modification Request on file.*

Performance Goal 3 – Expanded access to Technology and Support

List the Data Instruments used to measure Performance Goal 3

Objective 3a: : List the data instruments used to support Goal 3 – Expanded access to Technology
<i>1. CBEDs – Online Reporting Application: Technology Totals by School</i>
Objective 3b: Technology Support
<i>1. EdTechProfile Teacher Technology Assessment Profile – Category: Technical Support</i>

LEA is on target to meet all the objectives for Performance Goal 3?

<input type="checkbox"/>	YES
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO

Objective 3a -In the initial RFA, GUSD used the 2010-11 CBEDs data to determine the Student-to-Computer ratio of 10:1. GUSD has not reported 2011-12 CBEDs therefore no new data is available to compare Year 1. The district is in the process of changing directions by upgrading student workstations to the mobile cart labs containing notebooks/tablets. In order to accomplish this, various infrastructure needs to be replaced as follows.

- 1. SAN (Storage Area Network) with new anti-virus software*
- 2. KACE (Management System)*
- 3. Windows 7*
- 4. HP workstations to Dell notebooks/tablets*
- 5. Cloud*

The district is spending approximately \$330,000 of in-kind funds to provide this infrastructure for implementation of the Stoneware (cloud) software. The Program Modification Request will be submitted with this information.

Funding was increased to purchase Administrator’s iPads due to the iPad model price change, data plans, and surcharges. Amount allocated to student computers in RFA was \$3,000. Sites were responsible for purchasing student computers with using existing categorical funds; however, with the current budget constraints this will not be feasible. There will be a change in the district’s direction to use student notebooks instead of student workstations with the money originally allocated to the cloud since this was purchased by the district as in-kind. Approximately \$38,000 will be used for the purchase 64 Dell Tablets and 2 portable carts. The Program Modification Request will be submitted with this information.

Objective 3b – The initial Projected Year-end % was estimated at 50%; however, this was erroneously calculated thinking that we wanted to increase the response time when in fact, response time should decrease to reflect improved service. Therefore, the response time % was recalculated for both grant years to reflect a reduction of those waiting more than 2 hours for technology support.

Per EdTech Survey, the performance measures for more than 2 hours or less decreased by 4% from 37% to 33%. Even though sites need to wait for the district technology department to service work order requests, response time still decreased considering the reduction in staff. Every effort will be made to prioritize technical problems that impact student learning.

Performance Goal 4 - *Communication with Home, School, and Community*

Technology will be used to establish and/ or improve communication and collaboration among home, school, and community to support student learning needs.

Program Objective 4a below, as it appears in the LEAs EETT C application. Include a baseline and benchmark growth target for program year.

Other Objectives: List other objectives for this Performance Goal that was listed in your EETT C application.

Complete the Benchmark Data Chart for each of the objectives in Performance Goal 4:

Goal 4 – Communication with Home, School, and Community	Baseline %	Projected End Year %	Growth Target %*	70% of Growth Target	Baseline + 70% Growth	Actual End Year %	On Target ? Y / N
Objective 4a: Improve and expand communication and collaboration with Home, School, and Community	20	38	18	12.6	32.6	49	N

*Growth Target % = Projected End Year % minus Baseline %.

**If the original LEA EETT C grant application benchmark data has been revised, the CDE must have an approved Program Modification Request on file.

Objective 4a- The baseline will include measuring improvement in the Intermediate and Proficient performance bands. The initial growth target was comparing only the Proficient band, however, the district made significant gain moving staff from the N/A and Beginning bands to higher performing levels. The District shows N/A –Beginning bands decreased 29% with same percent gained in the Intermediate/Proficient bands. This is more representative of the significant growth made in using technology to collaborate with students and parents.

Performance Band	2008	2011
N/A	40%	11%
Beginning	40%	40%
Subtotal	80%	51%
Intermediate	12%	30%
Proficient	8%	19%
Subtotal	20%	49%

Section III: Technical Assistance from CTAP

Did your agency receive assistance from CTAP on achieving EETT C performance goals?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES
<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

If YES, describe the technical assistance provided by CTAP

The district's Technology Specialist met and/or had several telephone conversations with Kern County Superintendent of Schools (KCSOS) – Technology Department to discuss GUSD's Technology Plan, EETT-C grant, and C3 trainings. The district Technology Specialist received training on the C3 Observation tool, March 2011.

Would assistance from CTAP be helpful to your agency in reaching the EETT C Performance Goals?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES
<input type="checkbox"/>	NO

If YES, describe the technical assistance needed from CTAP

The KCSOS CTAP office scheduled trainings for administrators on the C3 Observation tool in Year 2.

Please indicate the specific performance goals and objectives your agency would like assistance from CTAP and we will have a CTAP representative in your jurisdiction contact you.

We are already in contact with our CTAP representatives for assistance.