

U.S. Department of Education
PART I: PT3 GRANT PERFORMANCE REPORT

COVER SHEET

1. Performance Reporting Period	
7/1/01- Start Date	3/31/01 End Date
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual	

2. PR/Award No. P342A-010094

3. Type of Grant: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation

4. Lead Organization Information

California County Superintendents
Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
1121 L Street, Suite 406
Sacramento, CA 95814
Tel#: (916) 446-3095
Fax: (916) 448-7801

NOTE: CCSESA HAS MOVED!

5a. Contact Information for Individual(s) Completing this Report

Pamela Redmond, Project Director
Tel# 415-422-5271 Fax#: 707-516-7773
redmond@usfca.edu or redmond@mac.com

David Georgi
External Evaluator
Tel. #: 661-664-3152 Fax #: 661-664-2016
E-mail Address: dgeorgi@sub.edu

5b. Project Director Information

Name: Pamela Redmond
If the project director on record has
changed during this reporting period,
check this box →

6. Budget for Reporting Period

Total Federal Amount Awarded (Annual):	\$505,904
Total Federal Amount Spent (for Reporting Period):	\$370,690
Total Non-Federal Amount Spent (for Reporting Period):	\$435,995

7. Authorized Representative Information
--

I verify that the information submitted in this report is based on the best available data.

Name: Pamela Redmond Title: Director
USF Telephone: 415-422-5271 eFax Number 707-516-7773 Email: redmond@mac.com
TEC Telephone: 415-381-8587

Signature

Date

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Teaching and Learning Interchange (TLI) has made significant progress in its mission to develop a research-informed model for using technology as a medium to distribute content-based instruction, inquiry into effective classroom practice, and to facilitate access to new teacher support. It has addressed the needs of pre-interns (uncredentialed teachers serving full-time in classrooms) to meet California's academic content and teacher performance standards through online and face to face tutoring. We have utilized our web-based technologies and developed two different applications of video streamed classroom practice to use as pedagogical tools to support teachers to view accomplished teachers applying their knowledge of subject matter in their diverse classrooms. These lessons demonstrate infusion of technology into the teaching and learning process and have been developed using the case study methodology.

The TLI has begun to mobilize its resources to accomplish its objectives. Corporate partners have attended the Statewide Pre-Intern director's meeting to demonstrate their technologies to the participating directors from pre-intern programs in county offices of education across the state. This event and contacts made by both the Executive Director of the LEA and the Project Director has resulted in the participant base for the project doubling in size. These County Office of Education (COEs) programs play a pivotal role in giving the TLI access to pre-intern teachers in California thereby directly affecting the K-12 students in those classrooms.

Four surveys have been conducted. One prioritized the work of the project from the participants' point of view. The other allowed the County Office directors to decide which of the end-user technologies they will employ in their work with the pre-interns teachers their projects serve. Two others allowed participants to provide the project with direct feedback on our progress from their point of view.

Training of mentors (coaches), participating pre-interns, and local support specialists began in December. In January, a full roll-out of activities to pre-interns began in concert with our new partner in science preparation, the acclaimed Exploratorium Teacher Center in San Francisco. Tutoring in biology, chemistry and physical science was conducted using the ClearPhone software. Our Video Case Study Team (VCS – renamed from "SuperTeam" in the proposal) has met three times so far to define and create the classroom dilemmas we've

produced. VCS has been successful in identifying necessary components of project videos and is informing our partners Apple and Lesson Lab on how to design these video-based lessons to specifically meet the unique needs of uncredentialed teachers. We have filmed three hour long science classroom lessons that are currently in production for use as video case studies: high school chemistry and biology and middle school chemistry. We will premiere the first case in April. Three exhibits for the restructured, video-based Apple Learning Interchange are in production and will be online at the NECC convention in June: Cloning: Issues in Science, a middle school lesson in which E.L.L. students work with a scientist and clone sheep DNA, then participate in a week long webquest activity on the human genome and cloning; Jenny's Kids: an early literacy study with special day students, a lesson in cultural acceptance for high school using Shakespeare.

The Exploratorium has been successful in identifying mentor teachers to tutor online and to provide the project with opportunities for taping science lessons for LessonLab to post. In partnership with the TLI, Apple is in the process of a total redesign of its Apple Learning Interchange (ALI), where more TLI resources will be posted that will include samples of student work, assessment tools, professional development resources, lesson plans, reflections and related materials. These will be tied to our larger database, conference forums and website via the FileMakerPro database currently being designed by our partner, InResonance. Our goal is to create a single source website that integrates all of our partner's technologies; where uncredentialed/alternative certification teachers can find support with subject matter, classroom management, lesson plans and classroom pedagogy.

To this end, the TLI has allied itself with the Santa Cruz New Teacher Center to assess the critical issues we face in scaling up our project for statewide use. Currently, there are approximately 43,000 alternative certification teachers in California alone who could benefit from our services. The SCNTC will meet this summer with representatives from each of our partner county offices to fully develop this plan which will be presented to the CCSESA board in fall of 2002.

Recent redesign of the state standards in the subject matter areas will result in the concomitant change in the rigorous subject matter exams pre-interns must pass in order to enter a credential program (SSAT, MSAT and Praxis exams.) In mid-May we will begin planning a series of institutes where we will assemble experts from the subject matter panels, test design

teams, and representatives from our county offices to create full courses of test preparation and support for use during the next school year. We will begin capturing tutoring sessions on video for on-demand viewing by participants in the courses.

The TLI is very fortunate to have forged a special relationship with the San Joaquin County Office of Education. The director of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) project and the Director of Curriculum and Technology have both been hired on a part-time basis to support the coordination of the TLI. In addition, we have hired the director of new teacher programs in Kings County to be the coordinator of science content. A full-time administrative assistant to the grant efforts was hired as of November 19, 2001, allowing the Project Director to be eighty percent released from her teaching responsibilities.

The URL <http://www.teachinginterchange.org> has been purchased and a webmaster has been hired to begin work on the overall design and user interface for the web site.

III. PROJECT STATUS

The TLI added service to pre-interns in four additional County Offices of Education (COEs) in its first year plus two more who will begin working with us in fall 2002. At that time we will have doubled the audience for our services to six more counties than the proposal identified. These extra avenues for distribution will help ensure that all aspects of the prototype projects will occur as planned. All corporate partners are actively involved and several new partnerships have been forged.

Report your progress in meeting each one of your objectives.

Based on the advice from the PT3 grants management office, the TLI leadership team has established four goals/objectives to ensure the development of a full prototype of the TLI by the end of project year one. The work of the TLI in year one has become focused primarily upon preparing Science and Special Education teachers with the hope of expanding to Math in year two if funding is available.

It should be noted that all five original objectives were designed to occur in project years two and three. Scheduled activities are taking place guided by the updated year one goals. Greater articulation of these activities, timelines and evaluation measures can be found in the flow chart below.

The decisions made about how and when to roll out services were guided by direct input from the directors of the pre-intern teacher preparation programs involved. Two surveys were conducted to provide leadership with critical information:

- 1) the Pre-Intern Director Survey (attachment 2) which was designed to address the reformation of the goals of the grant based on the critical needs in the field and the possibility of only one year of funding. Of primary importance to all involved was to create a *reliable* system. As a result we were given the mandate from the directors to thorough field test all technologies prior to wide-spread distribution in the programs. All concerned felt that such careful attention to detail would ensure greater success and acceptance of our systems in the future years of the project
- 2) the TLI Implementation survey (attachment 3) in which we asked our constituency to inform us as to the priority we should place on the development of each of our goals, the number of participants from their project, who in their project could help with implementation and when we should schedule activities.

Describe the corrective action(s) that will be taken to address the problem(s).

There have been no problems that required corrective actions. One unexpected event worth noting is that our first meeting of the county office participants was originally scheduled for September 15th, 2001 and would have required attendees to travel from all over the state to a central location. The impact of the September 11th event upon travel arrangements precluded our having this meeting. As a result, we began the practice of holding our countywide meetings in the evening during the State's regularly scheduled pre-intern directors' meetings. The outcome of this is that we have had 100% attendance from every county at every meeting, often with our project directors bringing other county representatives along to hear about our work.

Report your project performance using the GPRAs program performance indicators.

Please refer to the charts below which are cross-referenced to the GPRAs.

Describe any changes you wish to make in performance objectives and activities.

See above and the charts that follow. The Director of the project will be bringing the leadership team together in late May-early June to revisit all of our goals once we have knowledge regarding future funding. We feel we have been able to capture sufficient buy-in and support from our constituency that we can begin to plan for state-wide services. We must begin to

consider how we will disseminate , sustain and expand the work of our project. At this meeting, we plan to add goals and objectives relative to these critical areas for project years 2 and 3.

NOTE: Due to the uncertainty of future funding, the revised goals below were created for the interim report based on the advice from the PT3 office in Washington. We wanted to reflect outcomes that could be accomplished in our first year rather than the initial goals of the grant application which were set for years two and three.

<p>Revised Year One Goal (from original objectives 1,2,4)</p>	<p><i>the TLI will provide internet-based subject-matter competency training focused upon science that includes online access to test preparation materials and subject matter content tutoring. Participating pre-intern candidates passing rates for requisite subject matter competency exam (s) for teacher licensure purposes will increase by 20% (baseline from previous year and/or October 2001 rates)</i> <i>GPRA 1.4</i></p>
<p>Definition of Success</p>	<p>Implement the training and tutoring systems and have pre-interns attain the stated passing rates.</p>
<p>Progress</p>	<p>Partially Accomplished. The TLI has piloted technologies for developing a preparation system including pedagogy and mentoring through the support of EducationTalk’s ClearPhone web-base video conferencing network. The results of our initial survey of Pre-Intern program directors across the state helped to identify that the subject area most in need of subject-matter preparation support are science and health (which is needed for special education candidates.) The technologies in our project will be focused on the development of a science subject matter competency with a supplemental support system for the health exams. Systems for gathering data from Consortium partners on the passage rate on subject matter competency exam (s) are being put in place by the project evaluator. Previous passing rates on the ETS tests will be compared to passing rates for the February and April 2002 tests. We have not yet received the scores from the ETS. Specified county office participants will develop prototype procedures for providing access between pre-intern teachers and Exploratorium mentor teachers. ClearPhone and other technologies will be used to provide this service. Systems for reporting candidate access through technology to an individual, experienced mentor are being put in place.</p>
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>The content focus was determined by the survey of site directors. The training and tutoring systems are in place. As test results become known, a determination of success can be made. See Attachment 5 for survey information</p>
<p>Use of Evaluation Findings</p>	<p>These findings will be valuable in planning subsequent approaches to supplying support for other content area subjects. Our first survey of satisfaction with the ClearPhone technology will be issued in May. Based on the results, the summer institute planning team will make appropriate changes in delivery.</p>

New Year Goal 2	<i>The TLI will present video investigations into classroom practice in the teaching of science. GPRA 1.4,</i>
Definition of Success	Pre-intern, coach and program director satisfaction with the degree to which the LessonLab videos can be produced so that they are perceived as useful in supporting uncredentialed teachers with gaining critical knowledge of actual classroom practice with diverse student populations.
Progress	Substantially Accomplished. The proposal described a “SuperTeam” that would be formed to support this work. We have renamed this group the Video Case Study (*VCS) team. It is composed of persons chosen for their expertise in specific aspects of this project, e.g., knowledge of text-based case studies, online professional development, internet use of video. The team met of the team will occurred in December 4-5, 2001, February 28, 2002 and April 15-16, 2002. Videos were produced, previewed to a broad audience across the state and have been posted for viewing in the LessonLab engine. Piloting began at the county offices in April. Review of feedback will occur in May. Three case study videos are in production: High School Chemistry, High School Biology, and Middle School Chemistry.
Analysis	The VCS team has been effective in defining what sort of video case studies will be used in the project. The format pioneered by LessonLab appears to offer the greatest potential to help pre-interns learn instructional skills and classroom management. Though it is outside of this reporting period we have included Attachment 4 with survey results from April 20, 2002 statewide feedback session with directors, pre-interns, and coaches.
Use of Evaluation Findings	Surveys of pre-interns will seek to identify what elements of the LessonLab approach were most helpful or not helpful. In addition, mentor teachers and site directors will be surveyed to see how they perceived the process. Survey results will be used to plan for subsequent video case studies.
Objective 3 (rephrased for this year)	<i>80% of TLI Project participants will demonstrate competency with selected elements of the state’s recently adopted Technology Standard for teachers. GPRA 2.1</i>
Definition of Success	Attaining the stated competency rate
Progress	Partially Accomplished. While some materials to support acquisition of these skills have been developed, we are still in the development/piloting stage with three of our

	products. We will develop articulated skills for participating teachers that can be verified online as having met the Technology Standard requirements. Systems for gathering data from Consortium partners on the rate of candidates meeting California Standard 20.5 are being put in place. (Standard 9 under the new credentialing system just being adopted.).
Analysis	These systems are still being developed. The director of this project served on both the state standards team and the ISTE NETS for teacher team and has created an alignment grid combining both sets of standards for use in assessing our progress
Use of Evaluation Findings	When the selected elements are determined and an analysis of pre-intern performance is completed, the data can be used in planning how to target specified elements in the future.
Objective 4 (rephrased from the original objective 5)	<i>80% of TLI Project participants will demonstrate the ability to design and implement a technology-enhanced K-12 student lesson in the classroom. GPRA 2.1</i>
Definition of Success	Meeting the stated percentage and assessing the lessons in terms of standards based quality indicators.
Progress	Partially Accomplished. The TLI team is in the process of developing the course of delivery for the technology-enhanced K-12 lessons. San Joaquin County and Kings county each have experts in this field and the plan is to have a full course developed by January when the training can begin from InResonance. Apple Computer has a broad database of units of practice which will be a major resource that we hope to link into the TLI database. Support systems for reporting candidate ability to design and implement technology-enhanced K-12 student lessons in the classroom are being put into place at participating county offices. Three “exhibits” of the Apple Learning Interchange are in development and will be released to the public during the NECC conference in June: middle-school biology/webquest, early literacy in special education, and high school English and multicultural perspectives using Shakespeare.
Analysis	Models of practice from accomplished teachers are in development. Our initial survey of the field told us that rather than teaching classes to preinterns about technology integration in the classroom, they needed for us to build a database of pre-intern appropriate resources that modeled the effective use of technology in the classroom from which pre-interns could glean lesson plans, assessment tools, classroom management techniques, how-to sheets. Samples of student work and reflections from both teachers and students are included. The project is not at the stage of having pre-interns produce lessons at this time.
Use of Evaluation Findings	Findings will be useful in planning subsequent systems for helping pre-interns integrate technology into their practice.

IV. BUDGET INFORMATION

This section provides a table for you to summarize budgeted and obligated funds for the reporting period. Obligated funds include those that have either already been paid out or that have been committed through purchase order, contract, or receipt of an invoice.

Use the table provided to summarize what funds were budgeted and what funds will have been actually spent by the end of the reporting period.

Direct Costs	COLUMN 1: Approved Federal (Include Carryover)	COLUMN 2: Actual and Projected Expenditure s: Federal	COLUMN 3: Non- Federal (Project Matching Funds)	COLUMN 4: Actual and Projected Expenditure s: Non-Federal	COLUMN 5: Total Budget Sources (1+ 3 = 5)	COLUMN 6: Total Budget Projected (Federal + Non- Federal) (2 + 4 = 6)
1. Salaries & Wages (Professional & Clerical)	124,000	105,800	159,750	190,300	283,750	296,100
2. Employee Benefits	10,780	6,312	42,780	42,780	53,560	49,092
3. Travel	41,700	14,472	14,250	31,040	55,950	45,512
4. Equipment (Purchase)	8,500	0	31,000	31,000	39,500	31,000
5. Materials and Supplies	31,870	20,852	23,517	29,817	55,387	50,669
6. Consultants and Contracts	256,500	190,700	64,950	113,000	321,450	303,700
7. Other (Equipment Rental, Printing, etc.)	0	0	56,000	94,660	56,000	94,660
A. Total Direct Costs: (1-7)	473,350	338,136	392,247	532,597	865,597	870,733
B. Indirect Costs: Actual Indirect Cost Rate of Lead .65%.See below	32,554	32,554	22,185	22,185	54,739	54,739
C. Total Costs (A+B)	505,904	370,690	414,432	554,782	920,336	925,472

1. Please provide an explanation if you are NOT expending funds at the expected rate.

Not applicable at this time.

2. Please describe any significant changes to your budget resulting from modifications of project activities. List the amount of carryover for the budget period and describe how it was used, if applicable.

No significant changes. However, it is important to note that project has grown from 6 participating county offices to 10 this year and 12 next year. The number of pre-interns requiring service will grow proportionately. Which will require redistribution of the budget funds. We anticipate having to request additional monies either from the PT3 office or via other granting agencies when our project scales up to reach all of the counties in the state.

3. Please describe any anticipated changes in your operational budget for the NEXT budget period.

No significant changes anticipated at this time other than we believe we will require significant additional funds to reach our full audience of uncredentialed / alternative certification teachers in the state.

B. Consortium Partners

	Member Institution / Organization	Type of Partner	Date Added	Date Dropped
1	CCSESA California County Superintendents' Education Services Association	SEA	original	
2	Apple	For Profit Firm	original	
3	LessonLab	For Profit Firm	original	
4	EducationTalk	For Profit Firm	original	
5	WestEd	For Profit Firm	original	
6	CSU Monterey Bay	IHE	original	
7	inResonance (contracted services)	For Profit Firm	original	
8	California Council on Teacher Education	Other Non-profit	original	
9	Alameda County Office of Education	LEA	original	
10	Kings County Office of Education	LEA	original	
11	Los Angeles County Office of Education	LEA	original	
12	San Joaquin County Office of Education	LEA	original	
13	Santa Cruz County Office of Education	LEA	original	

14	Ventura County Office of Education	LEA	original	
15	Monterey County Office of Education	LEA	September, 2001	
16	Riverside County Office of Education	LEA	September 2001	On hold as of Dseember 2001
17	Sacramento City School District	LEA	September 2001	December 2001
18	San Diego City Schools (COE)	LEA	September 2001	
19	San Mateo County Office of Education	LEA	September 2001	
20	San Francisco Unified School District (COE)	LEA	October 2001	
21	University of San Francisco	IHE	October 2001	
22	The Exploratorium	Museum	November 2001	
23	California Science Standards Task Force	Other NFP (oversight of this body is through the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	October 2001	
24	PETPrep – PT3 Project at Pepperdine University	IHE	November 2001	
25	CENIC – California Educational Network Infrastructure Consortium	Other NFP	November 2001	
26	Santa Cruz New Teacher Center	Other NFP	March 2002	

V. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

As of January 2002, the project director will be working 80% on grant activities. This was made possible through the hiring of a full-time, rather than part-time, administrative assistant.

Attachments:

1. Year 1 goal summary

First Year Survey Results: <http://www.zoomerang.com>

2. Pre-Intern Director Opinion Survey Results
3. Implementation Survey Results
4. Registration for SSAT Tutoring Survey Results
5. Video Case Study Premiere Feedback Survey plus the Los Angeles results I will send separately.
6. ClearPhone Feedback Survey

For more information on California's Subject Matter competency requirements intended to raise teacher quality relative to our first goal, please visit:

1. Multiple Subject Guidelines <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentialinfo/leaflets/cl674m.pdf>
2. Single Subject Guidelines <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentialinfo/leaflets/cl674s.pdf>