



D District	MS Middle School
ES Elementary School	JH Junior High
EC Early Childhood	Alt Alternative School
HS High School	

OETT GRANTS-TO-SCHOOLS

Exhibit B
2014 OETT Grant Schools

School	County	Region	Level	Equipment	Teachers	Students
Beggs HS	Okmulgee	NE	High School	Tablets	23	325
Belle Isle Enterprise MS/OKC	Oklahoma	Central	Middle School	Laptops	24	449
Bristow MS	Creek	NE	Middle School	Laptops	15	380
Elk City HS	Beckham	NW	High School	iPads	24	354
Elmore City-Pernell ES	Garvin	SW	Elementary	iPads	18	286
Fairland ES	Ottawa	NE	Elementary	iPads	7	124
Frederick MS	Tillman	SW	Middle School	Tablets	18	180
Jefferson Early Childhood Center/McAlester	Pittsburg	SE	Elementary	iPads	10	147
Mannford ES	Creek	NE	Elementary	iPads	25	323
Minco Public Schools	Grady	SW	District	iPads	15	170
Peavine Public Schools	Adair	NE	District	iPads	15	146
Piedmont Intermediate Schl	Canadian	NW	Middle School	iPads	28	479
Sallie Gillentine ES/Hollis	Harmon	SW	Elementary	Tablets	20	301
Southmoore HS	Cleveland	Central	High School	Laptops	120	2078
Springer Public Schools	Carter	SE	District	Laptops	11	74
Waller MS/Enid	Garfield	NW	Middle School	iPads	42	612
William Gay Early Childhood Center/McAlester	Pittsburg	SE	Elementary	iPads	14	188
Wilson Arts Integration ES/OKC	Oklahoma	Central	Elementary	Smartboards	22	415
Yukon HS	Canadian	NW	High School	iPads	24	1210

TOTALS

475

8241

Exhibit D 2014 OETT Grant Schools

		PLC (I)	Tech Integration (II)	Prof. Learning and Sharing (III)	Practices of High Achieving (IV)	Overall Success (V)
1	Beggs HS	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
2	Belle Isle Enterprise MS/OKC	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
3	Bristow MS	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
4	Elk City HS	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
5	Elmore City-Pernell ES	Significant	Significant	Moderate	Moderate	Met
6	Fairland ES	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
7	Frederick MS	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
8	Jefferson Early Childhood Center/ McAlester	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
9	Mannford ES	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
10	Minco Public Schools	Significant	Significant	Minimal	Moderate	Met
11	Peavine Public Schools	Moderate	Significant	Moderate	Moderate	Met
12	Piedmont Intermediate School	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
13	Sallie Gillentine ES/Hollis	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
14	Southmoore HS	Moderate	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
15	Springer Public Schools	Significant	Significant	Significant	Moderate	Exceeded
16	Waller MS/Enid	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
17	William Gay Early Childhood Center/ McAlester	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
18	Wilson Arts Integration ES/OKC	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded
19	Yukon HS	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Exceeded

* Denotes statistically significant growth during grant year

Parts I and II: Level is determined by paired means from survey data

4 – 5 characteristics present is “Significant Success”

3 characteristics present is “Moderate Success”

2 characteristics present is “Minimal Success”

0 – 1 characteristics present is “Little or No Success”

Parts III: Level is determined by number of characteristics present.

4 - 5 characteristics present is “Significant Success”

3 characteristics present is “Moderate success”

2 characteristics present is “Minimal Success”

0 - 1 characteristics is “Little or No Success”

Part IV: Level is determined by number of characteristics present.

4 - 5 characteristics present is “Significant Success”

3 characteristics present is “Moderate Success”

2 characteristics present is “Minimal Success”

0 - 1 characteristics present is “Little or No Success”

Part V: Level is determined by combining above data

Significant Success = 4 Moderate Success = 3

Minimal Success = 2 Little or No Success = 1

Mean of 3 to 4 is “Exceeded Expectations”

Mean of 2 to 3 is “Met Expectations”

Mean of 0 to 2 is “Did Not Meet Expectations”

Exhibit E
2014 OETT Grant Schools

	Grant School	Grant Evaluation			Sustainability		
		Exceeded Expectations	Met Expectations	Did Not Meet Expectations	Significant	Moderate	Minimal
1	Beggs HS	X			X		
2	Belle Isle Enterprise MS/OKC	X			X		
3	Bristow MS	X			X		
4	Elk City HS	X			X		
5	Elmore City-Pernell ES		X		X		
6	Fairland ES	X			X		
7	Frederick MS	X			X		
8	Jefferson Early Childhood Center/McAlester	X			X		
9	Mannford ES	X			X		
10	Minco Public Schools		X			X	
11	Peavine Public Schools		X		X		
12	Piedmont Intermediate School	X			X		
13	Sallie Gillentine ES/Hollis	X			X		
14	Southmoore HS	X			X		
15	Springer Public Schools	X				X	
16	Waller MS/Enid	X			X		
17	William Gay Early Childhood Center/McAlester	X			X		
18	Wilson Arts Integration ES/OKC	X					
19	Yukon HS	X					
	Totals	16	3	0	17	2	0

One or more of the following describe schools where grants “Exceeded Expectations”.

- Strong, shared and supportive leadership including district/site and/or learning team
- Professional learning communities being established
- Plan developed for sustaining or exceeding grant goals
- Staff committed to technology integration

One or more of the following describe schools where grants “Met” rather than “Exceeded” Expectations.

- Traditional philosophy leadership
- Prominence of traditional secondary structure and isolation
- Minimal district support for professional development or technology equipment
- Multiple initiatives impeding significant progress
- Technology primarily a teacher tool.

One or more of the following describe schools where grants “Did Not Meet Expectations”.

- Lack of support for professional development at district and/or site level
- Significant resistance to change at district and/or site levels
- Combination of multiple factors listed in “Met Expectations”

Sustainability ratings are based on the following four indicators:

- Professional learning communities being established
- Staff committed to technology integration
- Staff committed to professional learning and sharing
- Evidence of practices of high achieving schools.

If all four indicators are present, a rating of “Significant success” is given.

If three indicators are present, a rating of “Moderate success” is given.

If one or two indicators are present, a rating of “Minimal success” is given.

OETT 2014 Grants-to-Schools Evaluation
XXXXXXX School

SAMPLE

I. Professional learning communities

Data sources: Post-surveys

√ **Shared leadership**

1. Administrators never share information with the staff nor provide opportunities to be involved in decision making. 0% (0)
2. Administrators invite advice and counsel from the staff and then make decisions themselves. 33% (7)
3. *Although there are some legal and fiscal decisions required of the principal, school administrators consistently involve the staff in discussing and making decisions about most school issues.* 67% (14)

1. Administrators do not involve staff. 5% (1)
2. Administrators involve a small committee, council, or team of staff. 52% (11)
3. *Administrators involve the entire staff.* 43% (9)

√ **Shared vision**

1. Visions for improvement held by the staff are widely divergent. 0% (0)
2. Visions for improvement are not thoroughly explored; some staff agree and others do not. 15% (3)
3. *Visions for improvement are discussed by the entire staff such that consensus and a shared vision results.* 85% (17)

1. Visions for improvement do not target students and teaching and learning. 0% (0)
2. Visions for improvement are sometimes focused on students and learning and teaching. 10% (2)
3. *Visions for improvement are always focused on student and learning and teaching.* 90% (18)

√ **Decision making**

1. Individuals randomly discuss issues, share information, and learn with and from each other. 0% (0)
2. Subgroups of the staff meet to discuss issues, share information, and learn with and from each other. 20% (4)
3. *The entire staff meets to discuss issues, share information, and learn with and from each other.* 80% (16)

1. The staff never meets to consider substantive educational issues. 0% (0)
2. The staff meets occasionally on substantive student-centered educational issues. 14% (3)
3. *The staff meets regularly and frequently on substantive student-centered educational issues.* 86% (18)

1. The staff does not assess their work or act on their learning. 0% (0)
2. The staff occasionally infrequently assesses their work, acting on their learning and making and implementing plans to improve teaching and learning. 10% (2)
3. *The staff, based on their learning and assessment of their work, makes and implements plans that address students' needs, more effective teaching, and more successful student learning.* 90% (19)

1/2 Peer review and feedback

1. Staff never visit their peer's classrooms. 0% (0)
2. Staff occasionally visit and observe each other's teaching, and have occasional focused follow-up conversations. 57% (12)
3. *Staff regularly and frequently visit & observe each other's classroom teaching, exchanging feedback about teaching & learning.* 43% (9)

√ **Supportive conditions**

1. Staff cannot arrange time for interacting. 0% (0)
2. Time is arranged but frequently the staff fails to meet. 0% (0)
3. *Time is arranged and committed for whole staff interactions.* 100% (21)

1. The staff takes no action to manage the facility and personnel for interaction. 0% (0)
2. Considering the size, structure, and arrangements of the school, the staff are working to maximize their interaction. 38% (8)
3. The size, structure, and arrangements of the school facilitate staff proximity and interaction. 62% (13)

1. Communication devices are not given attention. 0% (0)
2. A single communication method exists and is sometimes used to share information. 0% (0)
3. *A variety of processes and procedures are used to encourage staff communication.* 100% (21)

1. Trust and openness do not exist among the staff. 0% (0)
2. Some of the staff are trusting and open. 24% (5)
3. *Trust and openness characterize all the staff.* 76% (16)

1. Staff are isolated and work alone at their task. 0% (0)
2. Caring and collaboration are inconsistently demonstrated among the staff. 10% (2)

3. *Caring, collaborative, and productive relationships consistently exist among all the staff. 90% (19)*

Little or no success

Minimal success

Moderate success

Significant success

II. **Technology Integration – Weighted Averages on 5 Point Scale**

√ **Teachers' Use of Technology**

- a. Incorporate technology into my students' learning activities when planning lessons –4.1
- b. Work collaboratively with other teachers in planning & reviewing lessons that involve the use of technology –3.71
- c. Use technology-related activities to improve my students' basic skills (e.g., reading writing, math computation)—4.24
- d. Use technology-related activities to promote problem-solving skills and critical thinking in my students -- 3.95
- e. Observe other teachers' use of technology in their classroom instruction –3.67
- f. Use technology to gather information for my lessons (e.g., search the Internet) – 4.29
- g. Create lesson plans using technology –4.33
- h. Design instructional activities that encourage students to use technology – 3.84
- i. Design learning activities that require students to use technology resources – 3.79
- j. Design activities for my students that encourage creative expressions of learning using technology –3.76
- k. Design activities that require students to use technology to collaborate with peers &/or outside experts on assignments—3.52
- l. Design student activities that use technology for discussing ideas and reflecting on learning experiences –3.67
- m. Design student activities that use technology for collecting, manipulating & analyzing data (e.g., spreadsheets, databases)—3.33
- n. Design student activities to encourage information gathering via the Internet – 3.48
- o. Provide student opportunities to create and share presentations using technology – 3.19
- p. Teach students to evaluate the accuracy and bias of information gathered through technology – 3.1
- q. Incorporate technology into my instruction – 4.1
- r. Use technology to communicate with colleagues and staff for administrative purposes – 4.29
- s. Use technology to communicate with students – 3.0
- t. Use technology to communicate with parents -- 3.95
- u. Use technology to communicate with community members – 3.5
- v. Use technology to collaborate with colleagues and staff on student learning issues --3.9
- w. Collect and analyze student data using technology – 4.1
- x. Assess student learning using technology – 4.19
- y. Use technology to organize grade information for students -- 4.57
- z. Use technology to organize grade information for parents and/or school administrators -- 4.52
- aa. Keep student attendance, progress, and demographic information using technology -- 4.62
- bb. Use technology to post homework and other class information for student or parent access – 3.95
- cc. Use problem-based learning with my students – 3.81
- dd. Search the Internet for student learning activities – 4.14
- ee. *Engage my students in authentic learning activities – 4.15*

√ **Students' Use of Technology**

- a. Computer applications to prepare assignments/papers (e.g., wordprocessing) –3.19
- b. Computer applications to analyze data or keep records (e.g., spreadsheets, data bases, graphs) – 3.1
- c. Computer or web-based applications to produce class presentations (e.g., Power Point, Photo Story) – 3.29
- d. *The Internet or other software to research information or find materials for assignments -- 3.52*
- e. Software to learn or practice new skills – 3.62
- f. Software to study for tests – 2.95
- g. Enrichment tools to aide in learning (e.g., graphing calculators, GPS units, probes, student response systems, SmartBoards, projectors) – 3.7
- h. Computer communications to collaborate on assignments (e.g., email, blogs, wikis, Moodle, web-based communication) -- 2.86
- i. Computer communication to correspond with experts, authors, or others (e.g., email, blogs, wikis, Moodle, web-based communication) --2.81
- j. The Web to participate in virtual field trips, virtual science experiments, Web Quests, or simulations – 3.33
- k. Computer design or drawing software to complete assignments or projects -- 2.67
- l. Computer software to crop or enhance photographs – 3.0
- m. Computer-based simulations that encourage decision making and problem solving – 2.9
- n. Communication & multimedia applications to create and/or post podcasts or videos – 2.95
- o. Electronic portfolios to store examples of products or assignments – 2.57
- p. Computer software to create, administer, & analyze the results of online surveys – 2.71

√ **Support for Using Technology – Level of Support from Each Source**

- a. Your principal – 4.57
- b. Other teachers at your school – 4.38
- c. Organizations/businesses in your community – 3.48
- d. Parents of your students – 3.7
- e. Your students – 3.8
- f. Professional development providers – 4.2

✓ **Teachers' Beliefs About Use of Technology**

- a. I think learning how technology can be used by teachers and students is exciting – 4.71
- b. Students are more interested in learning when using technology to investigate an issue or solve a problem – 4.52
- d. Using technology can/does help students better understand what they are learning – 4.0
- g. I want to learn more about using technology and learning – 4.38
- h. *I feel confident in my ability to use technology for teaching and learning* – 3.95
- j. I think I am/will be a better teacher by using technology as part of my instructional practice – 4.29

Little or no success Minimal success Moderate success **Significant success**

III. Professional learning and sharing for technology integration

Data sources: Learning team, session evaluations, ILI, networking activities, January site visit reflections, evaluator follow-up site visit reflections, quarterly meetings, and field and meeting notes

- Successful systemic support and leadership
- Success of learning team
- Evidence indicating sharing of best practices
- Collaboration based on school goals
- Collaboration with others

Little or no success Minimal success Moderate success **Significant success**

IV. Evidence of Practices of High Achieving Schools

Data sources: *Technology Integration* survey student use score, January site visit reflections, evaluator follow-up site visit reflections, school's quarterly reports, field and meeting notes, TIPS data, TAGLIT pre-post data, and other interactions

- Development of shared purpose for technology
- Technology use for authentic learning
- Evidence of shared and supportive leadership
- Evidence of development of other practices
- Evidence of progress toward grant goals

Little or no success Minimal success Moderate success **Significant success**

V. Overall success: SIGNIFICANT—Exceeded Expectations

VI. Sustainability

Data sources: Fall site visit and evaluation data from sections I - IV

- Professional learning community
- Technology integration
- Professional learning and sharing
- Evidence of practices of high achieving schools

Little or no success Minimal success Moderate success **Significant success**