

Information Needed To Apply for TLCF Only

Requirements

Evaluation Criteria

Grant Agreement

**Sample TLCF Year-End Report
TLCF Application Forms**

Information about the Application

The Application

- Year-end reporting on 1999-2000 TCF grant is combined with reapplication.
- The progress report and the year-end financial statements for TCF are required by the grant deadline even if the district chooses not to reapply for one or both of the competitive grant awards.

Evaluation Process and Criteria

- Each proposal will be evaluated by three peer reviewers, who will use the attached numeric criteria to rate each proposal.
- Grant awards will be made by the Commissioner of the Department of Education based on numeric scores and available funds. The Department of Education may negotiate final award amounts based on numeric evaluation results and availability of grant funds in either category.

Funding Levels and Allowable Expenditures

- Districts applying for a second year of TCF funds are eligible to compete for a of \$25,000. All other districts are eligible for a combined award of \$15,000.
- The next federal allocation of TCF funds will not be available until October 2000. The steps in the internal grant award approval process take at least ten weeks to complete, and cannot begin until official notification of federal funding is received, so the district should not expect to receive TCF payments until at least December 2000.
- Negotiated revisions to any components of the application lengthen the payment process.
- Maine State Retirement benefits must be included in Goals 2000 and TCF budgets. These costs cannot be shared across budgets by listing salaries in one budget and the benefits associated with them in another. In addition, any other benefits specified by the local collective bargaining agreement must be applied to all salaries, stipends and honoraria in the circumstances and in the amounts covered in the agreement.

Direct questions and concerns about allowable expenditures to Heidi McGinley (287-5986); heidi.mcginley@state.us.me.

Required Components to Apply for T LCF Only

Basic Information (not evaluated):

- The cover page – Indicate which grants the district received during the 1999-2000 school year, how much was received, and how much has not been expended. Add unexpended funds to the district’s new requests in each category.
- The information page
- School board signatures
- Superintendent’s signature on the second page of the appropriate grant agreement

1. The Design Team:

- **1. A. and B.** Not Required.

2. Progress Report: Report on the district’s progress in achieving its T LCF 1999-00 indicators of success.

- **A.** Complete the table for each indicator from the local technology plan for the 1999-2000 grant year. Reference supporting portfolio evidence for progress in column 6 of the chart.
- **B.** Respond to the federal T LCF report questions.
- **C.** Year-end Financial Statement
- Complete the T LCF section. Note that expenses listed in the “obligated” column are those for which you have made a promise to pay. These activities may not have taken place when the proposal is submitted.
- Attach a single page to explain why funds were not expended as expected in each category.

2. The self-Assessment:

- **A.** Check the technology-related indicators in the “Student Learning” area and in each section of the “Climate Supportive of Change” area that describe where the district currently stands. In the blank columns embedded in the self-assessment, tell the readers where to find the supporting portfolio evidence for each checkmark. **Submit the checked self-assessment pages with the application.**
- Plot the district’s current position on the two self-assessment grids.
 - B.** In a narrative of 5 pages or less, explain how the information from the progress report and the self-assessment update lead to the district’s goals or next steps. Include:
 1. A summary of current conditions across the district based on the self-assessment and the progress report.
 2. A description of how the self-assessment findings and the progress report illustrate what the district’s next steps are in technology use.
 3. Not required.
 4. A description of the district’s economic need for technology funds to support Learning Results implementation (reference supporting evidence in the portfolio if necessary to fully document the current situation).
 5. Not required.

3. The Action Plan:

- **A. Impact Areas - Not Required.** Instead, copy the appropriate year of the local technology plan and insert it here. Make sure that the actual costs associated with each goal and action step are updated for the 2000-01 grant year..
- **B. Action Steps for each impact area or goal - Not Required.**
- **C. Budget:** Complete a line item budget for the unexpended and new TLF grant funds. The total amount for each fund is the expected award plus any unexpended funds from the previous grant year. Make sure that the action plan includes activities supported by the unexpended TLF funds
- If a detailed description is not possible within the space allotted on each line, attach one.
- Complete the monthly payment form for the new amount requested for TLF.

Insert Map

Document Total:
Vendor Code:

Account Code: 013-05A-5090-592

**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF)
GRANT AGREEMENT**

This agreement made this 1st day of September 2000 between the Department of Education ("the Department") and ("the school system").

WHEREAS, the Department in the exercise of its lawful functions has determined that your grant will stimulate, foster or encourage improvement in the schools of the State and serve as models for other schools and,

WHEREAS, the school system has determined that the proposal will advance systemic change which enhances the learning of school children,

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual agreements and provisions herein contained, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. The Department will award a Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) grant of«Final_Grant_Amt» to the school system for the purposes described in the grant application, which is hereby incorporated into this Agreement and made a part thereof.
2. Grant funds shall be expended by the school system between September 1, 2000 and August 31, 2001. Any funds not expended or obligated prior to August 31, 2001 shall be returned to the Department for reallocation.
3. Expenditures of grant funds by the school system will be in accordance with Maine law and applicable ordinances, rules and policies.
4. Financial and other records relating to the proposal will be maintained by the school system for at least three years from completion of the proposal and made available for review, upon request, to the Department.
5. Amendments to the approved budget which exceed 10% on any line or any programmatic components of the proposal must be approved in advance by the Department.
6. The school system will designate a grant coordinator who will have supervisory responsibility for the proposal and will function as the liaison person with the Department.
7. The school system will develop and maintain a portfolio of all grant related activities. The Department may examine the portfolio at any time to evaluate progress on the grant. In any case, a final report and a portfolio of grant related activities will be received by the Department no later than December 1, 2001, unless the district chooses to reapply for funds the next year, in which case the portfolio will become part of the reapplication.
8. The school system will provide the Maine Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Education with a statistical report by December 1, 2000 in the format determined by the U.S. Department of Education.
9. In consideration of the grant award, the school system agrees to include in all promotion and publicity concerning the proposal, the following minimum credit line: "with support of the Department of Education through a Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) grant."
10. Any publications relating to the proposal by the school system shall also include, in an appropriate place, a statement that the findings, conclusions or recommendations do not necessarily represent the view of the Department.

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

11. One copy of any printed publication resulting from the proposal must be furnished to the Department. One copy of any software, film, videotape, audio tape, record or any other audiovisual materials produced as part or as an outgrowth of the proposal must also be furnished to the Department.
12. The Department reserves a non-exclusive license to use and reproduce for public purposes, without payment, any publishable matter, including copyrighted matter, arising out of grant activities. The school system shall retain a non-exclusive license to use and reproduce the materials, without payment, for the use and benefit of the school system. A copy of the agreements shall be filed with the Department.
13. The school system will submit a full accounting of expenditures and a final report to the Department within 30 days of the completion of the proposal but in no event later than December 1, 2001.
14. Financial records of the proposal will be reviewed in the annual audit of school system expenditures and any deviations, discrepancies or questioned costs will be reported to the Department, with a copy of the audit report.
15. The Department may monitor the proposal on site and evaluate its progress and results independently of the school system's evaluation.
16. If the Department determines that the approved grant proposal cannot be completed as proposed, it may terminate the grant award and all unexpended or unobligated grant funds and any purchased equipment and materials shall be returned to the Department. No such termination may take place until the school system has been notified of the Department's intention and has had an opportunity to respond.
17. The Department and the school system may mutually agree to terminate the proposal at any time. If this occurs, all unexpended or unobligated grant funds and any purchased equipment and materials shall be returned to the department.
18. The Department may withhold or suspend payment of the grant award or require repayment of grant monies already spent upon a finding that grant monies will be or have been improperly spent, the required reports have not been filed in a timely manner or that the proposal is otherwise not in compliance with applicable law. No penalizing action will be taken until the school system has been notified of the alleged violation and has had an opportunity to respond.
19. The Department may withhold or recover payment of all or part of the grant award if the school system is found, after an adjudicatory proceeding or adjudication to be in violation of the Maine Human Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act or the Federal Civil Rights Act during the project period.
20. The grant award will become effective upon execution of this document by all parties.

Date

Commissioner, Maine Department of Education

Date

Grant Coordinator, Maine Department of Education

September 1, 2000
Date

Superintendent of Schools (Fiscal Agent)

Submission, with the application, of a signed copy of this agreement is for the sole purpose of expediting the distribution of Funds to districts to whom grants are awarded in accordance with the evaluation criteria and in no way commits the department to making an award to the applicant

Numeric Evaluation Criteria

1. Progress Report

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Points |
|---|---|---|--|--------|
| A. The indicators listed are not measurable. The indicators are not related to the stated progress or learning. | A. Some of the indicators listed are measurable and are related to the stated progress or learning. | A. Most of the indicators are measurable and related to the stated progress or learning. | A. All of the indicators listed are measurable and related to the stated progress or learning. | |
| B. No supporting evidence is provided for most of the indicators. | B. Evidence is provided for most of the indicators, but the connections to stated progress or learning are not clear, | B. The stated progress or learning is loosely connected to most of the supporting evidence. | B. The stated progress or learning is based directly on the supporting evidence. | |
| C. No district progress or learning is apparent. | C. Some district progress or learning is evident in at least one impact area. | C. Substantial progress or learning is evident in at least one key impact area. | C. Substantial progress or learning is evident in all impact areas | |
| | | | Total 9 | |

2. A. Self-Assessment and B. Identification of the Next Steps (Narrative)

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Pts. |
|---|--|--|--|------|
| A. The self-assessment pages are missing or incomplete. Little or no evidence is provided to support the checked descriptors. There is no explanation for the missing evidence. | A. The self-assessment pages are complete. Most of the evidence provided does not support the checked self-assessment descriptors. Some explanation is included to account for missing evidence. | A. Most of the evidence supports the checked self-assessment descriptors. Complete explanations are provided to account for missing evidence. | A. All of the evidence provided is necessary and sufficient to support the checked descriptors. | X 2 |
| B. The district's placement on both continua is unwarranted given the checked indicators and the supporting evidence. | B. The district's placement on both continua is confusing given the checked indicators and the supporting evidence. | B. The district's placement on one or both of the continua is justified by most of the supporting evidence. | B. Placement on both continua is consistently supported by the evidence. | X 2 |
| C. The narrative does not connect the progress report or the self-assessment to identification of the district's next steps. | C. The narrative partially connects the self-assessment or the progress report to the next steps. | C. The narrative supports the connections between the self-assessment findings, the progress report and the next steps. | C. The narrative clearly describes a process of analyzing the evidence of the current situation as the method of identifying the next steps. | |
| D. The narrative describes conditions in a single school, at a single grade span, or among a small population of students or staff. | D. The narrative describes conditions in some schools, grade spans or populations. | D. The narrative partially describes conditions across the system, and identifies some systemwide approaches to Learning Results implementation. | D. The narrative describes systemwide conditions and identifies systemwide approaches to Learning Results implementation. | |
| E. Impact areas or goals are not identified in the narrative. | E. The impact areas or goals identified in the narrative are not supported by the description of the current situation. | E. The impact areas or goals identified in the narrative are partially supported by the description of the current situation. | E. Key elements of the current situation are directly connected to the identified impact areas or goals. | |
| | | | Total 21 | |

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

3. Action Plan

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Points |
|--|---|--|--|--------|
| A. The indicators are not measurable. | A. Some of the indicators are measurable. | A. Most of the indicators are measurable. | A. All of the indicators are measurable. | |
| B. The data collected to evaluate progress toward the indicators will provide little or no supporting evidence of progress at the end of the grant period. | B. Most of the data collected to evaluate progress toward the indicators will provide some evidence of progress at the end of the grant year. | B. The data collected to evaluate progress toward the indicators will provide most of the evidence necessary to support progress at the end of the grant period. | B. The data collected to evaluate progress toward the indicators will provide necessary and sufficient evidence of progress. | |
| C. The data to be collected will not help the district identify its next steps. | C. Some of the data collected will help the district identify its next steps. | C. Most of the data collected will help the district identify its next steps. | C. The data collected will lead directly to identification of the district's next steps. | |
| D. The action steps are unconnected to the indicators. | D. Some of the action steps are connected to the indicators. | D. Most of the action steps are necessary in making progress toward the indicators. | D. All of the action steps are necessary in making progress toward the indicators. | |
| | | | Total | 12 |

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

Cost Effectiveness

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Points |
|--|--|---|---|--------|
| A. Proposed expenditures are not connected to the action plan. | A. Proposed expenditures support some of the action plan. | A. Most proposed expenditures support the action plan. | A. Funds from all sources support the action plan. | |
| B. Expenditures are not cost effective. | B. Some expenditures are cost effective. | B. Most expenditures are cost effective. | B. All expenditures from all sources are cost effective. | |
| C. No information is provided to describe the district's economic need for technology funds. | C. The district has significant financial capacity to provide adequate and sufficient technology to support Learning Results implementation. | C. The district has some local financial capacity to provide adequate and sufficient technology to support Learning Results implementation. | C. The district has no local financial capacity to provide adequate and sufficient technology to support Learning Results implementation. | X 2 |
| D. The district has ample and sufficient technology, coordination and professional development support to integrate technology use with Learning Results implementation. | D. The district has adequate technology, coordination and professional development support to integrate technology use with Learning Results implementation. | D. The district lacks some of the key components and supports necessary to integrate technology use with Learning Results implementation. | D. The district lacks most of the necessary technology and supports to use technology to support Learning Results implementation. | X 2 |
| | | | Total 18 | |

Instructions for Completing the Required TLCF Year-end Report
TABLE 4: Educational Technology Goals for the Subgrantee

| 1. Goals | 2. Measure (how was data collected?) | 3. Date and baseline status (June 1999) | 4. Date and current status (June 2000) | 5. Three-year subgrantee goal | 6. Portfolio Evidence |
|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| Measurable benefits/indicators from local plan/1999-00 TLCF application. | Examples: staff surveys, logs of student computer use, purchase orders, feedback sheets from training session. | What was the situation regarding this goal at the beginning of the grant period? Examples: no training was offered, computer ratio was 55:1, 50% of the teaching staff were at the novice stage of development. | What was the situation like as you began the second year of the grant? Examples: 50 teachers trained to use Internet, ratio of 15:1 | What is the long term goal in this area in the local technology plan? | |

4c. **State Technology Plan.** How are the subgrantee’s educational technology goals aligned with the state’s educational technology plan? Maine’s technology plan goals:

1. Each student will have ready access to technology which supports the learning, application and demonstration of the Guiding Principles and the content standards and performance indicators of the Maine Learning Results.
2. Educators will be fluent with technology and effectively use it to enhance teaching and learning.
3. All levels of the public education system will have the capacity to track Learning Results implementation and the relationship of technology use and student achievement.
4. Technology will be integrated into state and local consolidated plans to implement the Learning Results.

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

4d. **Subgrantee Learning Goals.** How do the subgrantees' educational technology goals support the subgrantee's learning goals? Coordinators who attended the October 27 and 28 1998 meetings generated a list of possible connections:

- the district is working to implement the Maine Learning Results and technology is helping us do that
- we are developing local learning results -- especially in technology -- or are infusing technology into local curriculum development
- technology is helping us manage curriculum, instruction and assessment changes across schools and grade levels
- technology is helping us connect Goals 2000, IASA, and district longrange planning.
- the district's vision for all students includes technology as an essential tool for learning

4e. **Use of Funds.**

Table 5: Use of Funds

| 1. Primary use of TLCF award | 2. Grade levels primarily impacted. | 3. Content areas primarily impacted | 4. Number of Students impacted | 5. Number of teachers impacted |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| There seem to be five major uses of TLCF grant funds: equipment, professional development, coordination, infrastructure, and software. Complete the chart this way: | List any combination of grade levels which were actually impacted | (see the glossary for a definition of "content areas" provided by the US Department of Education) | at each grade level | at each grade level |
| Equipment | K-6 9-12 | all science and math | 42 103 | 8 15 |
| Professional Development | K-12 | all | 230 | 58 |

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

4f. **Strategy.** Please explain how the use of the TLCF award and partnerships with businesses, libraries, and other public and private entities have helped the subgrantee accomplish its goals.

A list of the possible impact of partnerships was also generated in October 1998:

- partners provided additional resources and expertise
- were active planners and shared responsibility for the implementation of the local technology plan
- built community and board support for technology use in the district
- provides teachers with information about how technology is used in the “real world”
- adult education partners make it easier to teach parents and community members more about technology
- working with local libraries:
 - reinforces skills for students outside the school
 - creates a seamless transition from school to community organization for students and parents
 - helps adults learn to use technology
 - promotes lifelong learning in the community
 - helps to make local to global connections for community members

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

4g. **Four Pillars.** Please circle the appropriate number on the scales below to indicate the subgrantee's progress toward the 4 pillars for educational technology as a result of all funding sources (federal, state, local).

1. *All teachers in the nation will have the training and support they need to help students learn using computers and the information superhighway.*

Baseline (June 1999)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---------|--|----------|--|
| No member of the teaching workforce participating in ongoing training and receiving support | 1 - 49% | Half of the teaching workforce participating in ongoing training and receiving support | 51 - 99% | Entire teaching workforce participating in ongoing training and receiving support. |

In this box, indicate the situation in the district before receiving the TLCF grant.

By June 2000

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| How had the situation changed by the end of the first grant year? Write in the unique percentages below if the descriptions don't match the progress made. | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

2. All teachers and students will have modern multi-media computers in their classrooms.

Baseline (June 1999)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| All classrooms with a student to multimedia computer ratio greater than 21:1 | | All classrooms with a student to multimedia computer ratio of 13:1 | | All classrooms with a student to multimedia computer ratio at or less than 5:1 |
| See the directions for the first national goal above. | | | | |

By June 2000

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

3. Every classroom will be connected to the information superhighway.

Baseline (June 1999)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Less than 14% of classrooms connected | | 55% of classrooms connected | | All classrooms connected. |
| See the above explanation | | | | |

By June 2000

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Funded TLCF TLCF Only

NOTE: The TLCF coordinators who met in October 1998 had difficulty understanding what this goal meant, so we created definitions for some of the key terms:

- Effective -- helps students reach the learning goal and is used relatively easily.
- Engaging -- students can use it to do work
- Integral -- part of the lesson plan (not a special event)

4. *Effective and engaging software and on-line learning resources will be an integral part of every school's curriculum.*

Baseline (June 1999)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Not in use in any areas | | in use in half of the content areas | | in use in all core content areas |
| | | | | |

By June 30, 2000

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

4h. **Evaluation.** Describe the process for the ongoing evaluation of technology integration and its effects on student achievement and progress toward meeting the National Education Goals and challenging state content and performance standards. Describe who will have responsibility for evaluation and what will happen to any data collected about progress. Does the data go to the technology committee? the school board? the superintendent? Are there any links between technology use and student achievement that teachers are willing and able to document? How and what? (It is likely that there will not be any real proof of student achievement gains and that it is too early to look for any.)

HARDWARE WITH INTERNET ACCESS RATING FORM)

This form **is not required**, but may be helpful.

DIRECTIONS:

- Box A - Please enter the district's student population as of April 1, 2000.
- Box B - Enter the district's total number of computers (SEE NOTE).
- Box C - Enter the student/computer ratio (Divide Box A by Box B)

SAMPLE:

| NUMBER OF STUDENTS as of April 1, 2000 | NUMBER OF COMPUTERS* | STUDENT:COMPUTER RATIO |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| A 1800 | B 250 | C 7.2 |

***NOTE: DEFINITION OF COMPUTER:**

Count only those computers dedicated to student use which meet BOTH the following criteria:

- Internet accessible: stand-alone or networked and connected to the Internet.
- Meets MSLN hardware standards:
 - PC's: 386's, 486's, 586's, Pentiums or equivalent
 - MAC's: Centris, Performa, Power PC, LC II's/LC III's or equivalent

| NUMBER OF STUDENTS as of April 1, 2000 | NUMBER OF COMPUTERS* | STUDENT:COMPUTER RATIO |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| A | B | C |

Note: Your comprehensive inventory may include other kinds of computers in order to provide a clearer picture of the current situation.

TEACHER USE OF COMPUTERS RATING FORM

This form **is not required** but may be helpful..

PURPOSE: This form is designed to gather information about the nature and extent of computer use among individual teachers.

| BASIC STAGE | NOVICE STAGE | CAPABLE STAGE | PROFICIENT STAGE |
|---|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Know little or nothing about using computers in the classroom, or has very limited knowledge of using computers in the classroom. ● Takes no action to analyze the use of computers in the classroom, its characteristics, possible use, or consequences of use. ● Schedules no time and specifies no steps for studying the use of computers in the classroom. ● Takes no discernible action toward learning about or using computers in the classroom. The use of computers in the classroom is not happening. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Knows general information about the use of computers in the classroom such as software selection and inclusion in lesson planning. ● Analyzes and compares materials, content, requirements for use, evaluation reports, potential outcomes, strengths and weaknesses for making a decision about using computers in the classroom. ● Plans to gather necessary information and resources needed to make a decision for or against using computers in the classroom. ● Explores the use of computers in the classroom and requirements for use by talking to others, reviewing descriptive information and sample materials, attending orientation sessions and observing others using it. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Knows on a day-to-day basis the requirements of using computers in the classroom. Is knowledgeable of short term activities and effects. ● Examines own use of the use of computers in the classroom with respect to issues of logistics, management, time, schedules, resources, and general reactions of students. ● Plans for organizing and managing resources, activities, and events related to immediate or ongoing use of computers. Addresses these issues with a short-term perspective. ● Manages computers in the classroom with varying degrees of efficiency. May lack anticipation of immediate consequences. The flow of actions between teacher and students may be disjointed, uneven and uncertain. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Knows cognitive and affective effects of using computers in the classroom and ways for increasing impact on student learning. ● Assesses use of computers in the classroom for the purpose of changing current practice to improve student outcomes. ● Develops intermediate and long-range plans that anticipate possible and needed steps, resources and events designed to enhance student outcomes. ● Explores and experiments with alternative combinations of using computers in the classroom. Experiments with existing practices to maximize student involvement and to optimize student outcomes. |

Please enter your estimate of the current per cent of teaching staff at Elementary, Middle, and Secondary levels you believe to be operating at each of the above stages (BASIC, NOVICE, CAPABLE, PROFICIENT). Descriptors are provided for each stage. Account for 100% of your teaching staff for each level the applicant serves.

| Levels | Basic Stage | Novice Stage | Capable Stage | Proficient Stage | Total |
|------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Elementary | % | % | % | % | 100% Elementary |
| Middle | % | % | % | % | 100% Middle |
| Secondary | % | % | % | % | 100% Secondary |

Note: To avoid double counting, you may provide one total for K-8.

Adapted from G. Halt & S. Loucks, W. Rutherford, B. Newlove Spring 75 Vol. 26 No. 1 Journal of Teacher Education "Levels of Use of Innovations, A Framework for Analyzing Innovation Adoption "

COMPUTER INTEGRATION RATING FORM

This form **is not required** but may be helpful.

PURPOSE: This form is designed to gather information about computer technology integration.

| Stages of Integration | Descriptors |
|------------------------|--|
| 0 - Nonuse | A perceived lack of access to technology-based tools or lack of time to pursue technology implementation. Existing instructional technology is predominately text-based (e.g., ditto sheets, chalkboard, overhead projector). |
| 1 - Awareness | The use of computers is generally one step removed from the classroom teacher (e.g., integrated learning system labs, special computer-based pullout programs, computer literacy classes, central word processing labs). Computer based applications have little or no relevance to the individual teacher's instruction program. |
| 2 - Exploration | Technology-based tools serve as a supplement to existing instructional program (e.g., tutorials, educational games, simulations). The electronic technology is employed either as extension activities or as enrichment exercises to the instructional program. |
| 3 - Infusion | Technology-based tools, including databases, spreadsheets, graphing packages, probes, calculators, multimedia applications, desktop publishing applications, and telecommunications applications, augment isolated instructional events (e.g., a science-kit experiment using spreadsheets/graphs to analyze results or a telecommunication activity involving datasharing among schools). |
| 4 - Integration | Technology-based tools are integrated in a manner that provides a rich context for students' understanding of the pertinent concepts, themes, and processes. Technology (e.g., multimedia, telecommunications, databases, spreadsheets, word processors) is perceived as a tool to identify and solve authentic problems relating to an overall theme/concept. |

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate (circle) your estimate of the current stage of integration (0- NONUSE, 1 - AWARENESS, 2 - EXPLORATION, 3 - INFUSION, or 4 - INTEGRATION) within the program of curriculum, instruction and assessment for every level the applicant serves: Elementary, Middle, and Secondary levels. Please DO NOT make marks between stages.

| Levels | Stages of Integration | | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Elementary | 0 NONUSE | 1 AWARENESS | 2 EXPLORATION | 3 INFUSION | 4 INTEGRATION |
| Middle | 0 NONUSE | 1 AWARENESS | 2 EXPLORATION | 3 INFUSION | 4 INTEGRATION |
| Secondary | 0 NONUSE | 1 AWARENESS | 2 EXPLORATION | 3 INFUSION | 4 INTEGRATION |

Note: To avoid double counting, you may provide one K-8 total.

Adapted from C. Moersch in the Learning and Leading with Technology Journal, Nov. 1995. "Levels of Technology Implementation (LOTI): A Framework for Measuring Classroom Technology Use."