

## **Description of the FRSS survey suite on educational technology**

The Office of Educational Technology (OET) has requested three surveys (district-level, school-level, and teacher-level) on educational technology to be conducted with the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). The three surveys are designed to be complementary, allowing thorough treatment of the topics from multiple viewpoints, with emphasis not only on existing infrastructure and equipment, but also on how educational technology is *used* for instructional, administrative, and assessment purposes.

Early feasibility testing found that to obtain a full picture of educational technology in public schools and classrooms, we need information from all three types of respondents (districts, schools, and teachers). Each type of respondent provides complimentary information that together covers a broader range of topics and allows more in-depth analysis of each topic than would be possible with one survey alone. As the attached Table shows, each survey covers different aspects of the broad topic areas that OET is interested in analyzing. For example, feasibility calls found that most schools obtain their Internet connections through the district network, and districts are the best source of information on the networks and Internet capacity. Districts can also provide information on technology policies, types of teacher professional development offered and required, and district technology leadership. School respondents provide information on the availability *within* the school of wireless connections, technology equipment, operating systems, and computer applications. They also provide information about the leadership and support within the school to help staff integrate technology into instruction and obtain technical support. Feasibility calls clearly showed that teachers are the only one of the three levels that can provide information on the *use* of educational technology in the schools and classrooms, which cuts across most of the broad topic areas.

We conducted extensive testing with districts, schools, and teachers to determine and refine how specific questions should be distributed across the three surveys. Our goal was to cover all aspects of the topics and avoid duplication across the surveys. For example, during our four rounds of feasibility calls to schools, we tested collecting technology usage data using several approaches (e.g., frequency of use, percent of teachers in the school using technology equipment). But the school respondents told us emphatically that they could not provide this information and it needed to come from the teachers. Moreover, certain specific topics are addressed on more than one survey to allow comparisons of differing perspectives across levels. For example, district and school respondents' perceptions about technology issues can be compared.

Because the samples are nested (teachers within schools and schools within districts), we can copy information from a higher level to a lower level for analysis. For example, we can analyze whether teachers within schools that have full-time technology specialists use technology differently than teachers at other schools, and how district requirements for professional development affect teachers' participation in professional development activities.

**Topics Covered by the Proposed FRSS Educational Technology Surveys**

Topic	Survey that covers topic		
	District	School	Teacher
<b>Technology Infrastructure</b>			
Types of Internet connectivity and Internet capacity (D)	X		
Wireless connections from district to schools and from district to ISP (D)	X		
Wireless connections within schools (S)		X	
<b>Technology Equipment</b>			
Availability within schools (number of computers and devices by characteristics) (S)		X	
Availability within classrooms and frequency of use by teachers and students (T)			X
Computer operating systems (S)		X	
Treatment of older computers (D)	X		
<b>Digital Resources (e.g., online assessments, email accounts)</b>			
Resources provided to schools and teachers by districts (D)	X		
Applications available in the school through district network or Internet (S)		X	
Frequency of use by teachers (T)			X
<b>How Educational Technology is Used</b>			
Frequency teachers use various types of software and websites (T)			X
Frequency teachers communicate with parents and students using technology (T)			X
Frequency students perform various activities using educational technology (T)			X
Policies on acceptable uses of technologies (D)	X		
<b>Teacher Preparation and Professional Development</b>			
Activities that prepared teachers to use educational technology (T)			X
Types of professional development offered and required by districts (D)	X		
Hours spent in professional development activities by teachers (T)			X
Usefulness and convenience of professional development taken by teachers (T)			X
<b>Staff Leadership and Support for Educational Technology</b>			
District-level leadership (D)	X		
School-level leadership and support to help integrate technology into instruction (S)		X	
Provision of technical support within the schools (S)		X	
<b>Respondent perceptions</b>			
Perceptions about technology use within the district (D)	X		
Perceptions about technology issues in the school and district (S)		X	