THE TEXAS RURAL TECHNOLOGY (R-TECH) PILOT PROGRAM

CYCLE 1 FINAL EVALUATION REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NOVEMBER 2010



THE TEXAS RURAL TECHNOLOGY (R-TECH) PILOT PROGRAM

CYCLE 1 FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Executive Summary

November 2010

Prepared for Texas Education Agency

Acknowledgments

Texas Center for Educational Research

Texas Center for Educational Research	Contributing Authors
The Texas Center for Educational Research (TCER) conducts and communicates nonpartisan research on education issues to serve as an independent resource for those who make, influence, or implement education policy in TexAs15- member board of trustees governs the research center, including appointments from the Texas Association of School Boards, Texas Association of ScbbAdministrators, and State Board of Education.	Catherine Maloney, Ph.D. Daniel Sheehan, Ed.D. KatharineRainey, M.P.P.
For additional information about TCER research, please contact:	
	Prepared for
Catherine Maloney, Director Texas Center for Education Research 12007 Research Blvd. P.O. Box 679002	Texas Education Agency 1701 N. Congress Avenue Austin, Texas 87011494
Austin, Texas787679002 Phone: 5124673632 or 8005808237 Fax: 5124673658	Phone: 512463-9734
Reports are available on the TEA's website at	Research Funded by
http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=2926&menu_id=949, as well as TCER's website at www.tcer.org.	Texas Education Agency

Contributing Authors

Copyright \bigcirc **Notice:** The materials are copyrighted \bigcirc and trademarked TM as the property of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and may not be reproduced without the express written permission of TEA, except under the following conditions:

 Texas public school districts, charter schools, and Education Service Centers may reproduceoppidsus/ethe Materials and Related Materials for the districts' and schools' educational use without obtaining permission from TEA.
Residents of the state of Texas may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for individual personal use only without obtaining written permission of TEA.

3) Any portion reproduced must be reproduced in its entirety and remain unedited, unaltered and unchanged in any way.

4) No monetary charge can be made for the reproduced materials or any document containing them; however, a reasonable charge to cover only the cost of reproduction and distribution may be charged.

Private entities or persons located in Texas that are exats public school districts, Texas Education Service Centers, or Texas charter schools or any entity, whether public or private, educational educational, located outside the state of Texas MUSTobtain written approval from TEA and will be required to enter into a license agreement that may involve the payment of a licensing fee or a royalty.

For information contact: Office of Copyrights, Trademarks, License Agreements, and Royalties, Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Ave., Austin, **7%**7011494; phone 512/63-9270 or 512936-6060; email: copyrights@tea.state.tx.us.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The evaluation of the Texas Rural TechnologyT(ech) Pilot sought to understand how districts implemented RTechgrants, the effects of implementation on student and teacher outcomes, as well as

xMost districts (87%)

xAbout 30% of Cycle 1 districts offered dual credit coursework using R

Research Question 3: What Is the Effect of R -Tech on Teachers? In grant applications, all Cycle 1 districts indicated that echresources would be used to expand

CONCLUSION

The overarching finding of the evaluation is that rural districts struggled to implement supplementary R-Techprograms in which instruction was offered outside of the regular school day. Many rural students travel great distances to school and depend on buses for transportation. In many districts, bus schedules did not permit students to arrive early or remateraschool in order to receive supplementary instruction. Conflicts with extracurricular activities, student work schedules, and family responsibilities also limited some students' ability to participate in echprograms, and some students simply refused to participate in instruction offered outside of the school day.

Findings from the evaluation's second interim report indicated that many districts revised their implementation plans in order to overcome these challenges. As a means to ensure greater stud participation in RTech many districts included services as part of the school day and encouraged teachers to use resources as part of classroom instruction. Findings from the evaluation indicate that districts that incorporated Techas part of regular instruction (i.e., nosupplementary programs) experienced benefits relative to districts that adhered to the grant's intent and implemented supplementary programs. The evaluation's results indicate that districts implementing upper lementary programs:

- x Served more students using TRechresources,
- x Experienced lower average patudent implementation costs,
- x Had better student outcomes in readingA and mathematics,
- x Improved attendance outcomes, and