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Introduction

 In 2013 the Jersey City Public Schools (JCPS) published a strategic technology plan, based on a needs assessment of the district (JCBOE, 2013). One of the outcomes of this plan was the implementation of a 1:1 program using Chromebook. Each school’s infrastructure was updated to include high-speed Internet and wireless connections for every classroom. Google Classroom, a Learning Management System (LMS), was selected for the entire district and every teacher was given a laptop for school use. (See Appendix A for additional information about the selection process for a LMS.)

 In subsequent years, teachers were given limited training on the use of Google Sites and the administration has encouraged the use of Google Docs for a variety of purposes. However, the demands of Common Core State Standard (CCSS) training and implementation and PARCC testing left little time to address active integration of the Google Classroom into district schools.

 For the 2016 academic year, the Superintendent set on-boarding teachers in the use of the Google Classrooms LMS as a priority one goal. By the end of the 2019 academic year, all teachers are to be 100% compliant in the integration of Google Classroom. Recognizing that the use of an LMS, as with any other new technology is a multi-level process, the district will provide on-going Professional Development (PD), mentoring, and resources to support the users’ on-going growth from the early stages of entry and adoption through more advanced adaptation and teacher-led innovation. The goals for Google Classroom PD in JCPS are:

* To build capacity of the faculty, administration, and staff in proper use of the Google Classroom software;
* To ensure that every teacher has a Google Classroom for every class that can be further customized and developed by the classroom teacher(s); and
* To support the development of best practice with models of implementation, a variety of PD options, and school-based, peer coaches.

The primary reason for integrating use of Google Classroom in the school district is to improve student performance by providing more options for the delivery of content. With optimized use of an LMS, the district will be able to support hybrid learning, Flipped Classrooms, and Personalized Learning. Although beginning levels of PD will focus on the mechanics of adoption, the ultimate goals of enhanced content delivery and more effective instruction will be clearly identified throughout.

Professional Development

 The following will describe the planning process; the agenda, materials, and resources to be used in LMS-dedicated PD, and the evaluation tools for the district-wide plan for adoption and effective use of Google Classroom.

On-boarding Teachers

 Fear of failure, reluctance to invest the time needed to master and use the technology, and the belief that one shouldn’t try to fix what isn’t broken are just a few of the many reasons that teachers can be resistant to the integration of a LMS in teaching (O’Hanlon, 2009). For some, the use of a LMS to create an online classroom environment may seem counter-intuitive in an exclusively face-to-face teaching environment. The LMS requires a paradigm shift for many teachers who have spent their careers in paper-based classroom management.

O’Hanlon (2009) suggests that the first step in addressing teacher resistance to LMS integration is to communicate how the technology will enhance their teaching and benefit the students. One of JCPS’s strategic goals is to prepare students for college and career-readiness and LMS-based learning is a prominent feature of both. An early introduction to its use under the direction of a classroom teacher will prepare students for success after graduation.

 Further, teachers can be encouraged to consider that many aspects of instruction and testing already require increased facility with online learning environments. The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) testing, which has been mandated in JCPS, is one example. JCPS is also implementing a Flipped Classroom Initiative that will engage students in hybrid learning and use the LMS for video curation. Further, as the district-wide focus on Personalized Learning sharpens, teachers will welcome the efficiency and organization that the LMS offers.

 An important feature of the on-boarding approach in this plan is the training of the administration and staff in tandem with the faculty. The leadership and support of the administration are crucial in encouraging 100% compliance among the teachers. In order for Google Classroom to become feature of daily life in the school, it needs to become the pro forma tool for discussion and delivery of curricula. The twenty-five hours of required annual PD for teachers is determined by the administration. This training will aid the school administration in guiding teacher choices of PD for Google Classroom.

Target Audience

 All JCPS teachers in Grades 3 through 12 will train for use of Google Classroom in their teaching. Elementary school teachers will train in grade-level groups. Middle School and High

School teachers will train in subject matter groups. Librarians will form a separate group, receiving training similar to that of the teachers, with customized content related to their responsibilities. Likewise, Administrators and Curriculum Supervisors will undergo basic training that is nuanced to highlight effective implementation and assessment.

 Participants will self-select the initial level of training for the opening PD, choosing between beginner, intermediate, and advanced workshops. The choice of levels will be described as follows:

Beginner - This workshop targets introductory skills for using Google Classroom and related applications. Its goal is to give participants a solid foundation and to help them identify areas of interest for future growth.

Intermediate - This workshop targets the refinement of user skills in Google Classroom, as well as problem solving and solution sharing for best practice. Its goal is to enhance the skills of those who are already proficient adopters.

Advanced - This workshop targets extensions and innovations that can be built upon already extensive use of Google Classroom. Its goal is to maximize the benefit of the tool and to prepare participants to become Certified Innovators.

The goal of involving the participants in workshop choice from the beginning of the PD is to encourage self-efficacy. A pre- and post-survey that will be administered during the PD and professional learning plans will be developed in consultation with each participant.

 Prior to the inception of this initiative, school Technology Coordinators, Media Specialists, and Computer Science teachers will be officially certified as Google Classroom Trainers. These individuals will lead the initial workshop sessions, as well as on-going PD in their schools. All teachers will be expected to train their students in the use of Google Classroom. Parent orientation sessions will be lead by the Technology Coordinator and the teachers. The Technology Coordinator will train support staff in relevant aspects of the tool.

Timetable for the Organization and Delivery of the Google Classroom PD

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| December 2015 | The JCPS Superintendent will designate the coordinator of the Google Classroom Initiative. The coordinator will meet with Principals to engage their participation in the plan. |
| January – July 2016 | Technology Coordinators and Media Specialists willcomplete online certification as Google Classroom Trainers.  |
| June 2016 | District level communication to all stakeholders regarding the mandate for Google Classroom, the August PD day, and the plan to focus PD on this topic for the coming year.  |
| July 2016 | Registration for August PD: An email will be sent to participants that will include a link to Sign-up Genius <http://www.signupgenius.com/go/30e084faaab29a5f94-google/>, a site where it is possible to choose between beginner, intermediate, or advanced level workshops in Google Classroom.  |
| July – August 2016 | Technology Coordinators and Media Specialists will work with the school Administrators to plan the full day PD. |
| August 2016 | The full day PD will take place in JCPS’s 39 school buildings simultaneously. |
| September 2016 – May 2017 | Next steps will include:* Bi-weekly Professional Learning Community Meetings for the faculty on topics related to Google Classrooms
* Pairing novice teachers with peer-coaches
* Encouraging teachers to complete online certification in levels 1 & 2
 |

This timetable covers only the upcoming academic year. Based on formative assessment during that year, plans will be made for subsequent years.

Full Day PD

 JCPS consists of 39 schools including grades 3 – 12. PD for all teachers will take place in their own school buildings. Librarians will meet in the Franklin Williams School – MS 7 and the

Administrators will meet in Liberty High School. All participants are asked to bring their school assigned Chromebook and either student rosters or teacher rosters in the case of administration and librarians.

 Upon arrival at the school, participants will be given a nametag with a room/workshop assignment that is based on their pre-registration. The nametag will also include the URL for the PD website <http://asafanova.wix.com/pd-google-classroom>. Upon arrival at the assigned room, participants will be welcomed, asked to open the PD website and to participate in a Poll Everywhere <https://pollev.com/angelicasafa487>, which will be used as a trigger for a warm-up discussion. Next, the PD agenda and timetable will be introduced.

 The PD website includes an agenda; a Slideshare[[1]](#footnote-1) (Scheffer, 2014); target group-specific resources; pre- and post- workshop surveys about Google Classroom use; a workshop evaluation; and a selection of annotated resources for users. The agenda [http://asafanova.wix.com/pd-google-classroom - !agenda/cjg9](http://asafanova.wix.com/pd-google-classroom#!agenda/cjg9) will have a similar structure all target groups, but the active content will be customized by the presenter to address the needs and the level of the group. The agenda shown on the website is a sample shown for the beginner group, because in the first year it is expected that the largest portion of the trainees will be beginners. While beginners are practicing basic skills, the intermediate level will be troubleshooting issues based on their previous experience and learning enhancements. At the same time, the advanced group will focus on content delivery and innovative uses for Google Classroom.

Administrators will be given an overview of both teacher and student perspectives, then will move to a discussion of avenues for support of adoption and optimization of Google Classroom. Their session will include a planning session for on-going data collection and evaluation of the tool. The Librarians will also address general classroom use of the LMS, but training examples in their workshop will focus on contributions that they can make to effective implementation. Target group-specific resources will support all of these strands, as well as a Pinterest site <https://www.pinterest.com/explore/google-classroom/>

featuring general resources.

 In addition to training some of the schools’ most important stakeholders, this PD is focused on the 100% adoption mandate. At the end of the day, every class should have a functioning Google Classroom site and pre-existing sites should be improved. The Pre- and Post-Workshop Surveys ( <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/3QKBGZH>; <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/G7QKLKL>) will provide the Technology Coordinators with a snapshot of each participants self-assessment and will serve as a springboard for the creation of professional learning plans on this topic.

 The PD website also encourages participants to continue the conversation with widgets that send an email to the presenter, request a Help Desk appointment, and resource-related discussion boards.

Evaluation

The need to increase rigor across all content areas while exposing students to the skills and resources necessary to become digital citizens is the ultimate goal for implementing Google Classroom in JCPS. The latest results of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for

College and Careers (PARCC) administered in 2014-2015 indicates that more than half of the students in grades 3 through 11 failed to meet their grade-level expectations in both math and English in the State of New Jersey (Heyboer, 2015). With this goal in mind, the collection of both formal and informal data will be needed assess whether Google Classroom maximizes teaching and learning throughout the district. The artifacts to be gathered include, but are not limited, to the following:

* Student achievement data
* Daily walkthroughs
* Instructional rounds
* Formal teacher observations
* Teacher observation reports
* Focus groups
* Professional learning communities
* Surveys

 Since Google Classroom does not include an analytics component in its software,

the data mining will need to take place at the school level. The existing data available at

the school level includes a record of teacher observations and score reports based on

Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for teaching. The framework identifies those aspects of

a teacher’s responsibilities that promote student learning including planning and

preparation, classroom environment, instruction and professional responsibilities. The

components of the framework can be utilized to measure the effective implementation of

Google Classroom along with other data mining tools.

The score reports for teacher observations can be found on the Teachscape

Platform. The platform features the Teachscape Reflect component which is a web-based

observation and evaluation management system to monitor teacher performance which

can be used to make informed decisions about teacher practices and guide future

professional development. Access to the data management system can be found at the

school level, as well as, at the district level.

Instructional Rounds (IR) are also a critical component to measure the effectiveness of

the implementation of Google Classroom as a school and as a district. The IR process is designed to create a network approach to improving teaching and learning. The network is comprised of administrative staff at both the school and the district level all working together towards improved performance. The IR team will visit schools across the district to support the instructional improvement at the host site by sharing what the network learns and by building skills at the local level (City, E.A., Elmore, R., Fiarman, S.E. & Teitel, L., 2014).

As part of the process, the IR team will visit a select number of classrooms at the

host site. The host site will identify an existing problem of practice in terms of the

integration of Google Classroom which is directly observable. The IR team will observe

the practice and will later debrief. One of the critical components of the IR process is to

determine the next level of work based on observable evidence.

During classroom visits at the host school, the IR network team will utilize a

modified version of the Technology Integration Matrix (TIM) (See Appendix B) to evaluate the levels of technology integration into the curriculum. More specifically, the IR

network team will utilize the matrix to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing

professional development practices in order to guide the future PD implementation of

Google Classroom. The purpose of the matrix is to establish a common language for goal

setting while providing a framework for defining and evaluating technology integration

and professional development.

The levels of teacher indicators on the TIM include Entry; Adoption; Adaptation;

Infusion; Transformation (Florida Center for Instructional Technology, 2015). The entry

level represents the initial stages of implementation while the transformation level

indicates the highest level of integration. The instrument also takes into account the five

attributes of the learning environment including Active; Collaborative; Constructive;

Authentic; and Goal-Directed. Early integration practices would be at the active level while

more advanced learning environments would progress towards being goal-directed.

At the school level, teachers will be responsible for attending weekly Professional

Learning Communities (PLC) and collaborating with their grade-level partners as they work

towards improving the effectiveness of the instructional program. The PLCs will afford

teachers with an opportunity to turnkey pertinent information related to various aspects of

Google Classroom including student performance, student usage, best practices, sharing

information and establishing next steps. The facilitators of the PLC will vary depending on

the nature of the discussion. Discussions may be lead by the technology coordinator, media

specialist, administrator, content area expert and/or classroom teachers. The members of

the PLC will be responsible for maintaining a PLC binder that contains weekly Meeting

Record Forms (See Appendix C). The administrative staff will attend the weekly PLCs and will

also review the Meeting Record Forms to guide future professional development.

The administrative staff will conduct five walkthroughs per week, based on a

targeted focus, to record evidence of teacher and student usage of Google Classroom with

the ultimate goal of 100% compliance. The walkthroughs are informal in nature and

should be 5-10 minutes in length. The administrative team will utilize formative data, such

as the Classroom Walkthrough Tool, (See Appendix D) to record and monitor Google

Classroom usage and effectiveness. The administrative staff will be responsible for

submitting a composite of classroom visits to the Associate Superintendent on a weekly

basis. The weekly walkthroughs will provide the district staff with formative data which

can be utilized to review progress against project goals to determine where additional

support may be needed.

Metrics will include an analysis of student benchmark data to determine student

growth in English language arts and mathematics. Student performance will be measured

against last year’s benchmark results for all five cycle reviews (Six weeks per cycle), as well as,

a comparative analysis of student performance between cycles in the current school year.

Benchmark data will include overall student performance along with sub-group

performance.

Additional data collection will be comprised of focus group interviews with all

stakeholders including students, parents, teachers, administrators, librarians, technology

coordinators and media arts specialists. Pre-and Post-Professional Development surveys

will offer meaningful feedback on how to support building level personnel with the

implementation of Google Classroom. Helpdesk appointment data tracking and call logs

will also provide greater insights on allocation of funds and professional development

resources.

Conclusion

 Mullins, Lepicki, and Glandon (2010) identify four levels of evaluation for PD: satisfaction, learning, behavior, and impact (p.3). The PD process described above attends to each of these levels. Participant satisfaction will be measured using a SurveyMonkey survey at the end of the day-long PD and throughout the year in PLC sessions. Learning, “knowledge and skills that the participants acquire” (p.3) will be measured using the pre- and post- workshop surveys, in mentoring sessions, and in PLCs. Behavior or “the application of knowledge and skills” (p.3) will be evaluated with Instructional Rounds, Walk-throughs, formal teacher observations, and reviews. Finally, and most importantly, impact will be gauged by student achievement data and information mined from surveys and focus groups involving all stakeholders.

 The formative evaluation of this PD program is a process that will take place over the course of the three years leading up to the 100% adoption goal. As Google Classroom is a relatively new tool and is constantly being updated, it can be anticipated that new features will

need to be addressed with additional PD over time. As well, analytics tools may also be developed to address JCPS need for data collection (Krossbow via Google for Education Forum, private correspondence, 2015, December 11). In the meanwhile, the combination of JCPS district-wide commitment to serious training and support of this initiative, along with the judicious collection of data from a variety of sources will a successful outcome.
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**Appendix A**

**Delivering Professional Development –The LMS way**

 The opening statement of Chapter 6 in the report by the NCES (2003) is startling in its quotation: “The National Education Association…recommends that 50 percent of teachers’ time be given to professional development”.

 The NCLB, introduced in 2002 and now accredited as being a main pillar in getting school districts to implement technology planning, says that 25% of the school’s budget needs to be spent on Professional development which is fundamental to student outcomes.

Does any of the above make sense when teachers have for years just been given a listing/roster and their text, and implicitly informed that they are to be heard from again when it is time to report grades? Yes, the statements make sense in that times have changed! Today is a time when it is expected to have a constant exchange between administration, peers, and students. There is change in the classroom too: While the text-book is still in vogue—though evolving to electronic versions, the mode of presentation is moving towards student-centered presentations and away from the teacher centered paradigm.

 What this means is that the old modes of tracking students, communicating with them only in the classroom, giving infrequent formative reports, and end of semester summative reports is considered obsolete with a new tool needed to bring the complex issues to the fingertips of the user to produce a flexible interface to other faculty, staff, administrators, and students. It is recognized that teachers need to be trained in not just presenting come content, but also in mastering the conversation of integration of the technology in presenting content on an ongoing basis and the communications related to all parties.

The concept of a Learning Management System (LMS) began as a solution in business enterprises in the 1990s. These systems began by allowing centralized logon (for security), and access to all applications that covered everything from employee absence, to deliveries and fulfillment, and inventorying. They were more or less tools for pulling together different databases. They were automatic in updating all of the databases by using an event to trigger changes everywhere that was needed; Here is an example— I can’t make it to work today, but I have some critical deliveries for customers. All I do is logon to the system and sign in sick. The LMS would contact everyone with a electronic note—my supervisor, my coworker on the truck, and, off course, HR. LMSs were so named as Enterprise tools because the scope of access to the user was not limited to only his/her local establishment, but the entire set of entities making up the organization, independent of geographical separation. The internet brought an even greater growth because the interface was from wherever and whenever—true flexibility, which jumped once more when the introduction of smart phones and tables brought the Bring-Your-Own- Device technology to industry. LMS technology was a natural match for the ways schools operated within a district, which had a diverse populous (students, administration, faculty and staff) that needed tracking and needed the flexibility of the interface.

 Dan Sussman (2005) indicates that businesses now routinely uses a LMS to schedule employee issues, jobs, training, and inter departmental support and communications. However, while Oracle has always been a front-runner, something has happened that was unforeseen: The big names in Publishing have began to design LMS solutions for schools that provide the same features that the computer companies provided for industry.

Research shows that many of the principles of business tend to parallel those in business and many migrate for efficiency of operation. The LMS is a classic example. Today, we need an LMS with many components to allow the outreach required.

 In fact there are quite a few startups now dedicated to making LMS solutions from computer back companies such as Oracle, and Microsoft to publishers such as Pearson, and McGraw Hill, and Thompson publishing. The sprint in this sector for market share began when money from Common Core based projects regarding reporting needs started to flow in the direction of summative tools provided by the LMS.

 Let’s focus once more on Professional Development. What do we have for schools to assure Kirkpatrick’s four levels are covered? Can an LMS tool be used to help us with recursive planning as with the Guskey five-level model (Guskey, 2002), or the Technology Integration Model from the Florida Center for Instructional Technology?

Below is a listing of products with their access. Pick one, but be careful because they are not equal. Districts are advised as in the Garner Report to take the following into account when shopping for an LMS or looking to upgrade:

· Budget (over budgeting is better than under budgeting);

· The LMS must reflect training both professional development components;

· Professional Development and training components must be role based;

· There must be ad hoc and continuity of the training and support;

· The LMS must address formative and summative .issues; and

· There must be persistence in the system which allows a feedback mechanism for monitoring and adjustment of training, not just formative and summative tools. (Gartner 2012)

The LMS has to do some very specific things for the district and its schools. According to Victor Rivero, “It’s the Holy Grail of education : an online system that manages it all—content, courses, instruction, assessment, evaluation, reporting school websites, gradebooks, professional development for teachers, communications to parents, collaborative and social networking tools blended and adaptive courses and so on.” (Rivero, 2012)

Here is a randomized sample of some LMS products along with some pertinent notes:

**LMS Product Name site Notes**

1. Blackboard Learn [www.blackboardlearn/com/Platforms/Learn](http://www.blackboardlearn/com/Platforms/Learn) 1

2. Moodle <http://moodle.org/mod/forum/view.php?f=731> 1

3. LoudCloud <http://www.loudcloudsystems.com>

4. Knewton <http://www.newton.com> 1

5. Desire2Learn <http://www.desire2learn.com> 2

6. HotChalk <http://www.hotchalk.com> 3

7. Pearson SuccessNet <http://pearsonsuccessnet.com> 4

8. Schoology <http://schoology.com> 5

9. Cengage Learning <http://ceengagesites.com> 1

10. Adobe Connect 8 <http://adobe.com/education/products> 6

11. SharePoint LMS <http://sharepointims.com> 1

12. Edmodo <http://edmodo.com/institutions?/language=en> 7

13. CompassLearning <http://compasslearning.com> 1

Note 1: Does everything and moving closer to the complete LMS.

Note 2: Special orientation, Flipped, E-learning, Media repository

Note 3: Geared toward Professional Development

Note 4: Almost purely formative and summative

Note 5: Special latches to social networking learning community oriented

Note 6: Professional Development with interconnection to other LMSs

Note 7: Very popular with Facebook-like interface; PD and Training

**Which One Delivers Professional Development?**

 The researchers can’t pick a product over another for the District: In fact, it has to be stated that there are more products out there than are listed with others joining this very fast growing market for LMSs. The school District is advised to reach out to the supplier and discuss their budgeting and support roles, then make a decision.

At the core of the product must be true Professional Development and Training. It needs summative and formative instruments built in instruments or applications as add-ons. It needs communications instruments. It needs tools to assist in evaluation. If it can, it needs a repository tool for the PD to do with the evaluation. It must start with the needs assessment of tool like STNA, and build out a comprehensive technology plan. It is the plan that professional development must be built from.

 While Edmodo is popular because it can do all of the above, it has to be noted that the Government has recently began giving contracts in several districts to Pearson, and McGraw Hill back products.
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**Appendix B**

**Technology Integration Matrix**

**Level of Integration of Google Classroom into the Curriculum**

*This table includes teacher descriptors to measure the effectiveness of Google Classroom as a Learning Management System. It was designed as an evaluation instrument to assess the effectiveness of the professional development program.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Entry** | **Adoption** | **Adaptation** | **Infusion** | **Transformation** |
| **Active** | The teacher may be the only one actively using Google Classroom. This may include using the software to support delivery of a lecture.  | The teacher controls the use of Google Classroom and how it is used. The teacher may be pacing the students through a project, making sure that they complete each step in the same sequence with the same tool. | The teacher chooses which Google tools to use and when to use them. The students are developing a conceptual and procedural knowledge of Google Classroom and the available tools. The teacher acts as a facilitator toward learning. | The teacher guides, informs, and contextualizes student choices of technology tools and is flexible and open to student ideas. Lessons are structured so that student use of technology is self-directed. | The teacher serves as a guide, mentor, and model in the use of technology integration and the use of Google Classroom. The teacher facilitates lessons in which students are engaged in higher order learning activities that may not have been possible without the use of technology tools.  |
| **Collaborative** | The teacher directs students to work alone on tasks involving Google Sites and Google Classroom | The teacher directs students in the conventional use of Google Sites and Google Classroom when working with others. | The teacher provides opportunities for student collaboration using Google Sites and Google Classroom. | Teacher encourages students to use Google Classroom tools to work collaboratively such as Google Docs, Google Drive and Google Hangout. | The teacher seeks partnerships outside of the setting to allow students to access experts and encourages students to extend the use of collaborative technology tools in higher order learning activities that may not have been possible without the use of technology tools. |
| **Constructive** | The teacher uses Google Classroom to deliver information to students. | The teacher provides some opportunities for students to use Google Classroom and Google Sites in conventional ways to build knowledge and experience. Integration of technology is teacher directed.  | The teacher gives the students access to a variety of Google tools and guides them to appropriate resources. | The teacher consistently allows student choice in terms of use of technology tools to build an understanding of a concept. Technology tools are seamlessly integrated into a lesson. | The teacher facilitates higher order learning opportunities in which students regularly engage in activities that may not have been possible to achieve without the use of technology tools. The teacher encourages students to explore the use of technology tools in unconventional ways. |
| **Authentic** | The teacher assigns work based on a pre-determined curriculum unrelated to the students or issues beyond the instructional setting. | The teacher directs students step- by- step in the conventional use of technology tools and Google Classroom to either plan, monitor, or evaluate an activity.  | The teacher selects the technology tools and clearly integrates them into the lesson. The teacher facilitates students independent use of the technology tools to set goals, plan, monitor progress, and evaluate outcomes.  | The teacher creates a learning context in which students regularly use technology tools and Google Classroom for planning, monitoring, and evaluating learning activities.  | The teacher creates a rich learning environment in which students regularly engage in higher order planning activities that may not have been possible to achieve without technology. The teacher sets a context in which students are encouraged to use technology tools to monitor their own learning. |
| **Goal-Directed** | The teacher uses Google Classroom to give students directions and monitor step-by-step completion of tasks.  | The teacher directs students step- by- step in the conventional use of technology tools to either plan, monitor, or evaluate an activity.  | The teacher selects the technology tools and clearly integrates them into the lesson. The teacher facilitates students independent use of the technology tools to set goals, plan, monitor progress, and evaluate outcomes.  | The teacher creates a learning context in which students regularly use Google Classroom tools for planning, monitoring, and evaluating learning activities. The teacher facilitates students' selection of technology tools. | The teacher creates a rich learning environment in which students regularly engage in higher order planning activities that may have not been possible to achieve without technology. The teacher sets a context in which students are encouraged to use technology tools in unconventional ways to monitor their own learning.  |

\*This Technology Integration Matrix is an adaptation of The Technology Integration Matrix which was developed by the Florida Center for Instructional Technology at the University of South Florida College of Education.

**Appendix C**

**PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES**

**MEETING RECORD FORM**

**Grade Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Time: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Location: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Instructional Focus: \_\_\_\_\_*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

***\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

**Participants: (Please sign)**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Summary:**

|  |
| --- |
| ***Discussion Points and Next Steps:*** |

**Appendix D**

**JERSEY CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

Classroom Walkthrough Tool

*During classroom walkthroughs, school administrators will record evidence of teacher and student usage of Google Classroom based on a targeted focus with the ultimate goal of 100% compliance.* ***Directions: Place a check to record evidence of implementation.***

***School: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Week of: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Room:****Grade:** | **Room:****Grade:** | **Room:****Grade:** | **Room:****Grade:** | **Room:****Grade:** |
| Teacher has created a Google Classroom |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher communicates with students via Google Classroom |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher has created a digital workflow of assignments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher maintains digital communication with their students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Integration with Google Drive is evident |  |  |  |  |  |

**District Professional Development Plan (PDP) Template**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **District Name** | **Superintendent Name** | **Plan Begin/End Dates** |
| Jersey City School Public Schools |  Dr. Frederick Cantor  | July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016  |

**1: Professional Learning (PL) Goals**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PL****Goal****No.** | **Goals** | **Identified****Group** | **Rationale/Sources of Evidence** |
| **1** | To build capacity for the faculty, administration, and staff on the proper use of Google Classrooms software  | TeachersAdministratorsLibrarians | * Instructional rounds
* Teacher evaluations
* Informal and formal walkthroughs
 |
| **2** | To ensure that every teacher has a Google Classroom for every class that can be further customized and developed by the classroom teacher(s) | TeachersAdministratorsLibrarians | * Instructional rounds
* Teacher evaluations
* Informal and formal walkthroughs
* PLC Meeting Record Form
 |
| **3** | To support the development of best practice with models of implementation, a variety of PD options, and school-based, peer coaches.  |  TeachersLibrariansAdministrators | * Pre-Evaluation PD Surveys
* Post-Evaluation PD Surveys
* PLC Meeting Record Form
* Focus Groups
 |

**2: Professional Learning Activities**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PL****Goal****No** | **Initial Activities** | **Follow-up Activities (as appropriate)** |
|  **1** | Collaborative Professional Learning (Full day training) PD on Google Classrooms setup and management | * Coaching
* Webinar
* Webcasts
 |
|  **2** |  Departmental PD | * Grade-Level PD
 |
|  **3** |  100% of teachers using Google Classrooms for daily workflow  | * Use of Google Classrooms for at least 50% of PLC interaction
 |
|   |  |   |

**3: PD Required by Statute or Regulation**

|  |
| --- |
| **State-mandated PD Activities** |
| * Collaborative professional learning for school leaders.
* 20 hours of professional development for teachers and instructional staff per year.
* Suicide Prevention
* Harassment, Intimidation and Bullying Training
 |

**4: Resources and Justification**

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources** |
| * [New Jersey Professional Development Requirements in Statute and Regulations](http://www.state.nj.us/education/profdev/topics/StateRequiredPD.pdf)
* [District-Level Professional Development Planning Requirements](http://www.nj.gov/education/profdev/sdpdp/dPDRequirements.pdf)
 |
| **Justification** |
| The primary reason for integrating use of Google Classroom in the school district is to improve student performance by providing more options for the delivery of content. With optimized use of an LMS, the district will be able to support hybrid learning, Flipped Classrooms, and Personalized Learning |

**Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Superintendent Signature Date**

1. This Slideshare is an example of the type of slide deck that presenters will create for use with their groups. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)