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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the 2020–21 school year, school districts provided data on classroom-level use of educational technology assessments. Districts also reported data about instructional opportunities in educational technology at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

The educational technology assessments developed by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) are administered voluntarily in the elementary, middle, and high school grades. The past year has demonstrated how essential educational technology is to students’ ability to learn and educators’ ability to meet the multitude of needs of students and their families. Students’ technology skills were fully utilized for learning in all content areas and grades.

The results are as follows:

- 90% of all reporting districts provided elementary school instruction on integrating educational technology focused on hardware/software training, digital citizenship, media literacy, internet safety and online tools/search techniques.
- 42% of all districts reporting assessed elementary school students in educational technology.
- 91% of all reporting districts provided middle school instruction on integrating educational technology focused on hardware/software training, digital citizenship, media literacy, internet safety and online tools/search techniques.
- 49% of all districts reporting assessed middle school students in educational technology.
- 92% of all reporting districts provided high school instruction on integrating educational technology focused on hardware/software training, digital citizenship, media literacy, internet safety and online tools/search techniques.
- 56% of all districts reporting assessed high school students in educational technology.
BACKGROUND

In 2008, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) set standards for students in technology literacy and fluency, as directed by Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.655.075. In 2011, OSPI released educational technology assessments for classroom and project-based use to determine if students meet Washington’s standards. The assessments integrate and align with Washington’s K–12 Learning Standards. Classroom activities are well guided, easy to use, and come with an inventory of free and low-cost digital resources.

Teachers began to use the assessments in the 2011–12 school year. School districts are not required to use the OSPI-developed assessments, but if they do, they must report their use to OSPI. OSPI must report annually to the legislature on the number of school districts that use the assessments each school year.

UPDATE STATUS

Of the 205 school districts responding with elementary students, 16 reported using an OSPI-developed assessment, 69 reported using teacher-developed assessments and 15 reported using commercially developed assessments for educational technology in one or more grade levels. The most common formative assessment tool was student self-reflection, which was reported by 51 districts.

During the 2020–21 school year, most districts utilized both synchronous (videoconferencing) and asynchronous (Learning Management System) approaches to instruction. Teachers utilized a variety of educational technology tools that included Google Classroom, Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Canvas and SeeSaw. To support remote learning, districts made investments in teacher professional development, new applications to support student engagement as well as devices.

“We invested in significant teacher PD to have consistent practices in using Microsoft Teams as our LMS. This allowed families to have consistent experiences in finding daily class meetings, assignments, and announcements from the teachers. Our student surveys showed massive improvement in consistent practices in using technology for remote instruction.” District written response on 2021 Assessment Survey

Those districts who had made historical investments in educational technology (coaches, professional development, instructional strategies, devices), had fewer challenges to overcome when pivoting to remote instruction.

“We provided on going professional development about effective technology integration using the Triple E Framework as our guide: engage, enhance, enrich. Further, we set up a Google Classroom for our teachers with asynchronous professional development focused on the over 50 digital resources we have available. In addition, we utilized our two Tech TOSAs to provide in person and virtual learning opportunities focused on topics that were selected via our professional development needs assessment.” -District written response on 2021 Assessment Survey
Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, districts were not required to report participation data on EdTech integration and assessment in 2019–20. Table 1 includes the student counts reported in 2020–21.

Districts report data about instructional opportunities in educational technology at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Data was also collected about topics covered in educational technology and the number of students receiving instruction in educational technology. Table 2 includes the percentage of schools providing instruction, as well as the number of students receiving instruction during 2020–21.

For elementary student assessment, districts utilized a variety of assessment strategies. Table 3 provides the percentages for each strategy at the elementary level.

**CONCLUSION & NEXT STEPS**

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction will continue to gather this data annually. For more information, please visit OSPI's Educational Technology webpage.
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Table 1: Number of Students Assessed in Educational Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020–21</td>
<td>132,797</td>
<td>112,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSPI 2021 Survey Results

Table 2: Instruction in Educational Technology: 2020–21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of Districts Providing Instruction</th>
<th>Number of Students Receiving Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>295,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>147,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>204,008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSPI 2021 Survey Results

Table 3: Effective Elementary Assessments Strategies 2020–21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Percent of Use at Elementary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student self-reflection</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological tools (e.g., Kahoot, Nearpod, Plickers)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPI-developed assessments</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District or school-developed assessments</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-developed classroom assessments</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially-developed assessments</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSPI 2021 Survey Results
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