

Technology Plan Review

You may use this review source. In addition to just giving a number score, I'll ask that you give personal comments for each component to support your rating.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Committee list is missing or inadequate to determine representation.</p> <p>See note *.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Committee list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ identifies membership groups ❑ includes most membership groups ❑ is appropriate in size Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ reviewed previous technology plan's activities, outcomes, and overall progress Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Committee list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ has equitable representation ❑ provides TFA links Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ conducted detailed and comprehensive review of previous technology plan's activities, outcomes, and overall progress </p> | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – the Technology Plan for Sullivan School District is well detailed and consistent with most of the bulleted items. The only area where it seems to be a little lacking is in equitable representation. Students (1) and Community Leaders (4) are under represented compared to Teachers (13) and Administrators (9). Also, there were only three Tech Support Staff represented, but the three present are pretty much the only Tech Support Staff in the District.</p> |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

*Revision Note:

DISTRICT EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY MISSION STATEMENT: Provide the district’s current mission statement (and the vision statement, if applicable) with regards to education technology. If updated/revised, describe how and why. Describe how existing or new statement(s) aligns with the district’s other existing mission statements and addresses the impact of technology on the district’s teaching and learning goals as addressed in the district’s Comprehensive School Improvement Plan.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Technology mission statement is missing or inadequate to determine technology focus of the district.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Technology mission statement::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ focuses on integration and student achievement ❑ reflects current district mission statement ❑ reflects current district CSIP goals <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Technology mission statement::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ directs implementation of TFAs ❑ demonstrates a clear connection between education technology distribution (access) and use | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Adequate (4 points)</u> –the first 3 bullets were adequately addressed. However, while technology distribution is mentioned, I did not see a very clear connection between that and technology use. I also did not see how the mission statement would direct the implementation of TFAs, though I admittedly am a little unclear as to what that point means.</p> |
|--|--|---|

*Revision Note:

CURRENT STATUS – COMPILING RAW DATA: List and briefly describe the comprehensive and appropriate data (sufficient in size and scope) that were used to examine the current status of the five Technology Focus Areas. Indicate how the data helped to identify strengths and weaknesses for each of the TFAs and guide the development of objectives and action plans. Describe how and why the content and/or the process for compiling and analyzing data has/have changed in the past three years.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Data are missing, inadequate, or not current to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ student learning as it relates to the Show-Me Standards ❑ teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ❑ resource distribution and use <p>See note *.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Data sources address/include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ standardized assessments (MAP, ITBS, etc.) ❑ local performance assessments (pre/post-tests, scoring guides/rubrics, checklists, observations, etc.) ❑ surveys and records (COT, TAGLIT, Profiler, teacher/administrator/staff/student needs assessments, service records, satisfaction surveys, etc.) ❑ policies/procedures (equity, copyright, AUP, licensing, CIPA, filtering, web, computer donations, security, etc.) ❑ curriculum standards, including technology ❑ technology budget ❑ current status ❑ multiple years of data (three or more years) <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Data sources address/include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ student, teacher, and administrator standards (Show-Me Standards, local curriculum/technology, NETS, etc.) ❑ professional development data, trainer evaluations, training outcomes, etc. ❑ administrative networking tools (fiscal management, purchasing and budget management systems, etc.) | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this portion of the Technology Plan is very extensive, yet also very interesting. I had a hard time locating the Total Cost of Ownership section. Otherwise, all other items were included. The report contained very detailed information about the kinds of hardware and software found in the district as well as how and where the technology is being used.</p> |
|---|---|--|
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">❑ data management tools (student information systems, grade books, attendance, etc.)❑ communication tools (e-mail, Internet, Intranet, etc.)❑ total cost of ownership (TCO) | |
|--|---|--|

*Revision Note:

GOAL(S): List and briefly describe the goal(s) that provide direction for the district’s use of education technologies to improve, first and foremost, teaching and learning. Describe the progress/status of the previous plan’s goals and any changes made to the goals for the new plan to be approved. [Goals are broad statements of the purpose of the plan and are linked to comprehensive improvement plans. Goals should address all five of the TFAs. It is possible for a goal to cover multiple TFAs.]

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Goal(s) are missing or inadequate to determine the direction of the plan.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Goal(s) address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ district mission statement and CSIP goals ❑ student learning ❑ teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ❑ Title II.D Program goals (technology integration and 8th grade tech literacy) ❑ progress and status of previous plan’s goals <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Goal(s) address identified needs/weaknesses related to each TFA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ student learning ❑ teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ❑ administration/data management/communication processes ❑ resource distribution and use ❑ technical support <p>Goal(s) address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ state education technology plan goals and objectives | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – under each section’s objectives, the previous objectives are clearly stated and highlighted in bold. If it was a new objective, it was also clearly stated. Strengths and weaknesses were outlined in each area. Weaknesses were also highlighted in bold.</p> |
|---|--|--|
| | | |

*Revision Note:

TFA 1: STUDENT LEARNING -- DATA ANALYSIS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTION PLANS

Student Data Analysis: Identify and briefly describe the appropriate data and information that were used and list the strengths and weaknesses of student learning (as it relates to the Show-Me Standards, including technology literacy). Note any changes in the measures and measurements used during the past three years and for development of the new plan.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Strengths and weaknesses for student learning (as it relates to the Show-Me Standards and technology) are missing or inadequate or not based on current data.</p> <p>See note *.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Valid, reliable, and current sources were analyzed to identify and list strengths and weaknesses. ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ student learning as it relates to the Show-Me Standards and technology ○ Title II.D Program goal for students to be technologically literate by the end of their 8th-grade <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives ○ curriculum, teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ○ resource distribution (access) and use ○ technical support ○ policies and procedures | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – the district used a great many of analytical tools, most of them consisting of acronyms that mean nothing to me at this point. A table is set up for each goal with the following column headings: Data Examined, Strengths/Weaknesses Identified by District or Building, Current Results, 2006 Progress, Status, Trends.</p> |
|--|---|--|
| | | |

*Revision Note:

Student Learning Objectives: Describe the student learning objectives detailed in the previous plan and note the progress made during the past three years. Identify the objectives (milestones/measures of accomplishments) that address student learning and support the goal(s) of the new plan.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Objectives are missing or are inadequate to measure student learning or not based on current data.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> show changes/growth from previous plan <input type="checkbox"/> relate to stated goal(s) <input type="checkbox"/> address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what progress is expected ○ how the progress will be measured <input type="checkbox"/> are attainable and realistic <input type="checkbox"/> will benefit student learning <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Objectives address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> weaknesses identified in Student Data Analysis section <input type="checkbox"/> various learner needs | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Adequate (4 points)</u> – The only thing I felt was lacking in this section was a description of various learner needs. As a former Special Education teacher, I am particularly sensitive to how technology benefits IEP students. Overall, it still seems like the focus is on the mainstream students without addressing how to meet the needs of the fringes.</p> |
|--|---|--|

*Revision Note:

Student Learning Plans: Detail the action plans and implementation strategies that indicate technology’s role in achieving high student achievement and performance (related to the Show-Me Standards, including technology literacy). Describe the progress/status of previous action plans and note changes and/or additional actions to be taken under the new plan.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Action Plan is missing or inadequate or not based on current data to determine the effect of technology on student learning.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ status/progress of previous action plan ❑ objective ❑ action step/activity ❑ timeline/completion date <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ goal ❑ estimated cost/budget ❑ funding source ❑ alignment with CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives ❑ person responsible ❑ review dates ❑ benchmarks ❑ correction strategies | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – each strength and weakness is further disseminated and analyzed in detail. A table is set up for each goal with the following column headings: Activity, District Goal, CSIP, MSIP, Persons Responsible, Funding Sources/Cost Estimate, Benchmarks, Evaluation of Activity. The plans of action are very clearly stated.</p> |
|--|--|--|

*Revision Note:

TFA 2: TEACHER PREPARATION -- DATA ANALYSIS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTION PLANS

Teacher Data Analysis: Identify and briefly describe the appropriate data and information that were used and list the strengths and weaknesses of teacher preparation and delivery of instruction. Note any changes in the measures and measurements used during the past three years and for development of the new plan.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Strengths and weaknesses for teacher preparation (as it relates to technology) are missing or inadequate or not based on current data.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Valid, reliable, and current sources were analyzed to identify and list strengths and weaknesses. ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ○ Title II.D Program goal for technology to be integrated into core curriculum <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ student learning, including technology literacy ○ resource access and use ○ technical support ○ policies and procedures ○ CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this section has the same setup and structure as the Student Data Analysis section with a similar variety of excellent data sources. Again, weaknesses are highlighted in bold.</p> |
|--|---|---|
| | | |

*Revision Note:

Teacher Objectives: Describe the teacher objectives detailed in the previous plan and note the progress made during the past three years. Identify the objectives (milestones/measures of accomplishments) that address teacher professional development and support the goal(s) of the new plan.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Objectives are missing or inadequate or not based on current data to measure teacher preparation and delivery of instruction.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> show change/growth from previous plan <input type="checkbox"/> relate to stated goal(s) <input type="checkbox"/> address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what progress is expected ○ how the progress will be measured <input type="checkbox"/> are attainable and realistic <input type="checkbox"/> will benefit teacher preparation and delivery of instruction <input type="checkbox"/> correspond to the planned timeline <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Objectives address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> weaknesses identified in Teacher Data Analysis section <input type="checkbox"/> various and multiple teacher needs (disciplines, grade levels, technology integration, uses of resources, etc.) | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Adequate (4 points)</u> – this section is rather small compared to other sections of the plan. It didn't achieve a "commendable" because I couldn't identify various and multiple teacher needs, though the needs were addressed on a basic level.</p> |
|---|--|---|

*Revision Note:

Teacher Preparation Plans: Detail the action plans and implementation strategies that promote preparing teachers to integrate technology into curriculum and instructional practices. Describe the progress/status of previous action plans and note changes and/or additional actions to be taken under the new plan.

| Needs | Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are | Score and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Revision (1-2 points) Action Plan is missing or inadequate or not based on current data to determine the effect of technology on teacher preparation and delivery of instruction.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>required for 4 points)</p> <p>Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> status/progress of previous action plan <input type="checkbox"/> objective <input type="checkbox"/> action step/activity <input type="checkbox"/> timeline/completion date <input type="checkbox"/> estimated cost/budget <input type="checkbox"/> funding source <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points)</p> <p>Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> goal <input type="checkbox"/> alignment with CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives <input type="checkbox"/> person responsible <input type="checkbox"/> review dates <input type="checkbox"/> benchmarks <input type="checkbox"/> correction strategies | <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this section has the same setup and structure as the Student Preparation Plans section. The same kind of table was used to organize the information.</p> |

*Revision Note:

TFA 3: ADMINISTRATION -- DATA ANALYSIS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTION PLANS

Administration, Management and Communications Data Analysis: Identify and briefly describe the appropriate data and information that were used and list the strengths and weaknesses of the district’s use of technology to support administration, data management, and communication processes. Note any changes in the measures and measurements used during the past three years and for development of the new plan.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Strengths and weaknesses for administration/data management/communication processes are missing or inadequate or not based on current data. See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Valid, reliable, and current sources were analyzed to identify and list strengths and weaknesses. ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ administration/data management/communication processes <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ student learning ○ teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ○ resource access and use ○ policies and procedures ○ CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this section again has the same setup and structure as the Student and Teacher Data Analysis sections with a similar variety of excellent data sources. Weaknesses are still identified by bold highlighting.</p> |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

*Revision Note:

Administration, Management and Communications Objectives: Describe the administration, management, and communications objectives detailed in the previous plan and note the progress made during the past three years. Identify the objectives (milestones/measures of accomplishments) that address the district’s use of technology to support school administration, data management, and communications and support the goal(s) of the new plan.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Objectives are missing or inadequate or not based on current data to measure the administration/data management /communication processes.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ show change/growth from previous plan ❑ relate to stated goal(s) ❑ address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what progress is expected ○ how the progress will be measured ❑ are attainable and realistic ❑ will benefit administration/data management/communication processes ❑ correspond to the planned timeline <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Objectives address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ weaknesses identified in Administration, Management and Communication Data Analysis section ❑ various management needs (fiscal, attendance, etc.) | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (4 points)</u> – like the Teacher Objectives, this section is rather small compared to other sections of the plan. It did, however, very clearly and thoroughly address the various management needs as well as identify several weaknesses in the administration.</p> |
|---|--|---|

*Revision Note:

Administration, Management and Communications Plans: Detail the action plans and implementation strategies that indicate technology's role in improving the district's administration, data management, and communication processes. Describe the progress/status of previous action plans and note changes and/or additional actions to be taken under the new plan.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Action Plan is missing or inadequate or not based on current data to determine the effect of technology on administration/data management/communication processes.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ status/growth of previous action plan ❑ objective ❑ action step/activity ❑ timeline/completion date ❑ estimated cost/budget ❑ funding source <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ goal ❑ alignment with CSIP and MSIP and state education technology plan goals and objectives ❑ person(s) responsible ❑ review dates ❑ benchmarks ❑ correction strategies | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this section has the same setup and structure as the Student and Teacher Preparation Plans sections. The same kind of table was used to organize the information.</p> |
|---|---|---|

*Revision Note:

TFA 4: RESOURCE -- DATA ANALYSIS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTION PLANS

Resource Data Analysis: Identify and briefly describe the appropriate data and information that were used and list the strengths and weaknesses of the district’s access to and use of technology resources. Note any changes in the measures and measurements used during the past three years and for development of the new plan.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Strengths and weaknesses for resource distribution and use (as it relates to technology) are missing or inadequate or not based on current data.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Valid, reliable, and current sources were analyzed to identify and list strengths and weaknesses. ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ resource distribution and use <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ technical support ○ student learning ○ teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ○ administration/data management/communication ○ policies and procedures ○ CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this section again has the same setup and structure as the previous Data Analysis sections, though it is considerable smaller, identifying only 1 strength and 2 weaknesses overall.</p> |
|--|--|--|
| | | |

*Revision Note:

Resource Objectives: Describe the resource objectives detailed in the previous plan and note the progress made during the past three years. Identify the objectives (milestones/measures of accomplishments) that address technology resource distribution and use and support the goal(s) of the new plan.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Objectives are missing or inadequate or not based on current data to measure resource distribution and use.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ show change/growth from previous plan ❑ relate to stated goal(s) ❑ address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what progress is expected ○ how the progress will be measured ❑ are attainable and realistic ❑ will benefit resource distribution and use ❑ correspond to the planned timeline <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Objectives address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ student to computer ratio ❑ weaknesses identified in Resource Data Analysis section ❑ various resource distribution and use needs (equity, standards, surveys, maintenance, repair, etc.) | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Adequate (4 points)</u> – while the plan did achieve all of the bulleted items in the “commendable” section, I did have one concern that one of the objectives will not be attainable and realistic. One of the objectives stated that the district would purchase at least 20 percent additional technology every year. That seems rather high to me, though I am not in a position to know the resources that the district has available.</p> |
|---|--|--|

*Revision Note:

Resource Plans: Detail the action plans and implementation strategies that support adequate and equitable distribution and use of the district's technology resources. Describe the progress/status of previous action plans and note changes and/or additional actions to be taken under the new plan.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Action Plan is missing or inadequate to or not based on current data determine the effect of resource distribution and use. See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> status/progress of previous action plan <input type="checkbox"/> objective <input type="checkbox"/> action step/activity <input type="checkbox"/> timeline/completion date <input type="checkbox"/> estimated cost/budget <input type="checkbox"/> funding source <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> goal <input type="checkbox"/> alignment with CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives <input type="checkbox"/> person responsible <input type="checkbox"/> review dates <input type="checkbox"/> benchmarks <input type="checkbox"/> correction strategies | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this section has the same setup and structure as the previous Plans sections. The same kind of table was used to organize the information.</p> |
|---|--|--|

*Revision Note:

FTA 5: TECHNICAL SUPPORT -- DATA ANALYSIS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTION PLANS

Technical Support Data Analysis: Identify and briefly describe the appropriate data and information that were used and list the strengths and weaknesses of the district’s support of its technology resources. Note any changes in the measures and measurements used during the past three years and for development of the new plan.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Strengths and weaknesses for technical support (as it relates to technology) are missing or inadequate or not based on current data.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Valid, reliable, and current sources were analyzed to identify and list strengths and weaknesses. ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ technical support <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Strengths and weaknesses have been identified at the district and building levels as they relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ resource access and use ○ student learning ○ teacher preparation and delivery of instruction ○ administration/data management/communication ○ policies and procedures ○ CSIP and MSIP goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Adequate (4 points)</u> – this section is very short, addressing only 2 weaknesses and no strengths. Only a basic level of data was included here.</p> |
|--|--|---|
| | | |

*Revision Note:

Technical Support Objectives: Describe the technical support objectives detailed in the previous plan and note the progress made during the past three years. Identify the objectives (milestones/measures of accomplishments) that address technical support and support the goal(s) of the new plan.

*Revision Note:

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Objectives are missing or inadequate or not based on current data to measure technical support.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> show change/growth from previous plan <input type="checkbox"/> relate to stated goal(s) <input type="checkbox"/> address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what progress is expected ○ how the progress will be measured <input type="checkbox"/> are attainable and realistic <input type="checkbox"/> will benefit technical support <input type="checkbox"/> correspond to the planned timeline <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Objectives address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> ratio of technical staff to number of computers <input type="checkbox"/> weaknesses identified in Technical Support Data Analysis section <input type="checkbox"/> various technical support needs (e.g., maintenance, repair, number of workstations, FTE, service records, etc.) | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – while also brief, this section does address the previously mentioned weaknesses. It also mentions that the ratio of technical staff (2 full time) to the number of computers (700).</p> |
|---|--|---|
| | | |

Technical Support Plans: Detail the action plans and implementation strategies that promote adequate and equitable technical support goal(s) and objectives. Describe the progress/status of previous action plans and note changes and/or additional actions to be taken under the new plan.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) Action Plan is missing or inadequate or not based on current data to determine the effect of technical support.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ status/progress of previous action plan ❑ objective ❑ action step/activity ❑ timeline/completion date ❑ estimated cost/budget ❑ funding source <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Action Plan details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ goal ❑ alignment with CSIP and MSIP and goals/standards and state education technology plan goals and objectives ❑ person responsible ❑ review dates ❑ benchmarks ❑ correction strategies | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Commendable (5 points)</u> – this section has the same setup and structure as the previous Plans sections. The same kind of table was used to organize the information.</p> |
|---|--|--|

*Revision Note:

COMMUNICATION / DISSEMINATION, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION: Describe actions taken during the past three years with regards to the previous plan’s ongoing communication / dissemination, monitoring, and evaluation. Note successful strategies the district used the past three years in communicating the goals and progress toward meeting the goals of the previous plan with community representatives and key stakeholders. Note successful strategies the district used in monitoring the plan’s progress and evaluating the plan’s effectiveness. Detail the dissemination, monitoring, and evaluation plans for the new plan.

| <p>Needs Revision (1-2 points) The strategies to communicate / disseminate, monitor, and evaluate are missing or inadequate or not based on current data to determine the plan’s effectiveness.</p> <p>See note*.</p> | <p>Adequate/Required (3-4 points – all Adequate boxes are required for 4 points) Plan includes strategies for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Communication / Dissemination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ report progress ○ inform all stakeholders and policy makers (board members, legislators, civic leaders, staff, community, parents, etc.) □ Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ timely ○ ongoing □ Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ timely ○ appropriate assessment tools <p>Commendable (5 points – all Adequate boxes plus majority of Commendable boxes are necessary for 5 points) Plan includes strategies for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Communication / Dissemination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ make extensive or innovative use of technology to inform and communicate with stakeholders and policy makers □ Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ analytical and extensive □ Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ongoing and extensive | <p>Score and Comments</p> <p><u>Adequate (4 points)</u> – while this section completely meets required bulleted items, it does not delve into the commendable range at all. Overall, the plan seems to be very well written, and the plan did receive an “Exemplary” rating from DESE.</p> |
|--|--|---|
| | | |

*Revision Note: