

Gregory Gilmore  
Assignment 1: Tech Plan Evaluation  
7366 Fall 2011

## DESE District Technology Plan Review/Approval – 2010 Score Form

County-District Code: 048-066  
District Name: Fort Osage R-1 School District  
Your name: Gregory Gilmore

### Scoring Guide

Not Met = 0 Points  
Met = 1 Point  
Exemplary = 2 Points

**Needs Assessment:** Examine both the text in the ePeGS needs assessment box **AND** the data used for the objectives, strategies, and action steps within the plan before determining whether “needs assessment” is met or not met.]

**Not Met – Comment:**

**Met – Comment:**

- 2 Exemplary – Comment:** The needs outlined in the plan are based on the district’s Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. This should foster consistency between the tech plan and other plans and improvement documents generated throughout the district. The needs are not exclusively tied to technology, but focus on student achievement that can be augmented by the technology goals that follow in the technology plan. The objectives, strategies, and action steps within the plan are consistent with the needs listed in this section.

**Goals:** Indicate whether objectives, strategies, and actions steps are tied to one overall **Student Performance** goal, the five **suggested ePeGs/CSIP goals**, and/or **LEA-defined goals**. Whether the plan has one, two, or five goals, the objectives, strategies, and action steps must address the Missouri Education Technology Strategic Plan (METSP) tech focus areas (**TFAs**): **Student learning, Teacher preparation, Administration, Resources, and Technical support.**

### Goal Type(s):

**Student Performance Goal**

**X ePeGs Goals:** The five goals are directly based on the ePeGs/CSIP goals of student performance, high quality staff, facilities, support, and resources, parent and community involvement, and governance.

**EA-defined Goals**

### Goal(s)

**Not Met – Comment:**

- 1 **Met – Comment:** The plan includes the five ePeG/CSIP goals that address student performance, highly qualified staff, facilities, community involvement, and governance. Although the goals align with the ePeG/CSIP goals, no additional goals specific to the district are listed.  
**Exemplary – Comment:**

#### **Objectives, Strategies, and Action Steps:**

#### ***Student Performance / ePeGs Student Performance / Student Learning TFA***

##### **Not Met – Comment:**

- 1 **Met – Comment:** Goal 1 focuses on student performance and achievement. Objectives include implementation and assessment of NETS-S, updating curriculum to incorporate technology, meeting AYP requirements, and alternative instructional programs. The Strategies support the goal, list those responsible for meeting the goal, and include action steps listing specific plans and dates to achieve the goal.  
**Exemplary – Comment:**

#### ***Highly Qualified Staff / Teacher Preparation TFA***

##### **Not Met – Comment:**

- 1 **Met – Comment:** Goal 2 focuses on the recruitment and development of highly qualified staff to execute the district mission. The district plans to support this goal by providing integrated data management systems, developing professional development standards that support differentiated instruction and the integration of technology in the classroom, and allocation of funds towards software and hardware. The Strategies listed in this section support the goal, list those who are responsible for meeting the goal, and include a plan of action with target dates.

##### **Exemplary – Comment:**

#### ***Parent and Community Involvement [might be used to address one or more TFAs]***

##### **Not Met – Comment:**

- 1 **Met – Comment:** Goal 4 focuses on parent, student, and community involvement. The Objectives include technology-driven communication tools and a plan to encourage community involvement in the district and individual buildings. The Strategies listed in this section support the goal, list those who are responsible for meeting the goal, and include a plan of action with target dates.

##### **Exemplary – Comment:**

#### ***Facilities, Support and Instructional Resources / Resources and Technical Support TFAs***

##### **Not Met – Comment:**

- 1 Met – Comment:** Goal 3 focuses on providing resources, support services and functional and safe facilities. The objectives address appropriate funding, software and hardware updates, and infrastructure maintenance and upgrades. The included strategies support the goal, list those responsible for meeting the goal, and include action steps listing specific plans and dates to achieve the goal.

**Exemplary – Comment:**

### **Governance / Administration TFA**

**Not Met – Comment:**

- 1 Met – Comment:** Goal 5 is dedicated to effective and efficient governance and leadership. The objectives include annual reviews of board policies and reviewing the process for allocating funds for technology. The Strategies listed in this section support the goal, list those who are responsible for meeting the goal, and include a plan of action with target dates.

**Exemplary – Comment:**

**Other/LEA-defined – specify:** No additional goals are stated beyond the five CSIP goals.

- Not Met – Comment:**
- Met – Comment:**
- Exemplary – Comment:**

**Evaluation:** Examine the Additional Element text (for an ePeGS-submitted Ed Tech Plan).

**Not Met – Comment:**

**Met – Comment:**

- 2 Exemplary – Comment:** The additional elements section describes the steps the district will take to meet NCLB requirements when applying for funding. These steps include annual progress reports available to the school board, staff, and community, responsibilities of the technology committee, staff and student surveys, evaluation of standardized and district assessments, and additional responsibilities of the technology director and technology support staff. Also included in this section are the five elements required by the E-rate Program.

**Additional Comments** (Optional...but preferred):

The plan is 19 pages long, which is a little shorter than the exemplary plan from Warren Co. R-III listed on the DESE website. Both plans have the same basic structure and use the same ePeGs/CSIP goals to organize the plan. It was interesting to see how the two schools approached the same goals with different objectives and action plans.

The Fort Osage plan includes specifics that provide accountability such as dates and the positions that are responsible for carrying out the goal. The action steps are written in a way that their completion could be supported by data or artifacts, but they are sometimes vague and lacking specifics to how they will be carried out. I realize that the

purpose of the plan is not a detailed action plan on every step, but I could see actual reviewers of the plan raising questions to how the technology committee specifically intended to reach some of the goals.

**Overall – Provide additional comments as necessary or appropriate:**

Overall, the plan received 10 out of 16 total points. A score of 8 would indicate that each section had met the requirements of the rubric. Based on my limited exposure to technology plans, this plan meets the requirements, but does not appear to be exemplary across the entire plan. Some sections are better than others.

**Exemplary Overall – Comment whether this is a model plan:** This could be considered a model plan in that it uses the five ePeGs/CSIP goals and is built upon the needs established in the district's School Improvement Plan to guide the implementation strategies listed in the five ePeGs/CSIP goals. The plan does not include any district-specific goals, which could be used to justify why this plan is not exemplary. The plan is logically organized and contains the necessary elements listed in this evaluation rubric. Although it may not stand out among other district plans, it is a solid plan with the required elements that was approved by the local school board and state.