

# Technology Planning Analysis Rubric

from the [Technology Use Plan Primer](#) by Peter H.R. Sibley and Chip Kimball

Criteria	LEVEL OF COMPREHENSIVENESS			
	1	2	3	4
<b>Broad Based Support Contributions</b> (Administration, Teachers, Students, Community, and Staff)	A list of contributors is not provided.	A list of contributors is provided, but does not describe the constituencies they represent. Equitable representation is not apparent due to the lack of detail.	A comprehensive list of contributors is provided with the constituencies they represent. Representation is provided by at least three of the five areas of the objective. The principal is included.	A comprehensive list of contributors is provided with the constituencies they represent. Representation is across all five areas of the objective. The principal is included.
<b>Broad Based Support Process</b>	No process for equitable representation is described.		The process to assure equitable representation is briefly mentioned, but not emphasized.	The process to assure equitable representation is emphasized and mentioned in detail.
<b>Needs Assessment Breadth</b>	A needs assessment is not provided.	A needs assessment is referenced, but only covers one element of the school environment (equipment or staff development, but not both)	A needs assessment is referenced with more than one element analyzed, but completely assessing staff, student, and community needs.	The needs assessment is comprehensive in breadth, consisting of detailed information about staff development needs and competencies, attitudinal surveys, equipment inventories, and school and district context.
<b>Needs Assessment Depth</b>	Broad generalizations are made about what the school needs with no reference to an assessment.	A needs assessment is referenced, but the instrument is informal, brief and generally not very specific. For example, a computer count is provided with no specificity as to where or how they are used.	A needs assessment is reference with what appears to be some level of detail. However, the instrument and data are not provided, and there may be room for additional detail in the collection and analysis.	The assessment in any given area is detailed and thorough. The instrument is provided with generalizations about the data. Raw data may be provided in an appendix.
<b>Needs Assessment Equipment</b>	No equipment inventory was provided.	An inventory exists, but is limited to computers only and does not represent vintage.	The inventory moves beyond computers only(phone, TV), but does not address infrastructure or vintage of equipment.	A comprehensive equipment inventory was provided, including computers, infrastructure, access, ITV, telephone and other equipment.
Form: TPAR ver 2.5mm 2/6/98				
1				
copyright © 1998 EDmin Open Systems				

# Technology Analysis Planning Rubric

from the [Technology Use Plan Primer](#) by Peter H.R. Sibley and Chip Kimball

Criteria	LEVEL OF COMPREHENSIVENESS			
	1	2	3	4
<b>Mission and/or Vision</b>	No clear mission and/or vision is articulated.	Vision is skill based only and does not address the larger outcomes by the school or district.	Vision focuses on the technology outcomes and skirts around the learning outcome issue.	Vision is comprehensive which deals with large learning outcomes of students, not technology outcomes. The statement identifies the learning process skills and values.
<b>Goals and Objectives</b>	General learning goals are not clear or are absent.	Goals are equipment based instead of based upon learning outcomes. Objectives are not linked to goals or are absent. Objectives and/or goals do not appear to be measurable or obtainable.	Goals are broad and comprehensive but are not completely clear. The are linked to objectives, but are not readily obtainable or measurable. Goals are loosely tied to the state or district documents.	Goals are broad and comprehensive, addressing teaching and learning needs. The goals are clear, attainable, and measurable. Objectives are delineated from goals, further defining how they will be met.
<b>Action Plans with Timelines, Responsibilities and Budget</b>	An action plan exists, but timelines and responsibilities are non-existent or limited. Assessment is not mentioned. The action plan is not curriculum based.	The action plan is specifically tied to the goals and objectives. The identified task, timeline, responsibility, funding, and assessment are incomplete and several elements are missing.	The action plan is specifically tied to the goals and objectives. The identified task, timeline, responsibility, funding, and assessment components are thorough, but one or more elements are missing.	The action plan is specifically tied to the goals and objectives. Each task identifies a task, timeline, and responsibility, funding, and assessment.
<b>Program Integration</b>	Connection to other efforts is not mentioned throughout the document.	The TUP mentions other efforts, but is not explicit in connection with the other efforts.	The TUP is loosely coupled to the other documents with needs and program changes integrated much of the time.	The TUP is tightly coupled to the other reform, curriculum, or accountability documents with the approach fully integrated.
<b>Curriculum Integration</b>	The plan focuses upon technology outcomes and skill based goals, and does not address how it can enhance the curriculum.	The plan mentions curriculum integration and enhancement, but lacks detail.	The plan specifically identifies how the curriculum can be enhanced by the use of technology with detail. A technology-rich environment is described, but strategies for enhanced teaching are not explored thoroughly.	The plan specifically identifies how technology enhances the curriculum, and what a student using the technology may do in such an environment. The plan addresses strategies of teaching and learning that can be enhanced as a result of technology integration.

# Technology Planning Analysis Rubric

from the [Technology Use Plan Primer](#) by Peter H.R. Sibley and Chip Kimball

Criteria	LEVEL OF COMPREHENSIVENESS			
	1	2	3	4
<b>Evaluation</b>	No formal evaluation is described.	An evaluation process is described, but lacks detail and comprehensiveness. It does not refer to learning outcomes.	An evaluation process and instrument is described in detail, but lacks complete comprehensiveness. The link to goals and objectives is not apparent.	An evaluation process and instrument are described in detail, and is comprehensive in nature. Assessment is timely, and tied to the objectives.
<b>Multi-year Planning</b>	A timeline is not mentioned	The plan only covers one academic year or project.	The plan covers more than one year, but is short term in nature. with no reference to on-going planning and support.	The plan is multi-year and references multi-year funding, support, and planning activities.
<b>Standards</b>	No equipment and/or software standards are mentioned in the document beyond brand names.	Equipment standards are mentioned, but limited in their specificity.	Equipment standards are specific but limited to a narrow scope.	Equipment standards are specific, comprehensive, and a process is mentioned as to how they will be employed.
<b>Funding Alternatives</b>	Funding resources are not mentioned.	Funding is mentioned, but primarily focuses upon budgeting or specific site funding and does not address other incoming funding required to implement the plan.	Specific funding sources are described but are limited to traditional sources without specific budget figures.	Specific funding sources are described including current and future funding sources. Including the reallocation and employment of resources & attached budget figures.
<b>School Pilot Projects (Research and Development)</b>	No R&D projects are mentioned or planned as part of the project.	R&D efforts are mentioned, but lack detail. No timeline, assessment, or scalability is mentioned.	Specific R&D efforts are described, but scalability is not articulated; timelines and measurements are mentioned, but are not specific.	Specific R&D efforts are described, with implications for future work (scalability) articulated. The R&D efforts have a timeline and measurable instruments in place.
<b>Educational Research</b>	No educational research is mentioned as part of the project.	Educational research is mentioned, but only in the broadest sense.	Specific educational research is mentioned, but no connections are made to the efforts in the school.	Specific educational research is mentioned, and connections are made to the efforts in schools.

# Technology Planning Analysis Rubric

from the [Technology Use Plan Primer](#) by Peter H.R. Sibley and Chip Kimball

Criteria	LEVEL OF COMPREHENSIVENESS			
	1	2	3	4
<b>Model Classroom Configurations</b>	No classroom or school configurations are described.	Classroom configurations are mentioned, but lack detail. (i.e. there will be three computers and a printer in each room)..	Classroom configurations are described in detail, but may be restrictive in nature as the “Only” right way. Usually only one type of configuration is described.	Classroom and school configurations are specifically described, with links to teaching and learning outcomes. They are provided as possible solutions to particular problems, but are not prescriptive in nature.
<b>Facilities (Electricity, Security, etc.)</b>	Facilities issues are not mentioned.	Facilities issues are mentioned, but lack the detail to build into an action plan.	Facilities issues are identified and articulated, but solutions and suggestions lack detail or clarity.	Specific facility issues are identified and addressed, with recommended solutions, budgets, and responsibilities.
<b>Maintenance and Support</b>	No maintenance and support are provided.	Support plans are mentioned, but do not have the detail or clarity to implement.	Support plans are mentioned with clarity and detail, but do not take into consideration long-term issues.	Specific support plans are articulated. This included the process for specific support issues and on-going equipment replacement, staff development, and repair.
<b>Software Agreements (site licensing, etc.)</b>	No software agreements or policy is mentioned.	Software agreements and policy are mentioned, but the specific policies are not articulated in the plan.	Specific software policy is articulated, but is not tied to the needs of the site.	Specific software policy is articulated with plans to accommodate software needs at the site.
<b>Copyright and Acceptable Use Policy</b>	No copy right or acceptable use policy is described.	Copyright and acceptable use are mentioned, but specific policies are not articulated in the plan.		Copyright and acceptable use policies are articulated in the document with samples available.
<b>Gifts and Disposal</b>	No policy is provided for the disposal and receiving of gifts of equipment and services	Policy is provided, but is not clear or articulated.	Specific policy is articulated regarding disposal and gifts, but is not tied to the standards.	Specific policy is articulated regarding moving and disposal of equipment. Gift acceptance is tied directly to standards.
<b>Staff Development</b>	Staff development is not mentioned in the document.	Staff development is mentioned, but is not clearly articulated as to how it will be accomplished, or evaluated.	Staff development is articulated, but is limited to single modalities and is not clearly provided for with resources.	Staff development is addressed either in the action plan or in a separate section. It included multiple strategies, incentives and resources.

