

DISTRICT DIGITAL CLASSROOM PLAN

The intent of the District Digital Classroom Plan (DCP) is to allow the district to provide a perspective on what it considers to be vital and critically important in relation to digital learning implementation, student performance outcome improvement and how progress in digital learning will be measured. The plan shall meet the unique needs of students, schools and personnel in the district as required by s. 1011.62(12)(b), F.S. For additional assistance completing the District DCP, please use the checklist and accompanying instructions to ensure you have included all requested components. The components provided by the district will be used to monitor long-range progression of the District DCP and may impact funding relevant to digital learning improvements.

Part I. DIGITAL CLASSROOMS PLAN - OVERVIEW

The district's overview component of the plan should document the district's overall focus and direction with respect to how the incorporation and integration of technology into the educational program will improve student performance outcomes.

The **general introduction/background/district technology policies** component of the plan should include, but not be limited to:

- I.1 District Team Profile - Provide the following contact information for each member of the district team participating in the DCP planning process. The individuals that participated should include but not be limited to:
- The digital learning components should be completed with collaboration between district instructional, curriculum and information technology staff as required in s.1011.62(12)(b), F.S.;
 - Development of partnerships with community, business and industry; and
 - Integration of technology in all areas of the curriculum, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and special needs including students with disabilities.

Title/Role	Name:	Email:	Phone:
Information Technology District Contact	Uma Shankar	shankau@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-6850 x1502
Curriculum District Contact	Donna Jones	jonesdm@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-7812
Instructional District Contact	Mary Hall	hallme@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-6850 x1506
Assessment District	Matt Lynch	lynchmc@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-7628

Contact			
Finance District Contact	John Kirkpatrick	kirkpajg@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-7586
District Leadership Contact	Karen Clarke	clarkekd@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-7444
Director Grants and Special Projects	Everett Caudle	caudleew@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-7605
Director Staff Development	Isa Carter	carterig@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-7650
Media Services	Debi Bruner	brunerda@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-6860
Instructional Technology Coach	Tami Smith	smithtl@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-6860
Supervisor of Instructional Technology	Wylene Aubut	aubutwf@gm.sbac.edu	352-955-6860

I.2 Planning Process - Summarize the process used to write this plan including but not limited to:

- How parents, school staff and others were involved;
- Relevant training and instruction for district leadership and support personnel;
- Development of partnerships with community, business and industry; and
- Integration of technology in all areas of the curriculum, ESOL and special needs including students with disabilities.

Meetings were held to consider plan options and to assess the input that would be needed to write a comprehensive Digital Classroom Plan. A team of individuals was assembled to provide guidance to the process and to assist with plan design and to provide specialized training to personnel not familiar with the DCP. As described above, this team consisted of key leaders at the district level who were charged with collaborating to ensure continued integration of technology across all areas of curriculum and specialists from areas affected by classroom technology integration.

Input and guidance provided at the school level played a role in plan development. Alachua County establishes a School Advisory Council (SAC) in each public school with the purpose of assisting in the annual development and the evaluation of each school's School Improvement Plan (SIP) and the annual school budget. The SAC is responsible for the collection and analysis of both short-term and long-term outcomes for the SIP, the identification of problem areas, the development of improvement strategies and monitoring their implementation. Each council is composed of a principal and an appropriate balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students, parents, and includes business and community partners and citizens. The SAC is also representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by each school.

Data, input, and feedback from each school's SAC is funneled to the district level through principals in monthly meetings with the Executive Directors of Schools, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, and with Directors from across the division.

Information provided by principals is reviewed and incorporated into the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP). Both the individual needs and aggregate needs from SIPs and the DIAP were considered by the District DCP Team in development of the plan.

I.3 Technology Integration Matrix (TIM) – Summarize the process used to train, implement and measure classrooms using the TIM.

The following report was prepared by Dr. Kara Dawson from the University of Florida as an external review of the 2014-2015 DCP. The report is part of the Alachua County's *Digital Classroom Plan* funded by the Florida Department of Education and provides district-wide data about factors that contribute to technology use in K-12 schools. In particular, data collected from 1376 teachers using the Technology Uses and Perceptions Survey (TUPS) related to teacher perceptions of access and support, professional development, comfort and confidence with technology, technology skills, and the usefulness of technology. In addition, data about how teachers report they use technology and how students use it in classrooms are provided. Comparisons across responses from elementary, middle, and high school grade level bands are also reported.

Major findings related to technology use include:

- Teachers report overall positive perceptions about technology use, but reported much less confidence and comfort in actually using technology.
- Teachers report employing limited instructional methods involving technology in their teaching with using technology for instructional delivery and communication as the most common.
- Teachers report they regularly use a limited range of technology including word processors, email, web browsers and desktop computers.
- Teachers report that their students rarely use technology in the classroom with only web browsers, desktop computers and interactive whiteboards reported as being used on a semi-frequent basis.
- There is a discrepancy between the low levels of student use of technology in the classroom and the overwhelmingly positive perceptions reported about the value and importance of technology.
- Although teachers report low levels of use, they perceive the utility of and their skill level with technology positively.
- Teachers perceived some technology tools as very useful (i.e. word processors, web browsers, desktop computers, and interactive white boards) but had very low perceptions of the utility of others (i.e. databases, desktop publishing programs, web publishing programs, draw and paint programs, photo editing, sound editing, video editing, authoring tools, animation, and video conferencing technologies).

Major finding related to professional development and support include:

- Teachers report acquiring most of their technology skills from interaction with peers, friends, and family; and through independent learning. They report acquiring fewer skills through in-service professional development.
- Teachers report being most interested in receiving professional development on applications used by students, instructional applications and specialized training on the pedagogy of technology integration. Most report being less interested in receiving professional development on introductory technology skills or productivity applications.
- Teachers reported that the technology specialist assisted them with using technology, but much less in supporting their instructional strategies for technology integration. But, these results are difficult to interpret because the term “technology specialist” was not defined in the survey. It is unclear whether teachers were thinking about district level technology integration coaches or school level teachers who serve, formally or informally, as technology specialists.
- Teachers overall do not feel they have adequate opportunities for technology professional development within their schools.

Based on these results, recommendations were developed in four areas:

1. Using research to inform practice
 - 1.1 Use TUPS survey results to inform practice
 - 1.2 Provide schools with data to inform digital learning
 - 1.3 Analyze professional development plans from current grants
 - 1.4 Understand what students do with technology outside of school
2. Visioning and planning for digital learning
 - 2.1 Identify school leaders to represent digital learning on the Superintendent’s advisory board
 - 2.2 Develop guiding principles for digital learning
 - 2.3 Identify how digital learning and literacy aligns with the standards across elementary, middle and high school grades.
3. Support
 - 3.1 Ensure support is adequate at both the district and school levels
 - 3.2 Scaffold support for digital leadership at all schools
 - 3.3 Leverage library and media centers as hubs for promoting technology use
4. Professional Development
 - 4.1 Identify professional development for digital learning most relevant for teachers
 - 4.2 Provide district level support for digital learning professional development

I.4 Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) - By using an MTSS in the planning process, the district will provide a cohesive and comprehensive approach to meeting the needs of all learners. The DCP requires districts to summarize the process used to write this plan including but not limited to:

- Describe the problem-solving process based on available district-specific data which were used for the goals and needs analysis established in the plan;

- Explain the existing system used to monitor progress of the implementation plan; and
- How the district intends to support the implementation and capacity described in the plan.

The Alachua County DCP District Team (as outlined in District Team Profile section above) met to review the DCP requirements and guidelines. The District Team utilized the MTSS problem solving process to develop and refine the Alachua County DCP.

First, the District Team analyzed student assessment data, technology resources, and collected observation evidence (or lack thereof) of technology integration in the learning environment, specifically with the intent of identifying trends and patterns in both district-wide and grade-level data. Specific data collected from 1,376 teachers using the Technology Uses and Perceptions Survey (TUPS) related to teacher perceptions of access and support, professional development, comfort and confidence with technology, technology skills, and the usefulness of technology was also analyzed and was considered. In addition, the DIAP, staff development survey data, and technology survey data from teachers were used for analysis.

The DCP Team also examined barriers that might be affecting student achievement, particularly in the areas of ELA and Math. Barriers identified include a continued lack of sufficient teacher support for the use of technology tools to bolster ELA and math skills in the classroom environment and the need to build additional capacity, through a continued program of robust professional development and teacher support, for educator skills aligned to digital integration.

Progress monitoring of DCP implementation will be overseen by specific members of the District Team, to include periodic data analysis of both student and teacher data. Particular attention will be given to analysis of TIMs Tool data. Data outcomes will be fed back into the MTSS process to evaluate effectiveness and/or to refine the DCP.

I.5 District Policy - The district should provide each of the policies listed below and include any additional digital technology relevant policy in the "other/open" category. If no district policy exists in a certain category, please use "N/A" to indicate that this policy is currently non-applicable. (This does not preclude the district from developing and including a relevant policy in the future.)

These policy types are suggestions, please complete as they are available or add additional if necessary.

Type of Policy	Brief Summary of Policy	Web Address	Date of Adoption
Student data safety, security and privacy	2416 – Student Privacy and Parental Access to Information	http://neola.com/alachua-fl/	2012-2017 Revisions are on-going
	7530.01 – Staff Use of Board-Owned Wireless Communication		

	<p>Devices</p> <p>7540.02 – District Web Sites</p> <p>7540.03 – Use of Technology by Students</p> <p>7540.04 – Use of Technology by Board Employees</p> <p>7540.05 – Staff Use of Electronic Mail</p> <p>7540.06 – Internet Safety Measures</p> <p>7540.07 – Student Use of Electronic Mail</p> <p>8330 – Student Records</p>		
District teacher evaluation components relating to technology (if applicable)	<p>1220 – Evaluation of Administrative Personnel</p> <p>3220 – Evaluation of Instructional Personnel</p> <p>Instructional Collective Bargaining Agreement</p>	http://neola.com/alachua-fl/	2012-2017 Revisions are on-going
BYOD (Bring Your Own Device) Policy	<p>5136 – Student Use of Personally-Owned Wireless Communication Devices</p> <p>7540.03 – Use of Technology by Students</p> <p>7542 – Use of</p>	http://neola.com/alachua-fl/	2012-2017 Revisions are on-going

	<p>Personally-Owned Wireless Communication Devices</p> <p>7543 – Remote Access to the District’s Resources/Network</p> <p>Codes of Student Conduct</p>		
Policy for refresh of devices (student and teachers)	<p>2520 – Instructional Materials and Equipment</p> <p>2530 – Educational Media Materials Selection</p> <p>2252 – Digital Classrooms</p> <p>7530.01 – Staff Use of Board-Owned Wireless Communication Devices</p> <p>7540 – Computer and Technology Networks</p>	http://neola.com/alachua-fl/	2012-2017 Revisions are on-going
Acceptable/Responsible Use policy (student, teachers, admin)	<p>7540 – Computer Technology and Networks</p> <p>7540.03 – Use of Technology by Students</p> <p>7540.04 – Use of Technology by Board Employees</p> <p>Codes of Student Conduct</p>	http://neola.com/alachua-fl/	2012-2017 Revisions are on-going

Master Inservice Plan (MIP) technology components	3242 – Professional Development	http://neola.com/alachua-fl/	2012-2017 Revisions are on-going
Other/Open Response			

Part II. DIGITAL CLASSROOMS PLAN –STRATEGY

STEP 1 – Needs Analysis:

Districts should evaluate current district needs based on student performance outcomes and other key measurable data elements for digital learning.

- A) Student Performance Outcomes
- B) Digital Learning and Technology Infrastructure
- C) Professional Development
- D) Digital Tools
- E) Online Assessments

■ Highest Student Achievement

Student Performance Outcomes:

Districts shall improve classroom teaching and learning to enable all students to be digital learners with access to digital tools and resources for the full integration of the Florida Standards.

After completing the suggested activities for determining the student performance outcomes described in the DCP guidance document, complete the table below with the targeted goals for each school grade component. Districts may add additional student performance outcomes as appropriate. Examples of additional measures are District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP) goals, district Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and/or other goals established in the district strategic plan.

Data are required for the metrics listed in the table. For the student performance outcomes, these data points should be pulled from the school and district school grades published at <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org>. Districts may choose to add any additional metrics that may be appropriate below in the table for district provided outcomes.

A. Student Performance Outcomes (Required)		Baseline	Target	Date for Target to be Achieved (Mo/Year)
II.A.1.	ELA Student Achievement	55%	57%	06/2017
II.A.2.	Math Student Achievement	55%	57%	06/2017
II.A.3.5	Science Student Achievement – 5 th Grade	58%	60%	06/2017
II.A.3.8	Science Student Achievement – 8 th Grade	49%	51%	06/2017
II.A.4.	Science Student Achievement – Biology	68%	70%	06/2017
II.A.5.	ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	06/2017
II.A.6.	Math Learning Gains	54%	57%	06/2017
II.A.7.	ELA Learning Gains of the Low 25%	36%	38%	06/2017
II.A.8.	Math Learning Gains of the Low 25%	39%	41%	06/2017
II.A.9.	Overall, 4-year Graduation Rate	74%	76%	06/2017
II.A.10.	Acceleration Success Rate (MS)	78%	80%	06/2017
II.A.10.	Acceleration Success Rate (HS)	57%	59%	06/2017

A. Student Performance Outcomes (District Provided)		Baseline	Target	Date for Target to be Achieved (Mo/Year)
II.A.11. (D)				
II.A.12. (D)				
II.A.13. (D)				