

**DYSART UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT #89**  
**STRATEGIC LONG RANGE TECHNOLOGY PLAN**

**PLAN TERM:** Begins: July 1, 2007 Ends: June 30, 2010

Dysart Unified School District #89

Developing a comprehensive technology plan, based on the educational goals of the school system, will ensure that the most appropriate technologies are effectively infused in your instructional and/or administrative programs. Thorough planning also ensures that all parties have equitable access and achieve the greatest benefit from routine use of educational technology. The comprehensive technology plan should demonstrate clear targets for technology use, spell out desired goals for learners, create visions for future directions, build "buy-in" from stakeholders, and demonstrate to those who might provide funding that a district or charter holder is ready to act.

School Districts, Consortia or Charter Schools (LEAs) who apply for technology funding through any Federal grant program, are required to have developed a comprehensive, three-year to five-year plan, which outlines how the agency intends to utilize and integrate educational technology.

The applying agency (check all that apply)

X is compliant with the provisions of the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA).

\_\_\_\_\_ will be CIPA compliant by this date. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ has applied for E-Rate Funding for FY 200\_.

The LEA's comprehensive technology plan must be approved by the local governing board(s).  
(The plan must be approved by the local governing board before funds will be released.)

Date the plan was approved: May 23, 2007

**OR**

Date the plan is to be submitted for board approval: \_\_\_\_\_

**Certified by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized School System Agent (signed in blue ink) Date of Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name and Title

## LEA Profile

This information should provide a “snapshot” of your district and help planners and reviewers to understand areas of need.

LEA Profile	
LEA NAME: DYSART UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	
CTDS: 07-02-89-000	
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN LEA	19
NUMBER OF TEACHERS	1,200
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED	20,777
PERCENT OF STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FREE/REDUCED LUNCH	42%
TITLE I POVERTY LEVEL	9 schools
TEACHER / STUDENT RATIO	1:17
STUDENT / COMPUTER RATIO	5:1
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED AS EXCELLING	0
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED AS HIGHLY PERFORMING	0
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED AS PERFORMING AND PERFORMING PLUS	14
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED AS UNDERPERFORMING	1
BASED ON CENSUS TRACT INFORMATION, IS YOUR ENTITY RURAL OR URBAN	URBAN

### District Technology Coordinator/Contact

Name: Laurie King	Telephone #: 623-876-7000
School District: Dysart Unified School District	Fax #: 623-876-7046
Address: 15802 N. Parkview Place, Surprise AZ 85374	E-mail: Laurie.King@dysart.org

## VISION AND MISSION STATEMENTS

### Vision Statement

In the Dysart Unified School District, the learning community will be technologically literate life-long learners. Learners in DUSD include students, staff, parents and community members. Learners will skillfully develop strategies to collect and analyze data, solve problems, increase productivity, and communicate ideas throughout the school, community, nation and the world. They will be able to interact successfully in a technological environment to achieve their personal, education, and workplace goals.

### Mission Statement

The Dysart Unified School District Educational Technology Department mission is to ensure the academic success of all students and guide all learners through a bold, distinctive educational technology system to encourage responsible life choices. The focus includes fostering community partnerships to ensure that all learners and staff have equitable access to technology tools, information resources, ongoing training and technical support to provide for technology literacy and proficiency.

## TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

The Technology Committee should represent all stakeholders. Development of the technology plan and implementation of the plan should enable parents, educators, students and community members to benefit from the investment in technology and all should have representation on the committee.

LEA Technology Committee		
Member	Title	Constituency Represented
Beth Wofford	Barnes and Noble	Community
Filmore Bender	Rotary	Community
Kathy Rice	City of Surprise	Community
Michael Stewart	Surprise PD	Community
Adam Aragon	Parent	HS Parent
Jean Lewis	Parent	HS Parent
Chris Himko	Freshman	HS Student
DJ Bruner	Sophomore	HS Student
Natasha Chidester	Junior	HS Student
Gracie Ortaleza	Parent	K-8 Parent
Dylan Ward	8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Student	K-8 Student

Ryan Moore	8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Student	K-8 Student
Ben Goodman	Teacher	Staff
Brittany Lee	Teacher	Staff
Doug Rickard	Curriculum	Staff
Dr. Cyndi Miller	Director, Curriculum	Staff
Dr. Gail Pletnick	Superintendent	Staff
Evan Allred	Director, Information Tech	Staff
Jenea Bono	Communications	Staff
Jim Dean	Principal	Staff
Jonathan McMahan	Curriculum	Staff
Laurie King	Curriculum	Staff
Lawrence Readshaw	Information Tech	Staff
Michelle McCleery	Office Manager	Staff
Pete Arriaga	Information Tech	Staff
Randy McCleery	Teacher	Staff
Roberta Moore	Asst. Principal	Staff
Sheldon Morris	Attendance Clerk	Staff
Stephanie Lee	Human Resources	Staff
Tammy Hall	Principal	Staff

**Long-term role of the Committee:**

To guarantee that the goals of the district technology plan are consistent with the long-term goals of the district and to evaluate and report back to the governing board progress on implementation of the technology plan.

**NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

The Dysart Unified School district has just completed a technology audit facilitated by the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL). The findings of this audit are as follows:

**a. Curriculum Integration**

Teachers were asked their comfort level on various activities involving technology. A large number of teachers rated themselves as comfortable or very comfortable on some of the items, such as:

- Communicating with other teachers in the district using the e-mail system

- Communicating with other professionals outside of the district via e-mail
- Conducting online searches to locate resources for my instruction
- Sharing technology products with other teachers (such as lesson plans, multimedia presentations, and web-based activities)
- Using a word processing program as a teaching tool.

There were some activities that the majority of teachers were not comfortable doing, however. Those include:

- Setting up files of web links for students to use in research and projects
- Posting materials to a web page
- Mentoring other teachers in using technology
- Using brainstorming software (i.e., Inspiration, Kidspiration)

Teachers were asked how far along they were in enhancing teaching and learning using various technological tools. A few tools stood out as not being used very often, and possibly needing attention.

- 9.9 percent of teachers reported regularly using data collection tools, including both hardware and software (i.e., probes, microscopes).
- 12.7 percent of teachers reported regular use of spreadsheet software.
- 15.2 percent of teachers reported regular use of organizing and brainstorming software, such as KWHL charts and category maps.
- 16.0 percent of teachers reported regular use of communication software (i.e., blogs, e-mail, podcasts).

Software was, in most cases, very standardized and also limited. District computers have Microsoft Office, Inspiration, Kidspiration, Geometer's Sketchpad, Movie Maker and Photo Story, although many teachers seemed unaware or disinterested that some of these programs were installed on their computers.

Science instruction has a huge potential for technology applications. Nonetheless, few teachers had access to, or knowledge of digital probeware, data analysis software, science multimedia, digital scopes, animation, science inquiry applications, graphic organizers, or concept mapping. Few science teachers at the high school talked about using technology to teach science. The only significant application was the assignment of internet research.

There appears to be a disconnect between the computer labs and the classrooms. Almost all computer lab teachers stated they taught the basic parts of the computer and log in procedures to their primary students. Intermediate students began to learn basics of software. Older students used their computer lab time for some internet searching and PowerPoint training. Classroom teachers and computer lab teachers rarely, if ever, had collaborative planning time with the classroom teachers, and classroom teachers did not accompany their students to the lab. Both from teacher comments and from observations, it was clear there was a very limited connection between computer lab-time and the writing, math, science, and social studies curriculums taught in the classrooms. One elementary teacher stated, "The computer lab works well as a special subject and the computer lab teacher is not trying to coordinate with the classroom teachers to integrate what she is doing." Another teacher stated, "They (the students) go to the computer lab,

but I have no idea what they do on there. She (the computer lab teacher) has said that if we wanted to get her help with something just let her know, but I have not done that.”

There was also a concern voiced in a minority of elementary schools about a lack of available substitutes. While most elementary students were scheduled into the computer lab on a five or six day rotation, some schools were forced to use their computer lab teachers as classroom substitutes and cancel computer lab time. Since an individual student might only go to the computer lab three or four times a month, this results in a significant loss of instructional time in the lab. Further evidence of the low priority placed on computer lab time was the dismantling of one high school’s computer labs to make more space for a regular classroom during the 2005-2006 school-year. While space was obviously a legitimate problem, it is interesting to note that no other rooms or subjects were disrupted.

Again, there were two outliers to this scenario. In both of these schools, the administration actively supported technology integration at the classroom level. Teachers were required, not encouraged, to submit technology enhanced lesson plans and attend focused professional development. The administration monitors these processes and technology is part of the teacher evaluation process. On these campuses, technology in the lab and the classrooms appeared to be much more coherent.

## **b. Professional Development**

David Thornburg, a technology writer, said that “if you add computers to your school without appropriate professional development, the only thing you will increase is your electric bill.” A major frustration voiced in both the staff interviews and focus groups was a lack of technology related professional development. It is unreasonable to expect teachers to effectively use technology without appropriate and timely professional development.

Research has indicated that teachers move through five stages as they learn technology. This is a linear process; teachers need to go through each stage in order. Those stages, first identified in the Apple Classroom of Tomorrow (ACOT) research, move from entry to adoption to adaptation to appropriation to their prior knowledge and experience.

In addition to addressing teachers at their pedagogical skill level, effective professional development should be ongoing, long-term, and presented when the teachers are ready to learn a skill and have the necessary technology to implement the skill. Teachers, like their students, need to have materials presented to them and then have an opportunity to apply that learning, reflect, and then revise their understanding based on their experience.

Data from the teacher survey indicated that only a small percentage of teachers regularly use technology in their daily instruction (Table 1). These data were consistent with walk-through observations conducted at each school.

<b>Percent responding with a 5 (“This as an essential component of</b>	<b>Percent</b>
--	----------------

<b>everyday classroom practice for me and my students”) OR with a 4 (“I do this regularly in my instruction. Students use it frequently.”)</b> *Other options were 3 (“I do this in the classroom to supplement my instruction. Students may do it occasionally”), 2 (“I do this only for lesson planning, not in the classroom”), or 1 (“I don’t do this”)	
8a) Word processing applications: software tool that enables user to type and manipulate text.	28.7
8b) Spreadsheet software: software tool that enables user to type and manipulate numbers.	12.7
8c) Organizing and brainstorming software: software that enables user to create idea maps, KWL charts, and category maps.	15.2
8d) Multimedia: software that enables user to see or create visual images, text, and/or sound into one product (i.e., PowerPoint, videos, music).	24.5
8e) Data collection tools: hardware and software that enable user to gather information or practicing a concept.	9.9
8f) Web resources: resources available on the web that can be used for gathering information or practicing a concept.	30.2
8g) Communication software: software that enables users to virtually communicate via text, presentation, voice, or any combination of the three (i.e., blogs, e-mail, podcasts).	16.0

Table 1. Percent of teachers regularly using technology in their instruction.

Teachers indicated they had participated in limited technology related professional development in the past two to three years. When asked what types of professional development they would most want in the next two years, the majority responded they wanted training on technology integration.

### c. **Equitable Use of Technology**

Without a doubt, access to technology was identified as the biggest barrier to effective use of technology. Student access was very limited in most buildings. While principals proudly pointed out their laptop carts and one to three computers in every classroom, student access was consistently identified as the barrier. One teacher stated, “We have two carts with 16 computers in each one and 1200 students. Do the math.” This lack of student access to computers caused many teachers to ignore the computers they did have in their classrooms. One teacher expressed this sentiment by saying, “I know my kids should be using computers more, but with only two computers in my room it’s too hard to get them all on while still teaching.” Another teacher stated, “(The district should) have a lot more computers for student use and more time for them to use them.” Another teacher reported, “Teachers could check out laptop carts but there are not enough of them to go around all the grades so some grades end up not using them at all because they are hard to get to.” Finally, a teacher commented, “Every grade level should have one laptop cart. If there is not enough, teachers will not use the ones they have.”

A comment that was heard in most schools and the district level was the inequitable distribution of technology to the schools. While you might expect to hear this comment in older schools with less hardware, it was also evident in the newest schools, those with Smartboards and projectors in every room. One school had document cameras for

each classroom, but no projectors. Another had two projectors for a staff of 40. The equity issue was not only between schools, but within schools. Many of the T Cubed teachers felt all teachers should have the equipment they had. One T Cubed teacher stated, “(The district should) equip every student with the same access to technology. My students should not be the only lucky ones in this school.”

	Few, if any have access	Access primarily in teacher work areas, offices, libraries, or computer labs	User has access to computer for individual use in classroom or office
Administrators			x
Teachers (academic)			x
Teachers (vocational)			x
Teachers (exceptional education)			x
Teachers (electives)			x
Students		x	
Students with disabilities		x	x(as dictated by IEP)
Non-certified staff			x

**d. Describe the Infrastructure and Telecommunication needs.**

Increased use of technology has taxed our infrastructure. Our 2 T-1 lines for voice and data at elementary and high schools are inadequate. All WAN connections need to be upgraded to 100MB microwave circuits to provide increased service now and the ability to upgrade in the future.

Current E-rate reimbursement district-wide is 65% for telecommunication service only. These funds have enhanced our ability to provide telecommunication service.

Our current Student Information System has proved cumbersome in aggregating and tracking data on student achievement. The distributed database model restricts our ability to fully analyze data in a timely manner. We feel the need to begin to seriously evaluate potential replacements to this system as soon as possible.

We have developed a replacement schedule for all student computers, administrative computers, servers, and network gear. This plan needs to implement that schedule. A careful analysis has been completed to identify critical networking equipment and place that equipment under fast-response maintenance agreements.

**e. Describe the administrative needs that the agency plans to address through technology.**

Administrative staff use technology on a daily bases for communication, organization, and presentation of information. New online systems developed in the last 12 months are useful tools in helping administrators make data driven decisions such as school boundaries, enrollment projections, hiring needs, bus transportation routes, and nutrition services information.

The district has plans to add a complementary system to the existing student information system that will add key assessment and demographic information to help administrators make clear data driven decision regarding what works and what doesn't in improving student achievement. This system will eventually include lesson plans and units that have proven successful and which are aligned to state and district standards.

Our grade reporting committee has embarked on the challenge of reporting achievement on standards to our community and parents. This will involve changes to our electronic grade book system as well as our student information system.

Current workflow and document routing/sharing systems are inadequate given the rapid growth of the district. Changes and automation must be implemented to allow greater electronic access and storage of documents and work flow management procedures.

**PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

District Technology Goals and Strategies

- Goal:** Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools with a target of fully integrating technology into the academic curriculum.

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Accountability Measure</u>	<u>Timeline (Task % Done /Year)</u>
Develop and utilize a consistent curriculum development and revision process with a defined cycle and timeline that embeds technology into the content areas.	Workgroups align Arizona State Technology Standards to District Content Area Curriculum	Agendas Technology Standards included into the district curriculum tool	Ongoing Summer Work
	Workgroups evaluate technology resources for their inclusion into the curriculum tool	Agendas Technology resources included into the curriculum tool	Ongoing Summer Work
Teachers use scientifically researched based instructional practices, supported by technology, to support student achievement.	Establish a committee to address technology integration as part of the teacher evaluation process	Agendas	2007-2008 School Year
	Technology integration is reflected in the teacher evaluation process and instrument	Technology integration included in the teacher evaluation instrument	2008-2009

**2. Goal:** Ensure that quality teachers, staff, and administrators are involved in Arizona educational institutions and that they are proficient in the use and integration of technology through professional development activities.

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Accountability Measure</u>	<u>Timeline (Task % Done /Year)</u>
Design and implement a school-based professional development support system that will mentor and support teachers and provide instructional technology training supporting the content areas through embedded professional development.	Design and implement a training plan based on the Professional Development Leadership Team plan	Completed training plan Schedule training dates	2007-2008
	Deliver monthly trainings to school-based cadre through a train the trainer model (DFC)	Agendas Attendance logs Training evaluations	2007-2008
	Identify and appoint school-based instructional technology mentor teachers at each campus (T-Cubed)	Instructional technology mentor teachers placed at all campuses	2007-2008
	Deliver monthly trainings to school-based instructional technology mentor teachers	Agendas Attendance logs Training evaluations	2007-2008
	Evaluate the effectiveness of trainings to school-based instructional technology mentor teachers	Training evaluations Survey Walk-through data Observation data	2007-2008
Design and implement a long-term professional development plan aimed at training administrators to model the use of technology, and evaluate and support its use a tool to transform teaching and learning.	Design and implement a training plan based on the Professional Development Leadership Team plan	Completed training plan Schedule training dates	2007-2008
	Deliver trainings to administrators	Agendas Attendance logs Training evaluations	2007-2008
	Evaluate the effectiveness of trainings to administrators	Training evaluations Survey Walk-through data	2007-2008
Design and implement a long-term professional development plan aimed at training teachers to use technology to transform teaching and learning.	Design and implement a training plan based on the Professional Development Leadership Team plan (Tech Direct)	Completed training plan Schedule training dates	2007-2008
	Deliver trainings on teaching strategies and instructional content, supported by technology, to teachers	Agendas Attendance logs Training evaluations	2007-2008
	Evaluate the effectiveness of trainings to teachers	Training evaluations Survey Walk-through data	2007-2008

3. **Goal:** Ensure that all K-12 educational institutions have the capacity, infrastructure, staffing, and equipment to meet academic and business needs for effective and efficient operations.

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Accountability Measure</u>	<u>Timeline (Task % Done /Year)</u>
Establish standards for technology equipment, district-wide, that address both new classroom installations and modernization plans for existing classrooms.	Establish a district standard for technology equipment to student ratios that addresses grade levels and content areas	Agendas Recommendation for computer to student ratios	2007-2008
Ensure that technology infrastructure is in good working order and that all resources are highly available.	Implement an equipment replacement schedule	District Capital Plan fully funds replacement schedule	2008-2009
	Provide computer technical support staff and resources at the district and school level	Technical work orders are closed within three days	Ongoing
Provide a safe environment for staff and students to use technology	Maintain adequate and flexible Internet content filter	Survey	Ongoing
	Train parents, students and staff in Internet citizenship	Lesson Plans Agendas Assessments	2008-2009

4. **Goal:** Ensure that all K-12 institutions will be positively involved in collaboration and partnerships that are supportive of technology use and curricular integration.

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Accountability Measure</u>	<u>Timeline (Task % Done /Year)</u>
Enhance contact with parents by utilizing multiple forms of communication	Facilitate two way communication between teachers and parents through electronic communication (i.e., email, web pages, newsletters, calendars, list serves)	Email distribution list Teacher web pages are regularly updated Inclusion in school-based Continuous Improvement Plans	2007-2008
	Provide student attendance, grades, achievement and discipline data to parents online	Student attendance online Student grades online Student achievement and Discipline data online	2008-2009
	Provide community education classes in technology for students and parents	Course evaluations Attendance logs	2008-2009
Extend access to data and information to parents, including those who do not have ready access to	Establish parent and community resource rooms at each school and district office with computers	Attendance logs	2008-2009

technology	Establish and staff regional parent and community resource centers that are open evenings and weekends	Attendance logs	2008-2009
Develop partnerships with community, business, city and state organizations	Collaborate with local organizations to address teaching and learning objectives	Joint projects	2007-2008

- 5. Goal:** Ensure that all K-12 resources are available for all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability, so they can become technologically literate by the end of eighth grade and achieve their academic potential.

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Accountability Measure</u>	<u>Timeline (Task % Done /Year)</u>
Determine what technology a primary, intermediate, middle, and high school regular educational and special educational classroom should contain.	Establish a district standard for technology equipment to student ratios that addresses grade levels and content areas	Agendas Recommendation for computer to student ratios	2008-2009
Integrate Arizona State Technology Standards and 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills across the curriculum.	Workgroups align Arizona State Technology Standards to District Content Area Curriculum	Agendas Technology Standards included into the district curriculum tool	Ongoing Summer Work
	Workgroups evaluate technology resources for their inclusion into the curriculum tool	Agendas Technology resources included in to the curriculum tool	Ongoing Summer Work

- 6. Goal:** Develop a continuous process of evaluation and accountability for the use of educational technology as: a teaching and learning tool, a measurement and analysis tool for student achievement, and a fiscal management tool.

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Accountability Measure</u>	<u>Timeline (Task % Done /Year)</u>
Develop a standards-based assessment system that incorporates continuous progress monitoring	Technology proficiencies are reflected in the teacher evaluation process and instrument	360 Technology Assessment Technology proficiencies included in the teacher evaluation instrument	2008-2009
	Technology proficiencies are reflected in the administrator evaluation process and instrument	360 Technology Assessment Technology proficiencies included in the administrator evaluation instrument	2009-2010

	Provide online access to administrators and teachers to student achievement and demographic data in support of data driven decision making	Student achievement data online Demographic data online	2007-2008
--	--	--	-----------

In the following table, copy and paste at least seven to eight goals listed in the above tables for Goal 1 through Goal 6 to address how you will evaluate the goals you select. E-Rate requires that mid-course evaluation of program goals be done each year and this table meets that requirement.

Tech Plan Goals	Evaluation Question(s)	Evaluation Strategies	Responsible party/parties	Timeline (Task % Done/Year)
Improve Student Achievement through the use of technology	Has Student Achievement improved?  Which programs/strategies ultimately can be attributed to impacting student achievement?  Can technology be isolated as the only factor impacting student achievement?	Administration making Data-Based Decision Making;  Teachers using Differentiated Instruction;  Teachers using Standards Based Lesson Planning Tools	IT Director  Tech Integration Specialist  Teachers  Principals  District Decision makers	90% Data-Based Decision Making June 2008  90% Differentiate Instruction – June 2009  90% Standards Based Lesson Planning – June 2008
Teachers are proficient in the use and integration of technology	Are teachers integrating technology on a regular basis in their instruction?	Staff assessed as “proficient” using online assessment tools through ASSET. Self-evaluation, surveys and observations	IT Director  Tech Integration Specialist  Teachers  Principals  District Decision makers	60% register proficiency by 2007-08  90% proficiency by 2008-09
All schools have adequate capacity, infrastructure, staffing, and equipment	Is there technology equity at all district schools?	Capital Equity studies at all schools	IT Director	100% of all schools have equity by 2008
Positive involvement in collaboration and partnerships that support the use of	Is the district involved in partnerships to support the use of technology?	Partnership meeting notes/reports to Governing Board/IGA’s	IT Director  Tech Integration Specialist  District Decision makers	Partnerships continue to be established & nurtured 2007-08

technology and integration				
Evaluate the use of educational technology as: a teaching/ and learning tool, a measurement and analysis tool for student achievement.	Are students performing at higher levels in Reading and Math?  Are teachers and administrators making data-driven decisions to influence and improve student success?	Participate in national NCLB studies evaluating the effectiveness of software on Reading and Math success.  Decision makers using assessments and other demographic data to make instructional decisions	IT Director  Tech Integration Specialist  Teachers  Principals  District Decision makers	Begin Reading and Math study at grades 1, 4, 6, and 9 – August 2007  NCLB Study 100% completed – August 2007
Develop a schema of current and future financing requirements to support the Technology Plan.	Is the technology plan fully funded to ensure all goals are adequately met?	Annual budgets fully fund initiatives in tech plan	IT Director  Tech Integration Specialist  District Decision makers	100% tech plan funded in annual budgets August 2008

7. **Goal:** Develop a schema of current and future financing requirements to support the LEA’s Technology Plan.

<b><u>Objective</u></b>	<b><u>Strategy</u></b>	<b><u>Accountability Measure</u></b>	<b><u>Timeline (Task % Done /Year)</u></b>
Develop policy and procedures to make funding technology a district priority.	Commit a fixed percentage of the district capital budget to technology	District budget	2008-2009
	Recommend to voters a capital override	Governing Board request to voters	2008-2009

## STRATEGIES FOR FINANCING TECHNOLOGY

In this section, provide information as to how the LEA will fund the goals, objectives, and strategies detailed in the previous sections in the first table. In the second table, provide information of when the supporting resources will be acquired.

### Supporting Resources:

<b>Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Period Available</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Purpose and Restrictions</b>
---------------	---------------	-------------------------	---------------	---------------------------------

District Funds, M&O and Capital	\$5,825,000	Annually beginning 2007	Ongoing, Contingent upon legislative budgets Amount variable	Pays for hardware and software needs in the district.
School Facilities Board	\$130,000 per new K-8 school	Annually	Ongoing for each new SFB funded school	Pays for computer hardware for 1:8 computer to student ratio
E-rate	\$271,724	Applied for Annually	Ongoing (64% reimbursement for telecommunication services only)	Telecommunication Services
B-Bonds	\$3,000,000	One time through plan term	Available for construction, remodel projects only	“Bricks and Mortar” type projects only

Use the following table to describe the supporting resources for the technologies to be acquired that the agency plans to use during each year of the plan.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Connectivity / Infrastructure	Increase schools connected via high-speed WAN (20MB or higher) connection to 75%	Increase schools connected via high-speed WAN (20MB or higher) connection to 100%	
Hardware	Projectors in every classroom in 50% of the schools in the district; Provide a student to computer ratio of 1:5 in all schools	Projectors in every classroom in 75% of the schools in the district; Provide a student to computer ratio of 1:4 in all schools	Projectors in every classroom in 100% of the schools in the district; Provide a student to computer ratio of 1:3 in all schools
Software	Standardized Inspiration and Kidspiration, Type 2 Learn, Online Credit Recovery Program (A+ Software) at 3 high schools, Geometer's Sketchpad		
Interoperability	Continuing existing practices		
Curriculum Integration	Instructional Coaches, Instructional Technology Lead Teachers, embedded staff development,		

	technology embedded into content standards throughout district curriculum		
Evaluation	360 Full Circle Achievement Technology Assessment for teachers; Technology Literacy Assessment for a sampling of 5 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students		
Professional Development	4 Technology Trainers district-wide, Instructional Coaches at each campus, Technology Lead Teachers at each campus,		
Technical Assistance	IT Help-Desk, Technical Services Group	IT Help-Desk, Technical Services Group	IT Help-Desk, Technical Services Group
Support and Maintenance	In-house support & maintenance by IT Dept	In-house support & maintenance by IT Dept	In-house support & maintenance by IT Dept
Training / Conferences	Monthly training of Instructional Coaches and Technology Lead Teachers, Team of five to NSBA T+L Conference		

## ACCOUNTABILITY AND EVIDENCE OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

List the people and activities developed to monitor progress and accountability in implementing the technology plan.

<b>Deliverables/Activities</b>	<b>Responsible Entity</b>	<b>Evaluation Checkpoints</b>
1. Evaluate yearly progress on Technology Plan goals.	Director of IT, Instructional Technology Coordinator, District Technology Committee	Midyear and year end
2. Analyze data on yearly progress	Director of IT, Instructional Technology Coordinator, District Technology Committee	Midyear and year end
3. Disseminate information on yearly progress of technology plan goals	Director of IT, Instructional Technology Coordinator, District Technology Committee and Director of Curriculum & Instruction	Midyear and year end
4. Adjust strategies as needed to accomplish goals	Director of IT, Instructional Technology Coordinator, District Technology Committee	Midyear and year end

5. Revise technology goals as needed	Director of IT, Instructional Technology Coordinator, District Technology Committee	Yearly
--------------------------------------	---	--------

**COORDINATION AND ALIGNMENT OF LOCAL FUNDS**

The Dysart Unified School District has a Continuous Improvement Plan that was created using the Arizona State Standards and Rubric for School Improvement. The District CIP guides all School Improvement Plans in the district, as school plans are required to be aligned to the District Plan. The Technology Plan is no different. It is tightly aligned to the District CIP, sharing many of the same objectives. In addition, the District Professional Development Plan, Title Plan, and Curriculum Development Cycle are all aligned to the District CIP. Therefore, the Technology Plan is aligned to all district and school plans, as they are all crafted from the same overriding document.