

A digital strategy *worth* having.

This tool helps a school reflect on the quality, coherence and impact of its digital strategy. It asks a harder question than whether technology is being used: whether it is being used wisely and with purpose, to strengthen teaching and learning. Score each area honestly, and let the gaps guide the conversation.

Focus area and prompts	Rating (1–5)	Evidence and comments
<p>Vision and strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a clear digital strategy, aligned with the school's educational vision and values? • Is technology treated as a way to strengthen teaching and learning, rather than an end in itself? • Is the rationale for technology use explained clearly to staff, students and parents? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Leadership and culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do senior leaders model effective use of technology in their own practice? • Is there a culture of experimentation, collaboration and reflection around digital tools? • Is the use of technology supported rather than imposed? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Staff engagement and professional learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are staff given time and support to develop their digital pedagogy? • Is CPD tailored, iterative and built around real classroom needs? • Are lesson study, coaching or peer observation used to embed good practice? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Student experience and learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do students have a say in how technology supports their learning? • Are digital tools used to develop metacognition, retrieval, feedback and collaboration? • Is there a balance between engagement and deep learning, rather than surface activity? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Infrastructure and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the technology reliable, equitable and easy to use across the school? • Are platforms used meaningfully to extend learning, not just to store it? • Are students and staff supported well when things go wrong? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Evaluation and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are student and staff voices gathered regularly, through surveys or digital leader panels? • Is the impact of technology on learning evaluated in a systematic way? • Does the school revise its strategy in light of feedback and evidence? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	

Scoring: 1 = Not at all · 2 = Rarely · 3 = Sometimes · 4 = Often · 5 = Consistently

Reading the *scale*.

This guide supports a reflective, constructive use of the framework. Treat each score as a prompt for inquiry and dialogue rather than a verdict. The point is to start a conversation, not to settle one.

Score	What it means	What it implies
1 • Not at all	This area has not yet been considered in any meaningful way.	A gap that may need attention soon. Worth asking why it has been deprioritised, and whether that still holds.
2 • Rarely	Addressed occasionally, but inconsistent or isolated.	Early-stage or ad hoc. More leadership or structural support is probably needed.
3 • Sometimes	Evident in places, but not yet embedded across the school.	Partial implementation. Room to scale through shared practice and support.
4 • Often	Well established, supported by leadership and embedded in many areas.	Consistent good practice. Time to consolidate and fine-tune from feedback.
5 • Consistently	A distinctive strength, embedded in culture and policy.	Mature practice. Focus on sustaining it, evaluating long-term impact, and sharing it more widely.

Using the scores *well*.



Treat scores as learning tools, not judgements

These are not league tables. Treat a "1" as an invitation to begin, and a "5" as a challenge to share what works and keep reflecting on it.



Prioritise through conversation

Use the scores to open discussion. Where are the strategic tensions? What explains the variation? Which areas matter most in your context?



Look for patterns

Are strong infrastructure scores matched by weaker ones in pedagogy? Is impact felt where strategy is strongest? Patterns like these reveal where learning leaks away.



Revisit regularly

The tool earns its keep as part of an annual cycle. Re-evaluate every six to twelve months and track progress through staff voice, student work and leadership insight.



Use ratings to guide support

Build short case studies where a 4 or 5 exists, and direct coaching, CPD or shared planning where scores are lower. The aim is coherence, not compliance.

THE SPIRIT OF THIS FRAMEWORK

It assumes capacity, invites inquiry and grows ownership. Good leadership creates the conditions for others to do their best work.