

Is the technology actually *working*?

Buying technology is easy. Knowing whether it has helped is harder. This framework helps a school weigh the real impact of technology on teaching and learning, gather meaningful insight, and keep improvement grounded in evidence rather than enthusiasm. Be careful with attribution: a rise in attainment is rarely caused by a tool alone, so look for converging evidence and weigh how learning is happening, not only the headline numbers. Score each area honestly, and let the gaps guide the conversation.

Focus area and prompts	Rating (1–5)	Evidence and comments
<p>Student learning and outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has technology improved student engagement and motivation to learn? • Is there evidence of better attainment or progress in digitally supported areas? • Can students use digital tools to deepen their understanding, retention and transfer of knowledge? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Teaching practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has technology enabled more effective differentiation and personalisation? • Has formative assessment improved through digital feedback, quizzing or analytics? • Are teachers using technology to make learning more visible and reflective? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Metacognition and self-regulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does technology help students plan, monitor and evaluate their learning? • Are students using digital tools to support organisation and time management? • Has technology helped students set and track their own goals? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Digital literacy and skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are students developing age-appropriate digital literacy and citizenship? • Do students show critical thinking when navigating digital content? • Are students confident and safe in their use of digital technology? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Equity and inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has technology reduced barriers to learning for disadvantaged or SEND students? • Can all learners access and benefit from the school's digital provision? • Has the digital strategy helped close attainment or engagement gaps? 	<p>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p>	
<p>Whole-school impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a shared language around effective technology use across departments? • Do staff and students feel confident and supported in their use of digital tools? • Is technology use evolving in response to impact data and feedback? 	<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.