

RECEIVED & INSPECTED  
APR 19 2006  
FCC - MAILROOM

**CC Docket No. 96-45  
CC Docket No. 02-6  
Request for Review  
Letter of Appeal  
For BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICE**

To: Federal Communication Commission  
From: Robert Fisher, Brownsville Independent School District  
Date: April, 13, 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**Brownsville Independent School District Contact Information**

Name: Robert Fisher, Administrator for Instructional Technology  
Address: 1900 Price Road, Brownsville, TX 78521  
Phone: (956) 548-8241  
Fax: (956) 548-8884  
Email: [bass@bisd.us](mailto:bass@bisd.us)

**Appeal Information**

Funding Year: 2005, year 8  
Applicant Name: Brownsville Independent School District  
Billed Entity Number: 141638  
Form 471 Application #: 482818  
FRN's: 1337272

Dear Sirs,

My request for Telecommunication Services for BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICE were denied funding for E-Rate year 8 (July 2005 – June 2006) for the following reason:

*“No technology plan covering the current funding year was in place when the Form 470 was filed. A written technology plan is needed if seeking discounts for more than basic phone service.”*

Additionally, my appeal was DENIED by the Universal Service Administrative Company Schools and Libraries Division.

This appeal to the FCC is my last resort of the appeals process to prove to all readers that rules presented by the Universal Service Administrative Company Schools and Libraries Division that relates to “The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) requires applicants to base requests for services to be purchased with Schools and Libraries support discounts on an approved technology plan. The only exception is that applicants who seek discounts for basic telephone service only do not need a technology plan.”

<http://www.universalservice.org/sl/applicants/step02/technology-planning/>

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E

What is basic telephone service?

**The definition of basic telephone service.**

---

Basic telephone service is defined as wireline or wireless single-line voice service (e.g., local, cellular, and/or long distance) as well as mandatory fees associated with such service (e.g., federal and state taxes, universal service fees, etc.).

Basic telephone service must be provided by a telecommunications carrier. To be a telecommunications carrier, the carrier must provide telecommunications service on a common carriage basis. That is, the telecommunications carrier must (1) allow the customer to transmit intelligence of its own design and choosing and (2) provide the service to the general public (hold itself out to serve indifferently all potential users) for a fee.

<http://www.universalservice.org/sl/applicants/step02/basic-telephone-service.aspx>

This application meets **all** of these guidelines and rules.

In any event, I apologize if there was confusion during the PIA process leading to your conclusion that I did not have a completed technology plan when I filed my Form 470. The entire PIA process was very long and stressful, and I have had time to go back and review what happened during that process. In reviewing the email exchanges, I can see where I could have explained my circumstances better, and I can also see where the reviewer may not have had all the information necessary to make the decision that was made.

I filed my E-Rate Year 8 Form 470 on January 3, 2005. I do understand that, as described on the SLD web site under "Step 2: Technology Planning", a technology plan must be completed at the time the Form 470 is filed and must be approved before the start of service.

I was aware of that requirement, and believe that I have complied. However, there were some confusing circumstances regarding my technology plan(s), and I did not explain everything correctly during the PIA process. My intent is to explain that I did have a written and completed plan for the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 prior to the date I filed my E-Rate year 8 Form 470 on Jan. 3, 2005.

As best as I can explain the circumstances, here they are:

In 2003, I wrote and submitted a complete three (3) year technology plan covering the period from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007 to the Texas Education Agency. I have included that plan as **EXHIBIT A**. This plan was approved by the Texas Education Agency on April 27, 2004 as indicated on the document entitled "Texas Education Agency, 2004 Technology Plan Approval Certificate" included as **EXHIBIT B**. If you will look at the enclosed 3 year technology plan submitted as Exhibit A, you will see that everything pertaining to E-Rate year 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) was written, completed and inclusive in this plan. At the time I received this Certificate from

*the Texas Education Agency, I was confident that I had submitted a 3 year plan and been approved.*

As I was preparing to review what I had to do for submitting my applications for E-Rate year 8 in October of 2004, I received an email from our local Education Service Center (Region One) stating that Brownsville ISD was posted as having only a 1 year Technology Plan from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005 rather than through June 30, 2007 as shown on the certificate I had from TEA (Exhibit B). I asked my technology Lead Teacher, David Mitchell, to investigate. Our process is to use the services of our local Education Service Center in plan review and guidance, so he contacted Maria Elena Ovalle, Coordinator, Technology Integration at Region One Education Service Center for assistance. Maria confirmed that our district was showing a 1 year plan rather than the 3 year plan on the Region 12 web site. Region 12 is one of 20 Education Service Centers in Texas, but they have been delegated the responsibility to approve and maintain technology plans for all schools in Texas by authority of the Texas Education Agency.

David Mitchell then contacted Marcia J. Proctor, the State Technology Planning Coordinator located at Region 12 Education Service Center and asked about the discrepancy. Ms. Proctor stated in her email reply (dated 11/15/2004) ***“There was a programming error in that those people that had requested a 3 year plan but were only approved for one year, got a 3 year certificate.”*** She also stated the following: ***“The new corrected certificates, should have a 2 line banner next to the TEA seal rather than the 1 line banner that your original copy had. We apologize for the error.”*** I have included a series of email messages to confirm these facts. These emails are included collectively as **EXHIBIT C**.

As you can see from the emails dated November 22, 2004 between David Mitchell and Maria Elena Ovalle of Region One Education Service Center, it was clear that David had been informed of the corrections necessary to re-submit, and that what was necessary was to copy the “current plan and edit that one to update.” As per David’s email response, dated November 22, 2004, he states that he had copied the plan over already and was getting the new timelines and budgets ready. Please remember that the plan he copied already included the technology plan for July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007. What we intended to do was to take the 2004-2007 plan that we originally submitted and were led to believe was approved, and when we discovered it had been approved for only a single year, to modify the plan to include 2008 and re-submit in November 2004 for another 3 year plan that would cover July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2008.

What remains constant is that the plan for 2005 was written and completed in April 2004. It was still written and completed in November of 2004 when we learned we needed to re-submit due to “a programming error” by Region 12.

The last set of email messages I have submitted is an email string where David Mitchell is trying to submit our written and completed plan electronically to Region One, and finds that he has questions about how to submit the plan for APPROVAL. You can see

that he contacted Maria Elena Ovalle on December 15, 2004 because he was having trouble submitting the written and completed plan for approval. You will notice that the email string has to do with approval and there is not any question that the plan was written and completed. As I've indicated before, the part covering E-Rate year 2005 was submitted for approval to the TEA (via Region 12) in April of 2004.

Again, I apologize for such a long explanation, but I have no other way to demonstrate that BISD was in compliance with the requirement to have a written and completed plan covering the period of July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 before the Form 470 for E-Rate year 2005 was filed.

With respect to the questions and answers between myself and Jane Giancamillo as part of the selective review FY2005 follow-up questions, this is where things became confusing and likely led Ms. Giancamillo to the conclusion we did not have a plan in place.

On November 2, 2005, Ms. Giancamillo sent me an email with an attachment with questions to answer as part of the follow-up to the Selective review. I answered those questions, and sent them back to her. I was pretty confused with some of the questions, and you can see by my email response back to her I even stated: "***And please don't hesitate to call if any of it gets confusing. I got baffled more than once.***" I have included that email exchange as **EXHIBIT D**, and that email exchange also included a follow-up set of questions from Ms. Giancamillo dated Nov 9<sup>th</sup>, 2005 .

One of the question asked on the November 2, 2005 attachment was: "Please indicate the date that the version of the Technology Plan you provided was created?" I incorrectly interpreted that question to ask "when was the 2005 technology plan approved?" As you can see from the Texas Education Agency 2005 Technology Plan Approval Certificate, it is for 3 years and was approved on May 5, 2005 (**EXHIBIT E**). My answer to her question about when the plan was created was "May 5, 2005" which is obviously incorrect.

I clearly made a mistake with this answer, and provided an incorrect answer. As documented above, this plan was initially written and completed in April 2004 when it was reviewed and initially approved by the TEA as part of a three year plan.

The next question from Ms. Giancamillo was received in an email on November 9<sup>th</sup>, and asked the following questions: " The plan that you provided indicates it was last edited on 4/26/05. Did the technology plan that was edited on 4/26/2005 (i.e. your previous plan) cover the Funding Year 7/1/2005 to 6/30/2006? If it did please provide a copy of it and the date it was written and available. Please provide the date (month, day, and year) on which the approved Technology Plan you provided was written and available."

I sent her back the TEA Approval certificate for my 1 year approval for 2004-2005, thinking that question was in reference to my previous plan, as the Technology Plan

covering 7/1/2005 to 6/30/2006 was my current plan, not my previous plan. At the time of my response, I thought I had answered appropriately, but obviously not.

As per all the email and other documentation I have provided within this letter of appeal, I want to reinforce that the plan that covers the time period of 7/1/2005 through 6/30/2006 was initially written and available on April 27, 2004. After the TEA 3-yr vs. 1-yr approval problem was discovered, this same plan was modified slightly and was again written and available by December 15, 2004 as you can see from the email trail contained in Exhibit C.

I regret that some of the information I supplied was unintentionally incorrect. The pressure exerted on us is tremendous, especially when there are hundreds of questions and such a short time to answer everything. It is always a fear that one simple word expressed incorrectly will result in a disqualification, and sometimes I feel that I must try and literally interpret every question.

I am hoping that I have supplied enough documentation, email streams, references, and other information to demonstrate that:

- 1.) BISD has always had a technology plan that was written and available prior to submitting a Form 470 in any respective year.
- 2.) We experienced some confusion due to an error by the TEA, and worked diligently and quickly to correct the problem that was not of our doing, and still had a plan that was written, available, and re-submitted prior to our Form 470 being posted.
- 3.) The PIA process was conducted in a compressed time frame, with a great deal of pressure and many detailed questions that we had to respond to quickly and accurately. Unfortunately, we did make a mistake or two in supplying the correct and factual answers, having on occasion made a mistake of attempting to literally interpret the information needed.
- 4.) None of our answers were intended to mislead or provide false information. In fact, we obviously hurt ourselves as we did a bad job of always providing the amount of detail necessary to accurately provide the SLD with enough information to make a good decision.
- 5.) Despite our mistakes, the documentation exists to prove that we were in compliance with the technology Planning directives.

We are prepared to submit any additional information you may deem necessary to substantiate the fact that BISD did have a technology plan for the period 7/1/2005 through 6/30/2006 that was written and available prior to our Form 470 submission on January 3, 2005.

Due to the time frames involved, we provided our email interchanges between the people involved in the receipt, review, and approval of our technology plan for the period in question. We can obtain written statements from the individuals represented in these emails certifying that they are accurate if you require.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope the information provided is what you need to review and reach the conclusion that the facts support that BISD did have a technology plan in place when the Form 470 was filed for E-Rate year 8, and that you will reverse your decision and fund the FRN's initially denied.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert Fisher  
Administrator for Instructional Technology  
Brownsville Independent School District  
[bass@bisd.us](mailto:bass@bisd.us)

Attach as Exhibit A - The Actual 3 year Tech Plan submitted and initially approved for 2004-2007

Attach as Exhibit B - The TEA Tech Plan Approval Certificate for 2004-2007

Attach as Exhibit C - the emails listed in the word document attached

Attach as Exhibit D - the emails listed in the word document attached

Attach as Exhibit E - The TEA Tech Plan Approval Certificate for 2005-2008

Robert Fisher  
Brownsville Independent School District  
1900 Price Road  
Brownsville, TX 78521

Letter OF APPEAL  
" Denied "  
by  
USAC

Billed Entity Number: 141638  
Form 471 Application Number: 482818  
Form 486 Application Number:



**Universal Service Administrative Company**  
Schools & Libraries Division

---

**Administrator's Decision on Appeal – Funding Year 2005-2006**

March 24, 2006

Robert Fisher  
Brownsville Independent School District  
1900 Price Road  
Brownsville, TX 78521

Re: Applicant Name: BROWNSVILLE INDEP SCHOOL DIST  
Billed Entity Number: 141638  
Form 471 Application Number: 482818  
Funding Request Number(s): 1337272  
Your Correspondence Dated: January 07, 2006

After thorough review and investigation of all relevant facts, the Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) of the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) has made its decision in regard to your appeal of SLD's Funding Year 2005 Funding Commitment Decision Letter for the Application Number indicated above. This letter explains the basis of SLD's decision. The date of this letter begins the 60-day time period for appealing this decision to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). If your Letter of Appeal included more than one Application Number, please note that you will receive a separate letter for each application.

Funding Request Number(s): 1337272  
Decision on Appeal: **Denied**  
Explanation:

- You disagree with SLD's decision of denying the funding requests because you failed to provide a technology plan for Funding Year 2005 when the Form 470 was filed. You state that you were aware of that requirement and believe that you had complied. However, there were some confusing circumstances regarding your technology plan that you said you did not explain everything correctly during the PIA process. You further state that your intent was to explain that you did have a written and completed plan for the period July 1, 2005 through June 20, 2006 prior to the date you filed your Form 470 on Jan 3, 2005. To support your appeal, you provided a technology plan covering timeframe of 2004-2007, an approval certificate for the 2005 technology plan from Texas Education agency and some of the follow-up initiated by the Selective Reviewer with the appeal letter.

- Upon thorough review of the appeal and all relevant documentation, it has been determined that you failed to provide a technology plan for Funding Year 2005 when the Form 470 was filed. During the Selective Review, you were requested to provide a copy of the school's technology plan. On October 13, 2005, you submitted a technology plan for the timeframe of 2005-2008. On November 9, 2005, your response indicated the technology plan provided was created on May 5, 2005. You also provided a 2004 approval certification for the technology plan from the Texas education agency, which states the technology plan expires on June 30, 2005 and is approved for timeframe of 2004-2005; however, the expiration date of June 30, 2005 is before the funding year's start date of July 1, 2005, and you did not provide a technology plan other than the one that covers timeframe of 2005-2008. According to the FCC guidelines, a technology plan must be in place when the establishing Form 470 is filed. This rule was violated since the establishing Form 470 (Application number: 261630000528722) for the application was posted on January 3, 2005 and the technology plan for Funding Year 2005 was not created until May 5, 2005. On appeal, you provide a technology plan covering the timeframe of 2004-2007. SLD cannot accept or consider the new information since you were given numerous opportunities to provide the information during the Selective Review. The applicant is responsible for providing accurate information to the SLD. You have failed to provide evidence that SLD has erred in its original decision.
- Your Form 471 requested funding for services other than basic local and long distance telephone service. FCC rules require applicants to certify that the entities receiving products and/or services other than basic telephone service are covered by an individual and/or higher-level technology plan that has been, or is in the process of being approved. 47 C.F.R. § 54.504(b)(2)(vii); See Schools and Libraries Universal Service, Services Ordered and Certification Form, OMB 3060-0806 Block 6, item 26, 27 (FCC Form 471) .

If your appeal has been approved, but funding has been reduced or denied, you may appeal these decisions to either the SLD or the FCC. For appeals that have been denied in full, partially approved, dismissed, or canceled, you may file an appeal with the FCC. You should refer to CC Docket No. 02-6 on the first page of your appeal to the FCC. Your appeal must be received or postmarked within 60 days of the date on this letter. Failure to meet this requirement will result in automatic dismissal of your appeal. If you are submitting your appeal via United States Postal Service, send to: FCC, Office of the Secretary, 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554. Further information and options for filing an appeal directly with the FCC can be found in the "Appeals Procedure" posted in the Reference Area of the SLD web site or by contacting the Client Service Bureau. We strongly recommend that you use the electronic filing options.

We thank you for your continued support, patience and cooperation during the appeal process.

Schools and Libraries Division  
 Universal Service Administrative Company



**Step 2: Technology Planning**

An approved technology plan must meet five criteria that address goals, strategies, needs, resources, and evaluation.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) requires applicants to base requests for services to be purchased with Schools and Libraries support discounts on an approved technology plan. **The only exception is that applicants who seek discounts for basic telephone service only do not need a technology plan.** Applicants who seek telecommunication services other than basic telephone service, Internet access, internal connections, or basic maintenance of internal connections should review the following information about technology plan requirements and approval. Additional assistance in writing a plan is provided in Questions to Consider: Technology Planning

**Step 2: Develop a Technology Plan**

Basic Telephone Service
Technology Planning
Questions to Consider in Technology Planning
Sample Tech Plan Approval Letter
Frequently Asked Questions About Technology Planning

The sections below provide guidance on the core elements of approved technology plans and information about the approval process including:

- Elements of a Technology Plan
- Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe
- Technology Plan Approval Process
- Reviews for Program Compliance
- USAC Contact Information

**Elements of a Technology Plan**

The FCC has stipulated that requests for discounts must be based on an approved technology plan. To ensure that schools and libraries are prepared to effectively use the requested services, applicants must certify that their requests are based on approved technology plans that include provisions for integrating telecommunication services and Internet access into their educational program or library services. Most schools and libraries have already developed such plans and may only need to modify these existing plans slightly to conform to program criteria for technology plans.

To qualify as an approved technology plan for a discount and to meet the requirements of the FCC's Fifth Report and Order (FCC 04-190, released August 13, 2004), the plan must contain the following five elements:

- The plan must establish clear goals and a realistic strategy for using telecommunications and information technology to improve education or library services;
- The plan must have a professional development strategy to ensure that staff know how to use these new technologies to improve education or library services;
- The plan must include an assessment of the telecommunication services, hardware, software, and other services that will be needed to improve education or library services;
- The plan must provide a sufficient budget to acquire and support the non-discounted elements of the plan: the hardware, software, professional development and other services that will be needed to implement the strategy; and
- The plan must include an evaluation process that enables the school or library to monitor progress toward the specified goals and make mid-course corrections in response to new developments and opportunities and they arise.

**Note:** If the plan was approved prior to the effective date of the Fifth Report and Order (October 13, 2004) and did not contain all of the five required elements, that plan should be updated to include the missing elements. Technology plans must include all five elements.

**Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe**

**Scope**

Schools and libraries are not required to write or develop a separate Universal Service Fund technology plan. However, the approved plan must include a sufficient level of information to validate the purpose of a Universal Service Fund

request. An approved technology plan does not have to include the specific details on required on the *Description of Services Requested and Certification Form (Form 470)*, the *Services Ordered and Certification Form (Form 471)*, the *Receipt of Service Confirmation Form (Form 486)*, and the *Adjustment to Funding Commitment and Modification to Receipt of Service Confirmation Form (Form 500)*.

The information submitted on those forms should build on the foundation provided by the approved technology plan, by documenting specific implementation details and operational steps being taken under the plan. That information will be considered a refinement of the plan as long the requested services can be supported by the plan.

All approved technology plans should include provisions for evaluating progress toward the plan's goals, and ideally these assessments should occur on an annual basis. A technology plan should be responsive to new and emerging opportunities, open to review and not a static document. If you find that your technology needs change and you want to order services beyond the scope of your existing plan, you must prepare and submit a new plan for approval.

### **Timeframe**

Approved technology plans should cover a period of not more than three years. In view of the rapid development cycle of new technologies and services, schools and libraries should approach long-term commitments with caution. However, long-range planning may be important in the case of some lease-purchase arrangements or very large capital investments that require extended commitments. There may also be cases in which an approved plan is longer than three years to conform to federal, state, or local requirements. Whenever an approved plan is longer than three years, there should be a significant review of progress during the third year.

A technology plan must be written - including all five elements - **at the time the Form 470 is filed** and must be approved before the start of service. **Applicants are now required to formally certify on Form 486** that the technology plans on which they based their purchases were approved before they began to receive service. (See Reviews for Program Compliance below for more details).

### **Technology Plan Approval Process**

#### **Technology Plan Approvers**

To ensure that technology plans are based on the reasonable needs and resources of the applicant, and that they are compatible with the goals of the Schools and Libraries Program, the FCC requires independent approval of an applicant's technology plan (FCC Order 97-157). Applicants can locate a technology plan approver by using the [Technology Plan Approver Locator](#).

#### **Technology Plan Certification**

The technology plan approver is expected to use the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe. USAC will provide a letter of certification to each approving entity. Each approver should provide a copy of a document similar to the [Sample Technology Plan Approval Form](#) to the school district, school, library system, or library to certify that its plan has been approved and is consistent with the five criteria listed above in Elements of a Technology Plan and in the checklist on the sample form. When a Form 486 is submitted to USAC, the applicant will be required to identify the entity that approved the technology plan for each eligible school or library receiving services on the form. During a program integrity review, a school or library may be required to produce a document similar to the Sample Technology Plan Certification Form, in order to document approval of its technology plan.

#### **Approval of State Education Agency and Public School Plans**

The sole approver for State Education Agency (SEA) technology plans is the U.S. Department of Education. An SEA with an approved plan under the Technology Literacy Challenge (TLCF) initiative or the Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) program has an approved plan for purposes of the Universal Service Program. Although these plans cover a period of more than three years, they include provisions for periodic progress evaluations, and USAC will ask the U. S. Department of Education for progress reports under these plans during their third year.

Under FCC Order 97-157, SEAs are the preferred approvers for K-12 public school plans. A school, school district, or education service agency that has developed a plan approved under a TLCF or EETT initiative, when accompanied by a current year operating budget, has an approved plan for purposes of the Schools and Libraries Program. Many states also have established their own state-wide technology planning initiatives, and schools, school districts, or education service agencies may develop technology plans for state approval by participating in such initiatives, if those initiatives include the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe.

School districts that have not developed approved technology plans under one of these national or state initiatives may have their own district-level plans approved by their SEA, following the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe. In the case of a Local Education Agency (LEA), plans that were approved for the U.S. Department of Education's EETT program satisfy the requirements for Schools and Libraries Program technology plans as long as they are accompanied by a current operating budget.

- **School district technology plan.** A school within a district that has an approved technology plan is considered to have an approved plan, if the district-wide plan validates the use of telecommunications services for educational purposes in that school in a manner consistent with the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe.
- **Individual school technology plan.** If an individual public school develops its own site-based or building level technology plan, it should seek approval for that plan at the district level following the criteria and standards above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe.
- **Charter school technology plan.** A charter school may have its technology plan approved through the same institution that granted its charter, if that agency is a USAC-Certified Technology Plan Approver.

A SEA may delegate its approval authority by designating a third party to establish and operate an independent peer review process on its behalf. In the event of such delegation, the SEA should notify USAC. USAC will certify the alternative approval entity, but the state will retain responsibility for the approvers operating under its jurisdiction.

In FCC Order 97-253, the FCC states that: "the Schools and Libraries Division may review and certify schools' and libraries technology plans when a state agency has indicated it will be unable to review such plans within a reasonable time." If such an event occurs, the SEA will notify USAC, which will consult with the SEA to certify a third party that can establish and operate an independent approval process on behalf of the public schools in the state. Although USAC will certify the alternative approval entity, the state will retain oversight responsibility for this entity, which will be operating under its jurisdiction.

**Note:** Schools that are subject to a state review process by state or local law **may not circumvent the state process** by submitting plans directly to USAC (FCC Order 97-420, paragraph 157). In the event that USAC certifies alternative procedures for approval of public school technology plans in a state, these procedures may not be used as an alternative approval process for public schools in any other state, and no USAC certified approval procedure may be used as an appeals mechanism for any school in any state.

### Approval of Non-public Schools Plans

In states where non-public schools are not required by applicable law to obtain state approval for technology plans and telecommunications expenditures, or where SEAs have indicated that they will not be approve technology plans for non-public schools, USAC will authorize an alternative approval process administered by appropriate entities. The approved entities will certify to USAC that:

- Approval procedures will be similar in rigor to existing peer reviews used by non-public schools for other certification purposes
- Approval procedures will be based on an independent peer review that will include the criteria and standards for plans above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe.

USAC will certify technology plan approvers for non-public school plans. These entities may include:

- regional accreditation associations
- national, state, regional, and local private school associations
- national, state, and regional parochial school associations

In some states, the SEA or an education service agency may also work with non-public schools to establish an appropriate third-party approval process for non-public school technology plans. In the absence of any of these alternatives, USAC may consult directly with the SEA and the non-public schools in a state or region to certify appropriate approval procedures. USAC will maintain a directory of entities that it has certified to approve non-public school plans and will facilitate non-public school access to these entities when necessary. USAC and USAC-certified entities may not be used to appeal the review of any other entity.

A school within a Diocesan school district or comparable entity that has an approved plan is considered to have an approved plan in its own right, if that approved district-wide technology plan validates the use of the contracted telecommunications services for educational purposes in that school in a manner consistent with the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe.

## **Approval of Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Plans, BIA School Plans, and Plans of Districts and Territories**

The District of Columbia, Hawaii, and U.S. territories will have their plans approved under the U.S. Department of Education's Ed-Tech program.

The Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is the preferred approver for BIA contract and grant school plans, and it will use the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe to approve individual BIA school plans. BIA-operated schools can be covered by a plan written by the BIA and approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Any BIA school with an approved technology plan under the Ed-Tech program has an approved technology plan if that plan is accompanied by a current year operating budget.

An individual BIA contract or grant school with a BIA-approved plan may choose to participate in the Schools and Libraries program in its own right independently of the BIA, if the BIA-approved technology plan supports and validates the use of the contracted telecommunications services for educational purposes in that school in a manner consistent with the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe. If an individual BIA school, or any other school or system serving Indian students, develops a technology plan that is not covered by BIA approval, USAC will consult with appropriate entities to establish an alternative approval procedure.

### **Approval of State Library Agency and Library Plans**

State Library Agencies may have their plans approved through several mechanisms. The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) has approved a Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan for every state. These plans are similar in purpose and scope to Ed-Tech plans for SEAs, and they constitute approved technology plans for the purposes of the Schools and Libraries Program. Alternatively, a State Library Agency may choose to use a technology plan approved by an appropriate body within the state (e.g., the legislature, state department of telecommunications, state department of information technology, etc.). Since LSTA plans and many state agency plans cover a period of more than three years, USAC will ask the IMLS or the state agency for a progress report under these plans during their third year.

State Library Agencies are the preferred approvers for the technology plans of library systems and libraries in their states. USAC will consult with State Library Agencies and will certify their approval process if they affirm the application of the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe.

For the purposes of technology planning, USAC uses the following two definitions:

- "Library" is defined as a single administrative unit, which can have multiple outlets.
- "Library Consortium" is defined as an administrative unit which is a collection of multiple libraries, each with its own governing structure, that come together to share resources and aggregate demand.

Individual libraries may write their own technology plans. Library consortia technology plans may be used to fulfill the requirement for the individual libraries to have a technology plan if the consortium:

- Supports and validates the services requested by the library
- Is based on a collaborative planning process
- Follows the guidelines set out in the four technology planning scenarios outlined below:
  - Libraries and/or library consortia that apply only for basic telephone service are not required to have a technology plan.
  - Libraries that apply for discounts on services for its own library outlet(s) may have a plan written at the library level.
  - Library consortia that apply for discounts on services that are shared by a group of libraries may have a plan written at the consortium level as long as the plan supports and validates the requested services.
  - Libraries that apply for discounts on services for their own library outlet(s), which are part of a larger initiative supported by the library consortium, may have a plan written at the library consortium level, as long as the plan supports and validates the requested services.

A State Library Agency may delegate its approval authority by designating a third party to establish and operate an independent peer review process on its behalf. In the event of such delegation, the agency should notify USAC. The state agency will retain responsibility for the approvers operating under its jurisdiction.

### **Reviews for Program Compliance**

USAC reviews certifications made on FCC Forms for compliance with program rules concerning availability and approval of technology plans.

### **Description of Services Requested and Certification Form (Form 470), the Services Ordered and Certification Form (Form 471)**

All applicants certify on Forms 470 and 471 that their request for services will be based on a technology plan that has been or will be approved in accordance with the criteria and standards outlined above in Elements of a Technology Plan and Technology Plan Scope and Timeframe.

The technology plan must be written before the submission of the Form 470 and Form 471. The applicant must indicate the status of the technology plan in Block 5 of the Form 470 and Block 6 of the Form 471.

The plan should document an educational purpose or need for library services that are consistent with the "Summary Description of Needs or Services Requested" in Block 2 of the Form 470. The approved plan should be consistent with the "Technology Resources" in Block 3 and should support the "Certifications" in Block 5. The approved plan also should be consistent with similar information blocks in Form 471 and should support the "Certifications" in Forms 471 and 486. Applicants must retain documentation to demonstrate fulfillment of such requirements.

### **Receipt of Service Confirmation Form (Form 486)**

To indicate services have begun, the school or library must file Form 486 and indicate on that form the name(s) of the organization(s) that approved a technology plan for any eligible recipient receiving services. The technology plan has to be approved by the start of service or the filing of the Form 486, whichever comes first. The approving entity is required to provide the applicant with a Certification of Technology Plan Approval that is similar to the [Sample Technology Plan Approval Form](#). This document must be retained in accordance with the FCC's [document retention policy](#). In the event of a program integrity review, a school or library may be required to produce a document similar to the [Sample Technology Plan Approval Form](#), in order to document approval of its technology plan.

### **USAC Contact Information**

USAC's Schools and Libraries Client Service Bureau will be able to answer many of your questions about establishing an approved technology plan, and they will be able to refer you to the certified approval entity in your state or region. You may reach the Client Service Bureau by a toll-free telephone call to **1-888-203-8100**, by email, or by fax **1-888-276-8736**.

To correspond by mail about the technology plan approval process, you may address letters to:

Universal Service Administrative Company  
Schools and Libraries Program  
Technology Planning  
2000 L Street, NW - Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20036

### **DO NOT SEND YOUR TECHNOLOGY PLAN TO USAC**

Sending your plan to USAC will only delay the approval process. If you believe your state does not serve your type of school or library, call USAC's Client Service Bureau at **1-888-203-8100**.

Step 1	Determine Eligibility	Step 3	Open a Competitive Bidding Process
--------	-----------------------	--------	------------------------------------

Last modified on 1/6/2006

© 1997-2006, Universal Service Administrative Company, All Rights Reserved.  
[Home](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Sitemap](#) | [Website Feedback](#) | [Website Tour](#) | [Contact Us](#)



## Step 2: Basic Telephone Service

What is basic telephone service?

### The definition of basic telephone service.

Basic telephone service is defined as wireline or wireless single-line voice service (e.g., local, cellular, and/or long distance) as well as mandatory fees associated with such service (e.g., federal and state taxes, universal service fees, etc.).

Basic telephone service must be provided by a telecommunications carrier. To be a telecommunications carrier, the carrier must provide telecommunications service on a common carriage basis. That is, the telecommunications carrier must (1) allow the customer to transmit intelligence of its own design and choosing and (2) provide the service to the general public (hold itself out to serve indifferently all potential users) for a fee.

If an applicant requests Telecommunications Services from a telecommunications carrier that does not provide telecommunications services on a common carriage basis, the request for such services will be denied.

### Step 2: Develop a Technology Plan

[Basic Telephone Service](#)

[Technology Planning](#)

[Frequently Asked Questions About Technology Planning](#)

Step 1 Determine Eligibility

Step 3 Open a Competitive Bidding Process

Last modified on 1/6/2006

© 1997-2006, Universal Service Administrative Company, All Rights Reserved.  
[Home](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Sitemap](#) | [Website Feedback](#) | [Website Tour](#) | [Contact Us](#)

*Exhibit A*

**BROWNSVILLE ISD  
Technology Plan**

**2004 - 2007**

**Michael Zolkoski**

**SUPERINTENDENT**

# DISTRICT PROFILE

**ESC Region** 1  
**City, State Zip** BROWNSVILLE, TX 78521-2417  
**Phone** (956) 548-8000  
**Fax** (956) 548-8010  
**County District Number** 031901

<b>Number of Campuses</b>	51
<b>Total Student Enrollment</b>	42541
<b>District Size</b>	25,000 - 49,999
<b>Percent Econ. Disadvantaged</b>	92.20%

<b>Technology Expenditures</b>	<b>\$33,138,000.00</b>
<b>Technology budgets reported in plan by category</b>	Teaching and Learning Budget \$3,807,000.00 Educator Preparation and Development Budget \$1,266,000.00 Administration and Support Services Budget \$375,000.00 Infrastructure for Technology Budget \$27,690,000.00 <b>Total: \$33,138,000.00</b>
<b>Technology Expenditure Per Pupil</b>	\$778.97
<b>Number of Campuses with Direct Connection to Internet</b>	51
<b>Percentage of Campuses with Direct Connection to Internet</b>	100.00%
<b>Number of Classrooms with Direct Connection to Internet</b>	2625
<b>Percentage of Classrooms with Direct Connection to Internet</b>	100.00%
<b>Computer/Student Ratio</b>	3 student(s) for every computer
<b>Computer/Teacher Ratio</b>	1 teacher(s) for every computer
<b>Number of campuses that need to complete the Texas Campus STaR Chart</b>	47
<b>Percentage of campuses that have completed the Texas Campus STaR Chart</b>	100.00 %

# Plan Introduction

Plan Last Edited 04/14/2004

<b>Plan status:</b>	approved
<b>Years Included in the Plan:</b>	2004 - 2007
<b>Number of years covered by the plan:</b>	3
<b>Years Approved for the Plan:</b>	2004 - 2005
<b>Number of approved years:</b>	1

## Technology Planning Committee

Robert Fisher, Jay Harris, Frank Saldivar, Elizabeth Corr, Socorro Garza, Santos Castillo Jr., Angelcia Soto, David Mitchell, Joe Soto, Todd Nichols, Chris Rowan, Anthony Alvarez, Charla Tibbits,

## ***Executive Summary***

The committee has developed a plan that takes into consideration both NCLB requirements established for technology as well as the E-rate program developed by Congress in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to make modern telecommunications affordable for every K-12 school and public library in the nation. This plan conveys our vision statement, our beliefs in technology and our K-12 instructional goals as they relate to technology skills. Through this plan, we would hope to provide equitable access to the use of technology to enable students to become lifelong learners. Technology in this context includes computers, Telco services, electrical, data, and video systems designed and networked, when feasible, to enhance our district's communication, information processing and productivity needs.

## Needs Assessment

### Assessment Process:

The original technology plan was based on Star Chart data and concerns provided by campus representatives. Most of these objectives are still viable and are being reviewed by the District Technology Committee made up of various personnel within the district. Those objectives and strategies that continue to address the needs from the Star chart will be carried over with minor modifications to fit the e-plan format.

Any new objectives will be based on data from Star Charts, concerns from Technology Support teachers provided by internal auditors and the District Improvement Committee recommendations. Additional objectives will be based on information gathered by the DEIC committee. This information will be integrated into the District Technology Plan to provide the broadest possible input from various concerned parties. The district will use the judgment of the Technology committee to determine the most important objectives based on this data. Our focus for development will be on the E-rate, NCLB and the state Long Range technology Plan.

### Existing Conditions:

Brownsville Independent school District is a district growing at an exponential rate numerically and technologically. Hardware software, networking equipment and appliances are at every school to create an infrastructure that will allow schools and district offices to communicate with each other and the world. This infrastructure changes constantly as schools need more technological equipment to provide education to students in the Technology applications TEKS, to integrate technology and to create a transparent communication system to all those involved in the education of Brownsville's children. To further these ends the following systems are in place across the district.

A training system is in place to provide skills and support to professionals and staff who use technology. There are six lead teachers that provide support in grant implementation, networking and applications skills. Training sessions currently take place regularly on weekends at centrally located technology labs as well as weekdays at campus computer labs. Training opportunities ranges from IP phone use to word-processing and email skills. A stipend system has been developed to encourage attendance at district training sessions.

The district also provides Technology Support Teachers at each campus. These individuals allow teachers and staff immediate access to a technology support person both in hardware and software matters. In addition they give the district a contact person to facilitate communication of a technological nature to the individual campuses.

An infrastructure has been developed that allows E-mail, file sharing, Internet access, and IP phone telephony across the district. Web based email is now in effect for students as well as administration, faculty and staff. All teachers, staff, faculty and administration have access to Microsoft Outlook Web Access with a searchable database of district email addresses and calendar functions and group planning components. The district has purchased 45,000 E-PAL user accounts that allow all students access to email that is filtered for content and has translation capabilities. All campuses have internet access via a CISCO AS5300 Access server.

Every campus has 1 layer 3 switch with multiple V LANS. Networks follow a Star topology with point-to-point T1's. All high schools are directly connected with fiber back to the core router via Gigaman. Every wiring closet has been standardized with CISCO inline power switching network. No hubs are allowed. The network supports IPTV, IP Telephony and Data networks. Over 20,000 computers are currently connected to these LANs. A written Acceptable Use Policy is required for Internet and Email usage and is on file for each user and our CIPS has been approved. Campuses are being upgraded to IP telephony through a normal cable/ fiber backbone support with CISCO 7960 and 7940 telephones. The cost of communication is cut dramatically through this implementation. Access for all BISS employees and students to the Internet is via T1/ Gigaman lines.

All campuses have a fileserver and a network backbone that provides 100MB access. Campuses have at least one computer lab and multimedia projector. There are a minimum of six network drops in each permanent classroom connected to the campus LAN and ultimately to the district WAN.

A district website provides a host of information pertinent to students, teachers, administrators, parents and other interested community members. A searchable district policy database is available as well as all district policy regarding email and the Internet. Registration for all professional development, and substitute teacher requests are all managed electronically with links from the district website. Departmental and school information as well as maps showing directions and school zones can also be accessed via the website. Finally links to all school and department websites are listed alphabetically on a separate page for the community to access. Departmental and school webmasters are in place to develop individual sites for their respective locations. Department website holds pertinent information such as news, lesson plans, forms and templates to support the various functions of those departments. School websites reflect various content including student work, schedules, administrative information, homework information, as well as newsletters.

Other technological equipment on campuses is generally managed by the campus librarians. The equipment includes visual presenters, overhead projectors, tape players, CD players, projector screens and portable PA systems. Technology Education and Technology Applications are offered at most high school campuses. Computer literacy labs are maintained at all middle school campuses. Teachers at the elementary campuses are beginning to incorporate technology application TEKS and are supported by a number of Computer lab instructors who teach the TA TEKS in a lab setting.

### Technology Needs:

The district continues to see the need for regular training sessions for teachers and administrators to keep them abreast of technological changes related to education and the integration of technology into the curriculum.

*Continued support of a point of contact at each campus for teachers and staff to address campus technology concerns.*

Regular communication with the campuses about district technology policies and plans and support issues.

Assistance with integrating technology into the curriculum.

Increase in numbers of technology support personnel.

An increase in IP telephony.

Implementation of IP Television

## Goals, Objectives, and Strategies

**GOAL 1: Teaching and Learning: To provide all students with instruction in the use of technology that empowers them to become more knowledgeable of their world and develop their academic skills.**

**OBJECTIVE 1.1:** All students demonstrate knowledge and appropriate use of hardware components, software programs, the Internet and their relationships

*Budget Amount \$1,707,000.00*  
*LRPT category: Teaching and Learning*

E-Rate Correlates: ER01  
NCLB Correlates: 03, 04a, 07, 11

Strategies		State/Status:	Timeline:	Person(s) Responsible:	Evidence:
1.1.1:	All students will be taught all technology TEKS using a computer and/or Internet to complete classroom assignments throughout the year.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL02, TL04, TL08	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 - Spring 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Administrator for</li> <li>☐ Instructional Technology Administrator</li> <li>☐ Principals</li> <li>☐ Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Lesson plan documentation showing TA TEKS</li> <li>☐ Word Processing Spreadsheet and Multi-media presentations</li> </ul>
1.1.2:	All Campuses will assess the extent to which students meet the technology proficiencies in Technology Application TEKS.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL02, TL07, TL14, TL15	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 - Spring 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Administrator for Instructional Technology</li> <li>☐ Facilitators</li> <li>☐ Principals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Campus assessment or rubric and/or campus portfolio of student work</li> </ul>
1.1.3:	All students will participate in developing curriculum oriented computer-based multimedia projects.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL02, TL04, TL08	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 - Spring 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Principals</li> <li>☐ Facilitators</li> <li>☐ Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Lesson plan documentation showing TA TEKS</li> <li>☐ Multimedia project</li> </ul>
1.1.4:	All teachers will use classroom activities that incorporate technology into the curriculum.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL02, TL07, TL08, TL13	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 - Spring 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Principals</li> <li>☐ Teachers</li> <li>☐ Technology Lead Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Lesson plan documentation showing TA TEKS</li> </ul>
1.1.5:	Computer Science, Desktop Publishing, Digital Graphics, Video Technology, and Web Mastering courses will be offered at the high school level.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL02, TL04, TL06, TL07	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 - Spring 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Administrator for Human Resources</li> <li>☐ Campus Administrators</li> <li>☐ Deans of Instruction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Annual Campus Survey</li> </ul>
1.1.6:	Students will access technological curriculum support materials included with adoption materials.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL02, TL07, TL08	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 - Spring 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Curriculum Department</li> <li>☐ Campus administrators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Annual Campus Survey</li> <li>☐ Lesson Plan Documentation</li> </ul>
1.1.7:	Selected schools will pilot a CD-ROM based core curriculum support system through the use of an inexpensive CD	State: Original	Fall 2004 - Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ District program directors</li> <li>☐ Campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Pre/post test</li> </ul>

	display console deployed to the home as well as a lab setting.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL04, TL07, TL08, TL10, TL12	Status: Planned		administrators Campus coordinators Parent liaisons Classroom teacher	
1.1.8:	Teachers will document classroom technology integration in their lesson plans using the TA TEKS.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL02, TL08, TL13	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 – Spring 2007	Campus administrators Technology Support Teachers Teachers	Lesson Plan Documentation
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 1.2:</b> All students recognize the importance of ethical behavior pertaining to the computer, network and Internet usage in society.</p> <p><i>Budget Amount \$300,000.00</i> <i>LRPT category: Teaching and Learning</i></p> <p>E-Rate Correlates: NCLB Correlates:</p>					
<b>Strategies</b>		<b>State/Status:</b>	<b>Timeline:</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible:</b>	<b>Evidence:</b>
1.2.1:	Students will be instructed in the tenets of using the Internet in an acceptable, ethical manner.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL08	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 – Spring 2007	Administrator for Instructional Technology Principals Teachers Technology Teachers	Annually Signed AUP's filed at the campus level Lesson Plan documentation of TA TEKS
1.2.2:	Students will be taught the tenets of using e-mail in an acceptable, ethical manner.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL08	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 – Spring 2007	Administrator for Instructional Technology Principals Teachers Technology Teachers	Students will have a signed permission slip for using e-mail Lesson Plan documentation of TA TEKS
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 1.3:</b> Internet access will be integrated into all curriculum areas for all students</p> <p><i>Budget Amount \$1,350,000.00</i> <i>LRPT category: Teaching and Learning</i></p> <p>E-Rate Correlates: ER01 NCLB Correlates: 02, 03, 04a, 06</p>					
<b>Strategies</b>		<b>State/Status:</b>	<b>Timeline:</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible:</b>	<b>Evidence:</b>
1.3.1:	Students will participate in virtual field trips through the use of the Internet.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL04, TL08	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 – Spring 2007	Campus administrators Technology Support Teachers	Annually Signed AUP's filed at the campus level Lesson Plan documentation of TA TEKS
1.3.2:	Students will be given opportunities for distance learning if coursework is unavailable locally.  LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL07, TL10, TL16	State: Original  Status: Planned	Fall 2004 – Spring 2007	Administrator for Instructional Technology Campus administrators Technology Support Teachers	Annually Signed AUP's filed at the campus level Lesson Plan documentation of TA TEKS

<p>1.3.3: Students will have access to Internet based reference material and streaming video for supporting the classroom curriculum.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL08, TL18, TL21</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library Services</li> <li>Librarians</li> <li>Classroom teachers</li> <li>Technology Teacher</li> </ul>	<p>Library services summary of use</p>	
<p>1.3.4: Selected schools will pilot a Internet based tool for student reference material to support the district curriculum.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL02, TL08, TL12, TL16, TL17, TL18, TL21</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – ongoing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District program director</li> <li>Campus administrators</li> <li>Technology Support Teachers</li> <li>Parent liaisons</li> <li>Classroom teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Pre/post test</p>	
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 1.4:</b> All students will use network-based communication and collaborative tools.</p> <p><i>Budget Amount \$150,000.00</i> <i>LRPT category: Teaching and Learning</i></p> <p>E-Rate Correlates: NCLB Correlates:</p>					
<p><b>Strategies</b></p>		<p>State/Status:</p>	<p>Timeline:</p>	<p>Person(s) Responsible:</p>	<p>Evidence:</p>
<p>1.4.1:</p>	<p>Students will participate in a focused, curriculum based email project.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: TL01, TL07, TL08</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technology Lead Teachers</li> <li>Principals</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Technology Support Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annually Signed AUP's filed at the campus level</li> <li>Lesson Plan documentation of TA TEKS</li> </ul>
<p><b>OBJECTIVE 1.5:</b> Ensure accessibility by all students to technology-based instruction by providing adaptive/assistive devices for all students requiring the devices.</p> <p><i>Budget Amount \$300,000.00</i> <i>LRPT category: Teaching and Learning</i></p> <p>E-Rate Correlates: NCLB Correlates:</p>					
<p><b>Strategies</b></p>		<p>State/Status:</p>	<p>Timeline:</p>	<p>Person(s) Responsible:</p>	<p>Evidence:</p>
<p>1.5.1:</p>	<p>All Special Population students will be given the same opportunities to access computers and technological equipment as the remainder of the population.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: TL10</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrator for Instructional Technology</li> <li>Campus administrators</li> <li>Technology Support Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student I.E.P.s</li> <li>Parental feedback</li> <li>ARD committee Reports</li> </ul>
<p>1.5.2:</p>	<p>1.The Instructional Technology Department will coordinate with Special Services to make staff aware of adaptive/assistive technology.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: TL03, TL08, TL10</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrator for Instructional Technology</li> <li>Campus administrators</li> <li>Technology Support Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Electronic Registration Online</li> </ul>

**GOAL 2: To provide the knowledge and skills for all educators necessary to fully integrate technology into the curriculum.**

**OBJECTIVE 2.1:** All Teachers, Para-professionals, and administrators will be provided staff development in a variety of technology applications.

Budget Amount \$1,266,000.00  
LRPT category: Educator Preparation and Development

E-Rate Correlates: ER01, ER02  
NCLB Correlates: 01, 04a, 04b, 07, 11, 12

Strategies	State/Status:	Timeline:	Person(s) Responsible:	Evidence:
<p>2.1.1: The Instructional Technology Department will offer Saturday training sessions for teachers administrators, and paraprofessionals in various computer and technology related applications.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: AS03, EP01, EP03, EP08, EP09, TL03, TL04</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Administrator for Instructional Technology</p> <p>Technology Lead Teachers</p>	<p>Professional development evaluations</p> <p>Electronic registration Online</p>
<p>2.1.2: The Instructional Technology Department will offer afternoon training sessions for teachers administrators, and paraprofessionals various computer and technology related applications.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: AS03, EP01, EP03, EP08, EP09</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Administrator for Instructional Technology</p> <p>Technology Lead Teachers</p>	<p>Electronic Registration Online</p> <p>Professional development evaluations</p>
<p>2.1.3: The Instructional Technology Department will offer training sessions for groups of six or more teachers by request in various computer and technology related applications.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: AS03, EP01, EP03, EP08, EP09</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Administrator for Instructional Technology</p> <p>Technology Lead Teachers</p>	<p>Electronic Registration Online</p> <p>Professional development evaluations</p>
<p>2.1.4: The district will provide each new teacher with an orientation to the district's Instructional Technology program, Annually.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: EP03, EP08, EP09</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Administrator for Instructional Technology</p> <p>Technology Lead Teachers</p>	<p>Electronic Registration Online</p> <p>Professional development evaluations</p>
<p>2.1.5: Campuses that have not participated in a TIF grant project will pilot a program in which they will be given access to Web-based tools that give teachers access to: Curriculum content that aligns to state and district standards, and Professional development resources that are accessible anytime.</p> <p>LEA LRPT Correlates: EP01, EP03,</p>	<p>State: Original</p> <p>Status: Planned</p>	<p>Fall 2004 – Ongoing</p>	<p>District program director</p> <p>Campus administrators</p> <p>Campus coordinator</p>	<p>Pre/Post test</p>