

Professional Learning Leadership Plan
Purposeful Technology Integration in Correctional Education
Amber Young
EDLD 5389: Developing Professional Learning Leadership
October 2026

Context, Need, and Leadership Challenge

Within Windham School District (WSD), access to instructional technology continues to expand through teacher laptops, interactive boards, student devices, and approved digital resources. Yet access alone does not ensure meaningful instructional use. Teachers work within three-hour instructional blocks, mixed academic levels, security restrictions, and uneven connectivity and equipment availability across correctional campuses.

The underlying professional learning need is instructional decision-making: teachers need opportunities to determine when, why, and how technology can strengthen differentiation, engagement, collaboration, and learning within their actual classroom conditions. This need is informed by my experience supporting new teachers, troubleshooting access issues, and assisting with early student-device implementation at Holliday. These experiences illustrate barriers and possibilities, but they do not yet constitute systematic evidence of districtwide outcomes.

The leadership challenge is to build teacher confidence and capacity without treating technology adoption as compliance or assuming every campus is equally ready. Professional learning is an appropriate response because equipment and technical access must be paired with modeling, supported practice, feedback, and time to refine instruction. The 2024 National Educational Technology Plan distinguishes access, design, and use divides; this initiative addresses all three while concentrating on teachers' capacity to design meaningful learning (U.S. Department of Education, 2024).

Participants, Stakeholders, and Professional Learning Goals

Primary learners are WSD academic teachers, including new hires and experienced educators with varying confidence, content needs, and access to technology. Campus administrators, Academics and Instructional Technology leadership, IT personnel, and students are key stakeholders. Teacher voice will shape priorities through a brief readiness self-assessment, conversations during campus visits, and choices about which instructional challenge to address.

By the end of an initial learning-and-application cycle, participating teachers will be able to (a) identify a specific instructional need and their available technology resources; (b) explain why a selected technology-supported strategy fits that need; (c) design and try at least one manageable instructional application; and (d) use feedback and reflection to revise the next lesson. These are proposed indicators of professional growth, not claims of outcomes already achieved.

Teacher choice is intentional. One educator may strengthen interactive-board use, another may differentiate using approved software, and another may implement station rotation with five shared student devices. Station rotation remains a practical option, not a universal requirement.

Evidence-Informed Professional Learning Approach

The approach combines a three-priority new-hire sequence, active workshops, PLC collaboration, instructional coaching, peer sharing, and short reflection cycles. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) identify content focus, active learning, collaboration, modeling, coaching, feedback and reflection, and sustained duration as features of effective professional development. Learning Forward’s (2022) standards similarly frame professional learning as a system requiring effective learning processes and conditions for success.

The ISTE Standards for Education Leaders emphasize empowering educators, developing effective systems, and continuous improvement (International Society for Technology in Education [ISTE], 2018). Together, these frameworks support a design in which leaders remove barriers, educators retain agency, and instructional application matters more than the number of tools introduced. The National Educational Technology Plan’s access, design, and use divides reinforce why device distribution alone is insufficient (U.S. Department of Education, 2024).

Professional Learning Experience

Priority	Teacher Experience	Evidence of LProfessional learning
1. Access and readiness	Confirm laptop, district email, required accounts, and access; complete brief readiness check.	Access checklist and identified support needs
2. Core systems and resources	Explore Teams, WSD resources, Aztec, Get More Math, and other approved tools relevant to teaching assignments.	Locate and demonstrate use of a relevant resource
3. Instructional application	Analyze a realistic classroom scenario; observe a model; collaborate on a lesson; select and try a strategy.	Short instructional plan and first implementation reflection

For example, teachers may plan for a three-hour class with varied TABE levels, an interactive board, and five student devices. A modeled lesson could pair individualized Aztec work with

targeted teacher-led instruction and peer collaboration. Participants experience the structure, discuss its instructional purpose, and adapt it to their campus constraints.

The recurring learning cycle is Explore → Experience → Design → Choose → Try → Coach → Reflect/Share → Adjust → Build. Teachers will use a short “Try, Result, Next Step” reflection during coaching, PLCs, or Teams rather than completing extensive additional paperwork. Feedback from the first attempt will shape a revised lesson or a more appropriate strategy.

Artificial Intelligence and Professional Learning

AI will be optional and limited to educator-facing planning and professional learning. Where district-approved and accessible, Microsoft Copilot may help teachers brainstorm grouping structures, draft differentiated activities, or rehearse instructional alternatives. AI will not be required for implementation or used as a substitute for professional judgment.

Teachers will review all generated content for accuracy, bias, accessibility, alignment to instructional objectives, and appropriateness for adult learners. Staff must follow district security and data-protection expectations and should not enter identifiable student information or protected records into unapproved systems. The initiative will offer non-AI alternatives so that access limitations do not exclude participants.

Leadership, Implementation, and Sustained Support

As Education Specialist for Academics and Instructional Technology, I will coordinate readiness checks, facilitate modeling, curate resources, coach teachers, and synthesize implementation feedback. Campus administrators will help protect collaboration time and reinforce instructional priorities. IT staff will address technical access, connectivity, and device issues. Teachers will help lead by sharing successful practices and serving as peer resources.

Coaching will begin as non-evaluative support. At least one campus coaching/support visit per quarter is planned, supplemented by Teams communication, PLC discussions, videos, and targeted follow-up. When teachers encounter difficulties, the response will distinguish technical barriers from instructional-design needs before determining the next support.

Potential barriers include differences in readiness, limited time, restricted connectivity, security requirements, competing responsibilities, and resistance to unfamiliar strategies. Responses include differentiated entry points, offline or low-device alternatives, existing meeting structures, peer examples, and modest first steps. Leadership will adjust the plan based on teacher feedback and implementation evidence rather than requiring identical practices across campuses.

Timeline, Communication, and Resources

Phase / Timing	Lead and Communication	Resources / Checkpoint
Onboarding / Entry	Education Specialist and campus leadership explain purpose; teachers identify needs.	Access checklist, readiness self-assessment
First 2–4 weeks after core training	Facilitator models a lesson; teachers select an instructional goal and share it.	Scenario cards, sample lesson, approved programs
Following 2–6 weeks	Teacher tries strategy; coach checks in through visit or Teams.	Try, Result, Next Step reflection; troubleshooting
Quarterly	Education Specialist, administrators, and teacher peers review patterns in PLCs and visits.	Coaching notes, teacher examples, resource needs
End of annual cycle	Leadership and teachers identify what to sustain, revise, or expand.	Summary of implementation evidence and next-cycle priorities

Communication will use existing email, Teams, PLCs, and campus conversations. Teachers will receive the purpose, available choices, support contacts, and next steps; administrators will receive implementation priorities and common barriers. Resources include teacher laptops, interactive boards, student devices where available, approved software, offline-ready materials, sample lesson plans, and coaching time. Dates remain adaptable to staffing and campus access.

Evidence of Effectiveness and Continuous Improvement

Level	Proposed Evidence	How it Informs Decisions
Participation and experience	Attendance plus relevance feedback, questions, and perceived access barriers.	Adjust scheduling, format, and resources.
Professional learning	Readiness check, scenario-based plan, explanation of instructional rationale, teacher confidence reflection.	Offer foundational modeling or advanced support.
Application to practice	Teacher lesson examples, brief reflections, coaching notes, and walkthrough observations where appropriate.	Identify recurring barriers and refine coaching.
Broader impact	Patterns of differentiation, student engagement, time on task, and available TABE/GED indicators over time.	Explore promising changes cautiously; avoid causal claims.

At each quarterly review, leaders will look for evidence that teachers have moved beyond tool operation toward purposeful instructional decisions. A practical early indicator is whether teachers can show one tried strategy, describe what happened, and identify a reasonable next step. No districtwide baseline or achievement impact is claimed at this stage; those must be established during implementation.

If teachers repeatedly struggle with a practice, the next cycle will add modeling or simplify resources. If access is the barrier, leadership will coordinate technical support or a lower-tech alternative. If evidence suggests a practice is useful and feasible, teacher examples may be shared and implementation expanded. Approaches that add workload without meaningful instructional benefit may be modified or discontinued.

Conclusion

Purposeful technology integration requires more than training on devices or software. It requires professional learning that begins with instructional needs, respects teacher readiness and correctional-campus constraints, supports authentic application, and uses evidence to improve. This plan establishes a feasible structure for educators to grow from their starting points while developing shared capacity across WSD.

References

- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.
<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report>
- International Society for Technology in Education. (2018). ISTE standards for education leaders.
<https://iste.org/standards/education-leaders>
- Learning Forward. (2022). Standards for professional learning.
<https://standards.learningforward.org/standards-for-professional-learning/>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2024). A call to action for closing the digital access, design, and use divides: 2024 national educational technology plan. <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/GOVPUB-ED-PURL-gpo229250>