



edu-
-tec
alliance

**CROSS INDUSTRY
BEST PRACTICE
(CIBP) BENCHMARKING
FOR SCHOOLS**

DECEMBER 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the key elements of our work is helping member schools create their unique vision for how educational technology will be used within their context. However, the strategy for how to achieve this vision very much depends on their current situation; the systems in use, the curation of data and digital assets, the preparedness of staff and students to make effective use of the environment. A highly detailed picture of the current state is essential, and it needs to be assembled from a number of different perspectives. We create this current state picture as part of our initial member review. The EduTec Alliance's Reviews consist of three activities performed in parallel. These are:

Discovery

Conducting in depth interviews with a range of key stakeholders to understand what's working, what's not, what they would like to be able to do and why. Stakeholders normally include staff, pupils, and parents.



Baselining

Mapping every single educational technology component in use, or under review, onto our Knowledge Base. This captures costs, issues, integration points and related projects.



Benchmarking

Designed to provide a clear picture of how the school is currently performing in terms of educational technology, how it compares with its previous performance, with other schools and other industries. To obtain a holistic view, we approach benchmarking from two angles - human and technological.



Human: Our ISTE Standard based surveys are designed to measure an individual's current capability against the ISTE competencies that comprise each standard. They come in three flavours (Education Leaders, Educators and Students) and are electronically delivered to the appropriate school community. The responses are scored and analysed in our Knowledge Base to rapidly provide a clear picture at individual, year and school level.

Technological: We believe that schools should be constantly striving to make the best use of their information technology, benefiting from the experience of all business sectors. Our Cross Industry Best Practice (CIBP) benchmarking is designed to assess how well schools are doing against global best practice, and is defined in this guide.

2. CROSS INDUSTRY BEST PRACTICE (CIBP) BENCHMARKING

The aim of the CIBP benchmark is to assess schools against best practice use of information technology across all industry sectors.

CIBP Benchmarking comprises eight competencies, each being scored from one to five. These are;



	STRATEGY	PEOPLE	PROCESS	APPLICATION ECOSYSTEM	TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE	DATA	CYBER SECURITY	PROJECT MANAGEMENT
SCHOOL REVIEW #1								

Typical Initial CIBP Scores

The scoring is performed by The EduTec Alliance team at the end of each review, and consistency is provided using rubrics. These are provided in the next section and we would encourage you to have a go at benchmarking yourselves. It's not unusual to start out by scoring ones and twos, perhaps interrupted by a slight rise in 'Technology Infrastructure'. It's our experience that the intrinsic capabilities of the technologies that schools have deployed far outweigh the use that they are making of them.

As for taking action based on your score, we have found that a 'weakest link in the chain' philosophy applies. In other words, it is better to slowly raise your score across all competencies than to try to excel at just one or two – there are many levels of interconnection.

3. THE COMPETENCIES



STRATEGY

The presence/quality of any existing educational technology vision and strategy and how well it has been communicated and adopted



PEOPLE

The skills of staff and students in the usage of educational technology and their awareness of best practice standards (eg ISTE)



PROCESS

The presence/quality of processes relating to the use educational technology. How well they have been communicated, trained and adopted.



APPLICATIONS ECOSYSTEM

The quality of the applications in use and their functional coverage – taking into account gaps and overlaps. Also considers how well the applications function (quality of implementation) and their 'fit for purpose'



TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE

The quality of the technology stack in use – taking into account how well it serves the day to day operations, its failure rates and the support overhead required.



DATA

To cover data (eg student, financial) and digital assets (files, documents etc). Are they centrally and securely stored in an appropriate structure? Can they be found and collaborated on? Do the right people have the right access?



CYBER SECURITY

How well is your school protecting itself against cyber attacks; ransomware, data breaches and 'phishing'? Do you have the appropriate infrastructure, training, processes and plans in place?



PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Focusing on the project and programme management of educational technology initiatives. Is there a formal approach in place? Is there a structured project lifecycle and approval process? Is appropriate governance in place?

4. THE RUBRICS

STRATEGY

1. No agreed educational technology strategy exists.
 2. Basic strategy in place but not widely communicated.
 3. Basic strategy agreed and communicated.
 4. Comprehensive strategy agreed, but not widely communicated.
 5. Comprehensive strategy agreed and widely communicated.
-

PEOPLE

1. Staff and students have received little training and are using educational technology poorly.
 2. Staff and students have received little training but are using educational technology moderately well.
 3. Staff and students have received basic training but are using educational technology well.
 4. Staff and students have received full training and are using educational technology well.
 5. Staff and students have received full training and are using educational technology very well. Best practices are being adopted.
-

PROCESS

1. No processes are formally documented.
 2. Limited processes are documented but not followed.
 3. Basic processes are documented and predominantly followed.
 4. Key processes are documented and rigourously followed.
 5. All processes are documented and rigourously followed.
-

APPLICATIONS ECOSYSTEM

1. Majority of applications are not fit for purpose and do not support staff and pupils.
 2. Key applications are fit for purpose but do not adequately support staff and pupils.
 3. Majority of applications are fit for purpose and support staff and pupils.
 4. All applications are fit for purpose and enhance staff and pupil performance.
 5. All applications are fit for purpose and are used to their maximum potential by staff and pupils.
-

TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE

1. Majority of technology infrastructure is not fit for purpose.
2. Main elements of technology infrastructure are fit for purpose but not well implemented .
3. Majority of technology infrastructure is fit for purpose and adequately implemented.
4. Majority of technology infrastructure is fit for purpose and well implemented.
5. All technology infrastructure is fit for purpose and well implemented.

DATA

1. Data and digital asset storage is highly fragmented across multiple platforms with no curation or single version of the truth. Data is not trusted and assets hard to find.
 2. Data and digital asset storage is fragmented across a few platforms with little curation or single version of the truth.
 3. Data and digital assets are stored centrally are mostly well used and trusted.
 4. Data and digital assets are stored centrally and are well used and trusted as well as being moderately curated.
 5. All relevant data and digital assets are stored centrally under a formalised structure, trusted and actively curated.
-

CYBER SECURITY

1. Cyber security is not understood; no visibility over how the school is protected from cyber threats (at best this is left to suppliers to deal with); no specific cyber security policy or cyber security training for staff and students.
 2. Cyber security basics are in place in terms of infrastructure protection (firewalls, antivirus/endpoint protection, email and web access filtering); a cyber security policy is in place; there is ad-hoc cyber security training for staff and students.
 3. Cyber security roles are defined within the IT department; cyber security protective measures are monitored, security patches are kept up to date and the infrastructure is regularly security-tested; there is regular cyber security training for staff and students.
 4. There is a structured cyber security programme of work in place, with a specific budget allocated to it; cyber security incident response plans are in place and regularly tested with all stakeholders across the school and external suppliers; cyber insurance and breach support measures are in place.
 5. External suppliers are regularly vetted for cyber security; cyber threats to the educational sector are continuously monitored, and cyber security protective measures are adjusted accordingly; cyber security training for staff and students is targeted to their specific needs.
-

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1. There is no formal project or programme management approach. Projects rarely deliver on time and budget.
2. Formal project and programme management approaches are used sporadically. The majority of projects do not deliver on time and budget.
3. A formal project and programme management approach is place and commonly used. Most projects deliver on time and budget.
4. A formal project and programme management approach is place and always used. The vast majority of projects deliver on time and budget.
5. All project and programme management is formalised and the approach is well known and adopted. It is exceptional if a project does not deliver on time and budget.



Our grateful thanks to Jean-Christophe Gaillard, CEO and Founder of the cyber security transformation experts Corix Partners, for his invaluable assistance in creating the cyber security rubrics.

