

## Models of Technology Integration

Four different models or conceptualizations of the stages of technology integration are: [Reiber](#), [SAMR](#), [ACOT](#), & [Texas STaR](#). Each provides different labels (or names) for the stages, sometimes a different number of stages, but they all describe the same process on the way to the same result: technology integration. *Describe the similarities and differences among the four models. Discuss which model represents your level of technology integration and examine any difficulties.*

The similarities of technology integration all evolve around one facet of education, the construction of student knowledge. Four models of technology integration are 1) Reiber's - Model of Integration (Reiber), 2) SAMR - Four Levels of Technology Use (Puentedura, 2008), 3) ACOT Stages of Technology Integration (Brooks-Young, 2010), and 4) Texas STaR Chart ("Texas teacher star," 2006). Each of these four models describe different levels of teacher competencies with technology and student engagement in the use of technology. Students are actively using technology and collaborating while the teachers merely assists with problem-solving. When taking a closer look at each of the models one can identify what phase of technology use their teaching style is. The end result is to provide a learning environment that is student-driven allowing for the construction of knowledge.

One difference I noticed between the four stages is how the SAMR model does not examine closely the teacher's competency with technology. The focus of SAMR is to integrate technology and how student learning can occur at each level. The other three models list how student engagement and learning does not begin until the second half of the stages. SAMR is also the only model to specifically mention TPACK revealing how technology, pedagogy, content, and knowledge are intertwined. The similarities of the four stages are far more common than their differences.

The ACOT model provided more insight for me to identify effective teaching and student learning through technology integration. ACOT provided a concise and easy to understand analysis of the traits of a teacher who is or isn't confident with their use of technology. This is beneficial because we all need to look at how effective our classrooms are with technology integration. As a technology applications teacher, it is easy for me to look at these models and identify what stage or level of technology integration my classroom is in. My students are always in collaboration with their peers and using a constructivist method to solve problems and complete projects.

One area of concern I have had is the sometimes chaotic atmosphere of my classroom. What would an administrator say if they walked in my classroom when students are actively constructing their knowledge? Is it a classroom management issue? I now have something to refer to with ACOT when describing the freedom I allow students to explore and construct their learning. All four of these models are great resources to draw upon in the future. Each model presents the concept of technology integration slightly different; however, each model's ultimate objective is to drive student learning with effective technology use.

**Resources:**

Brooks-Young, S. (2010, January). *Acot stages of technology integration*. Retrieved from <https://onlinetools.pbworks.com/w/feed/f/ACOTStagesofTechnology.doc.pdf>

Puentedura, R. (Writer) (2008, December 22). Tpack and samr: Models for enhancing technology integration. *As we may teach*. [Audio podcast]. Retrieved from <https://itunes.apple.com/itunes-u/as-we-may-teach-educational/id380294705?mt=10>

Reiber, L. (n.d.). *A model of technology integration*. Retrieved from <http://www.nowhereroad.com/twt/animations/TechAdopt.html>

Texas Education Agency, (2006). *Texas teacher star chart*. Retrieved from website: <http://starchart.epsilen.com/docs/TxTSC.pdf>