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Technology will play a huge role in the way people learn and the medium they use to do so. In a world where social media and digital technologies are shaping the landscape, citizens must increasingly understand how best to consistently use emerging and changing technologies. The digital literacy of citizens will play an important role in fostering critical thinking in the face of information overload. Institutions of learning are changing, with the increasing use of digital games and social media in the learning space, pointing to the increased availability of self-learning, post-education and lifelong learning.

Policy Horizons Canada, December 2011, 19

Many educators recognize that they are behind the times in terms of technology, that their students communicate with these tools, and educators need to learn how to integrate social networking and content-sharing tools into teaching.

edWeb.net, MCH Strategic Data, & MMS Education, 2009, 9

...technology can no longer be framed as separate and outside of the typical business of schooling. Instead, educators must frame technology as inextricably embedded within the social and educational elements of school.

Ahn, Bivona, & DiScala, 2011, 2

**Research Question**

This study explored the following research question in School District 10, Arrow Lakes:

1) How does consultation between a post-secondary researcher and a K-12 district impact the development of social media policy and practice?
**Background**

This last year has been a turbulent time for education in British Columbia. There have been challenging contract negotiations between the province and the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation that resulted in a long-standing teacher job action. With a lack of progress in negotiations, the job action erupted into a full-blown strike as of March 5, 2012 with the government tabling legislation to force the union back to work. Additionally, over the course of the year the British Columbia Ministry of Education has been attempting to roll-out new educational initiatives based on the concepts of 21st Century Learning and personalized instruction. Some of these education plans address standards, policies, and practices with regard to mobile devices. For example, in the Ministry of Education’s “2012/2013 Transformation + Technology Update”, the province committed to:

- “Establishing a technology forum to exchange information and ideas between the education sector partners.” (18)
- “Piloting the Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) model to determine what works in standards, policies, and best practices.” (18)
- “Working to create more mobile options for staff, such as participating in a pilot for expanding the range of mobile devices with Shared Services BC.” (19)
- “Exploring the BYOD approach in the Ministry through a partnership with the Office of BC’s Chief Information Office” (19)

While the “2012/2013 Transformation + Technology Update” makes overt references to mobile devices, there is little consideration given to how educators might pursue harnessing the power of Web 2.0 and social media for education—indicating a disconnect between the priorities of the British Columbia Ministry of Education and the technology priorities of the Canadian federal
government as articulated by the Policy Horizons Canada (2011) in “Governing by Wiki: Fast, Flat, and Furious Social Media Foresight Study”.

**Social and Professional Context: Educators and Technology**

Educators in every society fulfill a dual purpose—instructing students in a variety of disciplines, and training future citizens to take their place as productive members of society. In “Chapter 3: The Nature of Technology”, Rutherford and Ahlgren (1991) argue that “scientists, mathematicians, and engineers have a special role in looking as far ahead and as far afield as is practical to estimate benefits, side effects, and risks” of technology for society. Educators, positioned as they are to train today’s youth, may be uniquely situated to scaffold the students to leverage the interdependencies of society and technology in a way that has yet to be fully explored. Educators are well positioned to guide students—our future citizens—in technology use, skill development, relating to and through technology, and in thinking about technology in complex, systematic, and socially responsible ways.

Government and business are two sectors that have historically lead the way in the development, adoption and proliferation of technology. The general public’s relationship with technology is still young—historically speaking—reaching back around 60 years while publicly funded education in Canada has been around for about 200 years. To put that in perspective, the evolution from mainframe computer to Apple iPad has occurred in a period shorter than the life expectancy of a child born this year in 189 of the 221 countries ranked in the CIA World Factbook (2012). Similarly, public education’s relationship with technology is a relatively new phenomenon. It wasn’t until the 1980s the technology began to gain a significant foothold in
North American education (Murdock, n.d.). Moreover, the last 10-15 years have seen significant technological changes with the rise of the Web 2.0 and the participatory web, and new hardware emerging in the form of web-enabled, user-friendly mobile devices. (See Appendix A: Education and Technology: Events, Influences, & Trends.) Schools have found it difficult to keep pace.

**Policy, Professional Development, & Practice**

School district policy plays a significant role in teachers’ uptake of technology. Brooks (2011) states in “Locating Leadership: The Blind Spot in Alberta’s Technology Policy Discourse”,

> Education policy documents contribute to, in vary degrees, setting provincial direction, supporting implementation of policy directions within jurisdictions and potentially influencing public discourse. The way thinking about technology is endorsed in and through education policy influences how technology is taken up in schools. (5)

Brooks’ (2011) quote highlights the issue inherent in any district’s dichotomous relationship to Web 2.0 and social media technologies. While Lemke et al. (2009) found that almost 75% of school administrators in the United States believed that Web 2.0 and social networking had positive applications for education, 70% of the school districts surveyed banned social networking while allowing prescribed educational use for most of the other Web 2.0 tools (e.g. blogging, using wikis, sharing music or sound files, sharing visual media, posting messages, participating in virtual worlds, playing interactive games, creating polls or surveys, etc). (9)

The policy in such a case not only guides teacher practice away from social networking technologies—but officially prohibits it. As Ahn, et al. (2011) point out, “the proliferation of
new technologies, media, and services often challenge the established policy and regulatory order” and “introduce new pressures on educational institutions” (2). They go on to say,

*The use of social media in public primary and secondary education (K-12) presents schools with numerous obstacles and constraints. Educators might use new media to enrich the classroom, but there are also accounts of grave student misconduct (such as cyber bullying) and legal liabilities for school districts. Education leaders and policy makers face difficult questions of how to promote access and use of technology while safeguarding children.* (Ahn, et al., 2011, 1)

New technology policies like those addressing social media are emerging. Ahn, et al. (2011) found that while the majority of U.S. school district acceptable use policies were silent on the issue of social media, 34% permitted use of social media with restrictions; 24% “allowed access with approval or supervision from a teacher or the school’s administration” (7); and 14% banned its use outright. In just two years, these figures stand in stark contrast to the 2009 U.S. figures of Lemke, et al. (2009) where 70% of districts were banning social media. Furthermore, Ahn, et al. (2011) point out “…very few districts explicitly noted that social media had potential educational value and use in the classroom” (7).

Ultimately, in the absence of relevant, thoughtful policy, a vacuum forms. The dangers are that educators will either fill that vacuum with unofficial practice by subverting the official policy prohibitions—thereby exposing themselves and their students to personal and professional consequences—or they will be paralyzed and forego the opportunity to use a powerful, engaging set of tools in the service of learning. To date there has been little—if any—discussion in the literature about the ways in which educators might subvert official policy and practice to use new technologies like Web 2.0 and social media tools in the service of teaching and learning.
Brooks (2011) suggests that reticence from engaging in policy development with regard to new technologies might stem from a variety of factors:

- there is an implicit “assumed connection between technology and improved student learning outcomes” (9)—technology is implicitly expected to generate improvements;
- “a lack of interest or perhaps relevance to the core work” of administrators (9).
- a potential mismatch between how technology enhances student learning and how it is officially measured by the provincial body (10).

Further, Ahn, et al. (2011) point out that lack of engagement with policy creation—or banning of technology—can stem from concerns regarding “high profile legal battles for school districts” (1). Like Rutherford and Ahlgren (1991), Brooks (2011) goes on to say “educational leaders must also consider how a technology will influence how students and teachers work together. Carefully considering what teaching and learning will look and sound like after a technology is introduced” (12) is important because technology can change the way we teach and learn.

In her review of professional development literature, Desimone (2009) found evidence suggesting “that policy can play a role in influencing who participates in effective professional development” (192). Similarly, Weiss, et al. (2005) consider policy support to be a critical workforce input along with professional development and organizational capacity to affect outcomes and long term impacts for children and youth. While policy is an important factor in the adoption of technology, Brooks (2011) points out that classroom teachers don’t often have the opportunity to contribute to setting policy and direction with regard to technology use in schools or the province. Brooks (2011) posits that when teachers become integral to this process they will be able to contribute technology perspectives and ideas that might otherwise be overlooked by other stakeholders with differing agendas. However, to be effective partners
in the discourse around technology, to exploit the full potential of social media for educational aims, educators must be knowledgeable, reflective users of technology themselves; specifically, more fluent in Web 2.0 and social media technologies.

**Educators’ Use of Technology**

Despite American school district administrators’ strong stance against social media use, Lemke, et al. (2009) found that other Web 2.0 technologies were widely used in school districts and/or formal curricula. (See Figure 1.0 Reported adoption of Web 2.0 technologies in US school districts.)

![Figure 1.0. Reported adoption of Web 2.0 technologies in US school districts (Lemke, et al., 2009).](image)

In 2009, edWeb.net, MCH Strategic Data, and MMS Education surveyed 1,284 educators (teachers, principals, and librarians) regarding their use of social networking and content-sharing tools. The researchers found that 61% had joined a social network and that these
individuals participated “in more online activities than educators who had not joined a social network” (2009, 5). The research found that these educators were also “more positive about the value of this technology for education than those who haven’t [joined social networking sites]” (edWeb.net, et al., 2009, 5). Educators using social networking did so for the personal desire to connect with family and friends, and for the professional desire to connect with colleagues and to stay current with the technology (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). In context with the social media bans uncovered by Lemke, et al. (2009) in 70% of US school districts, the lack of social networking use in the classrooms is understandable.

edWeb.net, et al. (2009) found that “Social networks dedicated to education...have low penetration thus far, but there is growing awareness.” In fact, some respondents learned about sites such as Classroom 2.0, and edWeb.net from the survey instrument itself (edWeb.net, et al. 2009). In “Final Report: A Survey of K-12 Educators on Social Networking and Content-Sharing Tools,” the researchers found that “Although educators are joining social networks, they express a need for guidance, training, and professional development” and have expressed frustration with schools and districts that “often block access to sites” (edWeb.net, et al., 2009, 8). The research goes on to report, “Many educators recognize that they are behind the times in terms of technology, that their students communicate with these tools, and educators need to learn how to integrate social networking and content-sharing tools into teaching” (edWeb.net, et al., 2009, 9). Whether an issue of the survey instrument, or an oversight on the part of the respondents, no connections were made between school policy and social media use by educators in this research.
With regard to social media use by educators, the most heavily used social networking site by far was Facebook, with 85% of respondents reporting membership (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). Significant memberships were also reported in MySpace (20%), LinkedIn (14%), Ning (11%) (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). edWeb.net, et al. (2009) found that while teachers, librarians, and principals were most likely to join Facebook, librarians were more likely than other groups to be members of Ning, and principals were more likely to be members of LinkedIn (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). Furthermore, the most popular tools used by educators were YouTube for personal use, Wikipedia for personal use, and webinars for professional use (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). The tools reportedly used most in classrooms were Wikipedia, YouTube, and TeacherTube (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). The tools reportedly used most in a professional context were webinars, Wikipedia, YouTube, Google Docs, wikis, and TeacherTube (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). By educator subgroup, librarians tended to be the most prolific users of Web 2.0 technologies for professional uses, followed by principals (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). Additionally, both groups exhibited significantly higher use of these technologies for professional reasons than did teachers (edWeb.net, et al., 2009). However, when it came to the classroom context—as one would expect—teachers were the more prolific users of Web 2.0 technologies followed by librarians; principals trailed both subgroups significantly (edWeb.net, et al., 2009).

**Impacts of Professional Development**

As the epigraphs at the opening of this paper indicate, the common perception is that society is changing in its relationship to/with technology, that education is lagging behind this transformation, and that education must change to keep up with the needs of society. For
instance, in BC the Ministry of Education (2012) and BC Association of School Business Officials found that while almost 90% of BC schools “have some wireless access and many students had internet-connected devices, but ...[no] common strategy that would let students use them to enhance learning at school” (12). Such sentiments sound like a battle cry for educational reform. As Linda Darling-Hammond (1993) said,

Reforms that rely on the transformative power of individuals to rethink their practice and to redesign their institutions can be accomplished only by investing in individual and organizational learning, in the human capital of the educational enterprise—the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teachers and administrators, as well as those of parents and community members. (754)

Such investment in individual and organizational learning is accomplished—in part—by providing opportunities for effective professional development. In her review of the literature on professional development, Desimone (2009) found that “Research increasingly has identified the continuing development and learning of teachers as one of the...critical mediators in the effectiveness of policy for teachers and teaching practice” (181). With regard to technology use by elementary school teachers, O’Dwyer, et al. (2004) found:

- “the strongest predictors of school-to-school differences among teachers’ use of technology...is school-mean perceived pressure to use technology” (13);
- “inadequate professional development...has a negative relationship with technology use for delivering instruction” (13);
- increasing variety in technology-based professional development has “a small positive effect” on technology use(13).
O’Dwyer, et al. (2004) also found

*The strongest positive predictor of whether a teacher will use technology to deliver instruction...have their students use technology during class time...and have their students create products using technology...is a teacher’s belief about the positive impact of technology for students.*(15)

For Weiss, et al. (2006), professional development is but one of three main elements affecting outcomes and ultimately impacting learning. The other elements are organizational capacity and policy support (Weiss, et al., 2006). Weiss, et al. (2006) describe a logic model to show the interrelationships between these three elements, outcomes (short, intermediate, and long term), and impacts. (See Figure 2.0. The Weiss, et. al Logic Model.)

![The Logic Model](image)

*Figure 2.0. The Weis, et al. Logic model (2005)*

Though developed to enhance the human services workforce, Weiss, et al.’s (2005) logic model has clear applications for education; though in reviewing the literature on early
childhood education, Weiss, et al., (2005) found that model pathways varied according to the education sector in question. As delineated by the model, the short term outcomes of effective professional development are increased knowledge, skill, and competencies; improved organizational supports for staff; and improved policy to sustain the workforce (Weiss, et al., 2005). In the mid-range outcomes, professional development can influence improved practice and increased professionalism (Weiss, et al., 2005). In the long term, professional development can influence the quality of experiences for children and youth, and potentially create improved outcomes (Weiss, et al., 2005).

**Professional Development: Assessment Model Selection & Design**

A guiding question of the case study in SD 10 was “How does consultation between a post-secondary researcher and a K-12 district impact the development of social media policy and practice?” As this consultation was to be provided in the form of 2 professional development sessions, the delivery and outcomes would need to be assessed. As Kutner, et al. (1997) state, before professional development can impact learner outcomes it must first “be positively perceived by instructors who participate in such services; and it must enhance their knowledge and skills as well as have an impact on their instructional behavior” (5). This framework for assessing professional development is clearly rooted in the Four Level Model developed by Donald Kirkpatrick. Kirkpatrick first developed the Four Level Model in the late 1950s to evaluate employee training programs (Wikipedia, March 7, 2012). He extended his work in years that followed (Wikipedia, March 7, 2012) and many of his ideas transitioned in to the field of educational professional development. The Four Level Model evaluates participant reactions, learning, behavior, and results (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).
The case study survey designed for evaluating the professional development impact in School District 10 was designed based on the Four Level Model focusing on short-term outcomes. It does not address any long-term outcomes or impacts, and like the Weiss, et al. (2006) model, assumes that policy supports and organizational capacity must also be addressed to affect outcomes. As Kutner, et al., (1997) write,

> During the first year of a professional development initiative, data collection efforts should focus on changes in instructor knowledge and behavior, with perhaps a preliminary assessment of program services and learners. It is only after instructors have the opportunity to practice the skills that professional development activities are intended to promote, and to participate in repeated professional development activities that reinforce and enhance what is being learned, that an evaluation will be able to reveal effects on program services. Finally, improvement in learner outcomes can be realized only after program services have changed in response to instructor changes that result from professional development activities. (44)

The survey was also designed as a retrospective pretest. A retrospective pretest is defined by Preskill (2005) as when “the evaluator collects data at one time but asks for recall of behavior or conditions prior to, as well as after, the intervention or program”(104). Reliance on recall over time can be somewhat problematic as the time gap between training and assessment can obscure respondents’ memories of their experiences of the professional development event.

**Professional Development: SD 10**

Since 2007, Julia Hengstler, has been presenting in British Columbia on digital professionalism for teachers with a focus on social media and Web 2.0 technologies. During August 2011, the researcher was invited by School District 10, Arrow Lakes, British Columbia, to provide professional development sessions to support policy and best practices development in
the area of Web 2.0 and social media: one for district administrators, and another for the full district faculty. In the British Columbia public education system, educators have allocated days and time for professional development: some professional development activities are self-selected by educators, and other activities are specified by the educators’ school or district. The professional development sessions provided by the researcher fell under ‘district professional development’ days as opposed to self-directed days. All district staff were expected to attend one of the two sessions depending on their role in the district.

The researcher provided separate training sessions for teachers and administrators based on a framework of digital professionalism developed by the researcher (Hengstler, 2011; Kuehn, 2010). Sessions addressed the use of all digital technologies by educators with specific discussion of social media and Web 2.0 tools in the context of creating and managing digital footprints - traces or records of a person’s online activities (Hengstler, 2011). The professional development sessions were provided in the following format:

- one day of professional development with school district administrators delivered at the school board office in Nakusp, BC; (n=approximately 6)
- one day of professional development with school staff delivered at Nakusp Elementary School; (n=approximately 40)

While qualitatively similar in that both sessions addressed the issues of digital professionalism in a Web 2.0 world and the researcher’s suggested theoretical scaffolding for developmentally appropriate student access to technology tools, the presentation for administrators focused more intently on policy and practice issues, how policy and practice might be scaffolded (including Canadian, American and British exemplars selected by the researcher as “best practices”), and suggested policy considerations for Web 2.0, social media, and emerging technologies. In contrast, the teacher session focused more on professionalism in personal and professional use of technology, with some suggestions regarding responsible practices for social media use in the classroom (e.g., use of Web 2.0 permission slips, consultation with school administrators in the absence of policy, etc.).
Context: School District 10, Arrow Lakes, British Columbia

The case study focused exclusively on School District 10 (SD10), Arrow Lakes, British Columbia. SD 10 is a small rural school district located in the mountainous southeastern interior of the province. (See Figure 3.0 Location of School District 10, British Columbia.)

Figure 3.0. Location of School District 10, British Columbia (Adapted by J. Hengstler from NordNordWest, 2011)

The district is comprised of six schools: three elementary schools, two elementary-secondary schools (including the Distance Education School), and one senior-secondary school (Ministry of Education, 2012a; School District 10, 2012). SD 10 reported 519 students for the 2011/2012 academic year — 285 enrolled in elementary and 234 in secondary schools as follows:

- 503 in “Standard (regular) school” programs (attending face-to-face classes)
- 16 in the “Distributed Learning Program” (attending courses at distance or mediated through technology) (Ministry of Education, 2012a).

The number of educators (teachers and administrators) working in this district was approximately 40 (Ministry of Education, 2012c). At the time of the survey there were approximately six administrators in the district. The average years of teaching experience reported for educators in the district was 13.5 years (Ministry of Education, 2012c). The majority of experience was roughly distributed in thirds across the brackets 5-9 years, 10-19
years, and 20 years or more (Ministry of Education, 2012c). For teachers as a sub-group, the average experience was 13.1 years with the bulk of teachers falling into the 5-9 years and 10-19 years experience brackets (Ministry of Education, 2012c). The majority (28) of teachers held “professional certificates” with masked remainders holding “basic” or “standard” certificates (Ministry of Education, 2012c). The age of educators in the district ranged from 25 to 64 with an average age of 48.9 years old (Ministry of Education, 2012c) and approximately 25% of the educators in the district were between 50 and 54 years old (Ministry of Education, 2012c).

**Methodology**

The impact of the specialist’s work with the district was assessed using a survey based on D. Kirkpatrick and J. Kirkpatrick’s (2006) Four Level Model for evaluating training programs. This assessment approach addressed four levels: degree of participants’ favourable reaction to the on-site work of the specialist; degree to which participants acquired the intended knowledge and skills; degree to which participants’ behavior was affected; and degree to which the organization or environment was affected by the participants’ training (e.g., drafts of social media policy and practice guidelines were produced; participants actively managed their digital footprints) occurred as a result of the specialist’s on-site sessions and subsequent support. The survey was deployed approximately six months after the professional development training was delivered. The survey was divided into four main sections:

- **Section 1**- demographic data: items regarding respondent role in the district (teacher or administrator) and professional development session attended;

- **Section 2**- respondent’s reaction: items regarding the respondent’s reactions to the training session and trainer;

- **Section 3**- respondent’s learning in 2 sub-sections “Learning as a Result of On-Site Professional Development” (addressing prior knowledge, changes in awareness, beliefs and feelings) and “Behaviour as a Result of Session” (addressing changes in respondent
behavior) within specific contexts: personal, professional, classroom, school, and district.

- Section 4-value of similar training for others: items regarding the respondent’s perception of the value of similar training for other specified groups (in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, school administrators, students, and parents/guardians).

(See Appendix B: Survey Items.) This survey was deployed on FluidSurveys, a secure Canadian survey site.

The purpose of the demographic data was to determine if there were differences in the results from the two separate professional development sessions. The respondents’ reaction section was structured based on Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick’s (2006) Four Level Model for evaluating employee training sessions. In this model, favourable reactions to the professional development trainer and session are assumed to increase the likelihood of the session affecting attendees’ knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes, and therefore increase the likelihood that attendees will incorporate the content from the session into their personal and/or professional practice. The third section was designed to determine potential ways attendees might have changed their behaviours as a result of the professional development sessions. This is what is considered to be evidence of learning a direct result of the professional development sessions. The fourth section of the survey was designed to determine the value of this type of professional development for in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, school administrators, students, and/or parents and guardians. This section was structured to inform the researcher’s practice as the researcher currently delivers similar training to post secondary pre-service teachers, K-12 students, schools/districts and professional teaching associations. The survey was also designed as a retrospective pretest. A retrospective pretest is defined by Preskill (2005) as when “the evaluator collects data at one time but asks for recall of behavior or conditions prior to, as well as after, the intervention or program” (p. 104). Reliance on recall over time can be somewhat problematic as the time gap between training in and assessment can obscure respondents’ memories of their experiences of the professional development event.
SD 10 was distant from the researcher’s location. Consequently, the researcher depended on emails forwarded by administration to recruit the majority of respondents. By the time the survey was deployed, approximately six months after the training session, a provincial job action was in effect. As a result of this job action, teachers were not reading or responding to emails from administration; thus, with union input, the researcher reached out to the local association president to forward the researcher’s emails soliciting respondents.

Results

Of the approximately 40 educators (teachers and administrators) in SD 10, 11 respondents completed the survey for a response rate of approximately 27% of district staff (teachers and administrators). Based on the number of responses (n=11) it was difficult to delineate general results between the two professional development sessions or by demographic subgroup of teacher (n=9) or administrator (n=2).

With regard to Section 2 items (n=6) which addressed the respondents’ reactions to the training session and trainer, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive. The items asked respondents to rate statements on a five point Likert scale which ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Each item was framed in positive language and asked about aspects of the training session. For example: (a) “I liked the Managing Digital Footprints session provided”; (b) “The presenter was good at delivering the session”; (c) “The presentation was engaging”; and (d) “The session topics were interesting and relevant and/or on point”. In all cases, the positive response rates (collapsing agree and strongly agree) ranged from 82% to 90%. Thus, it was clear that participants had positive reactions to all aspects of the training session that were queried.

Given this favourable reaction, the Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) Four Level Model predicts that respondents should evidence some changes in behavior as a result of the professional development session received. Section 3 of the survey was designed to determine participants’ knowledge and attitudes towards social media before the sessions and the impact of the sessions on awareness, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours. Section 3 was divided into two
sections: (a) Section 3A “Learning as a Result of On-Site Professional development”, and (b) Section 3B “Behaviour as a Result of the Session”. An item that was designed to elicit an indication of prior knowledge respondents might have had about the professional development topic before the researcher’s sessions had one of the lowest (45%) positive responses. Thus, the likelihood of change in knowledge, attitudes and behaviours was high. The responses to all items in Section 3 regarding learning directly resulting from the onsite professional development demonstrated that the professional development sessions affected changes in respondents’ knowledge, attitudes, or behaviours within all the specific contexts (personal, professional, classroom, school, and district) addressed by the survey. Responses ranged from a low of 55% (agree or strongly agree) to a high of 100%. The higher percentages of positive responses ranged from 72% to 100%. Most significantly, the highest positive response (100%) was to Item 8 in Section 3A: “I believe more that students need support and scaffolding in use of social media.” Additionally, 91% of respondents indicated positive responses to:

- “This session raised my awareness that there was a lot I didn’t know about digital footprints, social media & Web 2.0” [Section 3A, Item 2].

- “I know of the professional issues that can arise in using social media” [Section 3A, Item 4].

Though remaining items from Section 3A: “Learning as a Result of On-Site Professional Development” received a lower (82% to 72%) positive response, they still indicated positive impacts of the professional development:

- “I know more about managing digital footprints in social media than I did before” (82%) [Item 3].

- “I know more about the issues that can arise for schools in using social media” (82%) [Item 6].

- “I know more about the issues that can arise for students in using social media” (81%) [Item 5].
• “I believe that the practices of the teacher in and out of the classroom can form student behavior with social media” (72%) [Item 9].
• “I believe that my school needs to directly address social media in our policies and procedures” (72%) [Item 10].
• “I believe that my district needs to directly address social media in our policies and procedures” (72%) [Item 11].

The results in Section 3 of the survey also indicated that though there were a variety of aspects for which the professional development was less effective; two items garnered the lowest (18%) positive response: “I felt more confident about using or trying to use social media” (Section 3A, Item 13) and “This session influenced me to develop classroom practices and policies for social media use (e.g., permission slips, and guidelines)” (Section 3B, Item 11). Also, “This session influenced me to develop district practices and policies for social media use (e.g., permission slips, and guidelines)” (Section 3B, Item 7) had a low positive response of 27%. The remaining items in Section 3B “Behaviour as a Result of the Session” with a relatively low positive response were related to changes in behaviours. In order from lower to higher percentage response, they addressed professional use of social media, feeling more likely to use social media, personal use of social media, developing school-wide practices and policies for social media, creating a positive digital footprint, and raising awareness of social media issues at the district level.

Responses to Section 4, which assessed whether respondents thought similar training would be valuable for others—specifically in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, school administrators, students, and parents/guardians—received the most consistently high percentages of positive responses ranging from 73% to 100%. Participants gave a 100% positive response to two items:

• “Developmentally appropriate sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for students” [Item 4].
“Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for parents and guardians” [Item 5].

The next highest positive percentage response (91%) was to “Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for pre-service teachers” (Item 2). There were two remaining items in this section which also received positive responses but to a lesser degree:

- “Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for in-service teachers” (82%) [Item 1].
- “Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for school administrators” (73%) [Item 3].

Moreover, though there were no open ended items with regard to value of this type of professional development for other stakeholders, one respondent used an “Other comments?” box at the end of the survey to suggest, “Similar sessions for educational assistants, community workers (mental health, social work, etc.) school boards and other stakeholders. Where appropriate, adapted sessions for students with developmental disabilities and mental health challenges.” Therefore, respondents valued the content of the professional development sessions highly enough to recommend them to their colleagues and other stakeholders in school communities.

Within the scope of the survey, respondents had several opportunities for open ended responses. One of the items was, “In your view, what were two important strengths of the training?” (Item 5, Reactions to Training Sessions & Trainer). All but one of the respondents (n=10) to the survey answered this item. Responses indicated that key strengths of the training were the timeliness of the professional development with regard to what is occurring in the larger social/technological context—especially with regard to children; as well as the training emphases on the need to stay current with technology, and raising attendees’ awareness about digital footprints. The knowledge, expertise, and delivery of the presenter were also cited as strengths. One respondent noted,
Provision of sample policy, background research, source material, and other supporting docs is invaluable. Depth and breadth and support in presentations makes it likely that change will occur as a result. We know where to go next, and trust the process.

Another respondent said that a strength of the training was learning “Caution when using social media. All students need to be given instruction on social media behaviour, life-long implications, responsibility associated with using this form of communication.”

Responses to open ended items soliciting weaknesses of the training sessions were slightly lower in number (n=8); 50% of those who responded took the opportunity to cite issues with technological access or infrastructure in the district. Respondents also cited a desire for more hands-on, interactive activities, “Practical applications. It would be nice to go through accounts and create or manage them with the presenter.”

Where respondents had the opportunity to share actions they have taken as a result of the professional development, responses were lower and ranged from n=4-5. Some reported changes in individual and instructional behavior reported were:

- Being more ‘cautious’ or ‘careful’ with regard to social media and Web 2.0 use and sharing this perspective with students using social media
- Expanding upon what respondents were previously sharing with students regarding social media use
- Checking and controlling what’s online with regard to respondent’s identity, including photos
- Using pseudonyms to protect identities
- Better personal branding when using social media/Web 2.0
- Trying a Moodle forum for students
- Increased Twitter use
Discussion

Overall, the district case study results indicated that that the professional development sessions provided by the researcher (Hengstler) on managing digital footprints, addressing professionalism, social media and Web 2.0, positively influenced professional awareness, and knowledge about social media and Web 2.0. The results also indicated, to a lesser extent, that the professional development training influenced changes in behavior, practice, and policies at the personal/professional, school and district levels.

A large majority (91%) stated the sessions raised their awareness that there was “a lot” they did not know about digital footprints. Considering that 45% of respondents reported prior knowledge on the topic, this indicated that the training increased knowledge among entry level learners as well as those who had prior knowledge. The greatest impacts reported as a result of the training sessions were:

- Respondents believing that students need more support and scaffolding around social media (100%);
- Respondents perceiving value in similar, developmentally appropriate sessions for students (100%), parents and guardians (100%), and pre-service teachers (91%).

These results affirmed the value of the researcher’s (Hengstler’s) previous work with K-12 sector students, and her concept for developing training materials appropriate to parents and guardians with regard to digital footprints, social media, and Web 2.0. The results also affirmed the researcher’s (Hengstler’s) ongoing work with pre-service and in-service teachers in this area and indicated that the respondents valued the contents of the professional development training sessions highly enough to recommend them to their colleagues and other stakeholders. In fact, one respondent indicated a desire for

*Similar sessions for educational assistants, community workers (mental health, social work, etc.) school boards and other stakeholders. Where appropriate, adapted sessions for student with developmental disabilities and mental health challenges.*
This comment provided potential directions for developing additional professional development training on the topic of digital footprints, social media, and Web 2.0.

Interestingly, the positive response to the value of similar training for pre-service teachers (91%) was higher than the value attributed to training for in-service teachers (82%). That difference may be attributed to in-service educators’ perceptions that faculties of education and teacher training programs should focus on emergent issues or that in-service educators have other, more relevant ‘practical’ topics for professional development. More research is needed to determine why this difference emerged. Responses may also be due to ‘newness’ of the technology, or the fact that managing social media and Web 2.0 behaviour for educators and students is still an emergent area. This gap could also be related to the age demographics of the district. As an emergent area, training is not readily or widely available because expertise in these areas is still confined to a small group in the educational community—British Columbia and elsewhere. Moreover, perceived need for training across a variety of stakeholder groups may be because the topics of digital footprints, social media and Web 2.0 have not yet been embedded in provincial curricula. To date, no specific body has stepped forward to coordinate training or supply information in this area—as has been done with anti-drinking and driving campaigns, recycling efforts, etc. Currently, the most consistent organizational response to this topic has been the application and/or updating of acceptable use policies and/or prohibitions—generally at the school level.

It was also notable that the majority of respondents (91%) reported that the professional development sessions raised their awareness about how much they didn’t know about digital footprints, social media, and Web 2.0; and increased their knowledge of the professional issues that can arise in using social media. Kutner et al.’s (1997) review of professional development literature indicated that “one-shot” professional development activities such as the one provided in the case study were unlikely to affect behavior. In the Four Level Model (2006), the ability of the training to affect participant behavior moves training to the third level. In the case study, while the perceived need for school and district policy received a 72% positive response, at the time of the survey (six months post-training), 55% of
respondents also reported being influenced by the training to develop school-wide practice and polices for social media use (e.g., permission slips, and guidelines). The literature in the field has yet to determine the critical mass required for affecting change in technological policy and practice in a school district; however, if over half (55%) of a sample of the district was moved to take some type of action at the school level, that represented a significant movement as a result of the professional development training for a school, and by extension, the district. One respondent commented that as a result of the professional development, “Several teachers in one of my schools have been teaching social media/dig[ital.] footprint in their Planning/HCE classes—this was a school wide decision by our staff”.

This influence on school-related practice and policy may have been affected by several factors. Firstly, the separate training provided to the school district administrators (of which faculty were made aware), the commitment of district resources allotted for the training, the commitment of the “district day” training to the topic; and the fact that all district administrators and faculty were expected to attend a training session may have signaled to all educators in the district an ‘upper level’ significance or priority for the topic. Perhaps the district-wide scale of the training might have been the most significant factor as it also meant that a professional-interest group could coalesce at the school level—and in each school in the district—around a shared knowledge base and similarly heightened awareness of issues. The relatively small size of the district lent itself to this type of full-scale training. It is unclear at this point in time whether similar district-wide training in a substantially larger district would have a similar effect.

The positive response regarding the influence of the professional training on the development of district practices and policies was roughly half of that found at the school level (27%). The higher positive response for school versus district influence to act could have resulted from a variety of factors. Some of these might be faculty perception that their sphere of concern/influence is located more at the level of the school than at the district; teachers’ perceptions that the business of district-wide policy and practice is more relevant to administrative roles and takes place in the school board office; or that a larger number of
teachers do not have sufficient time to influence district practices and policy. The level of positive response was even higher (60%) for being influenced in the more individualistic behavior of creating a positive digital footprint for their professional identity. That said, regarding district-wide influence of the training, two respondents reported “A district committee has been struck” and another stated that s/he had presented to the board to help “form[a] committee to develop policy.” From a complexity thinking perspective these results can be interpreted in terms of the multiple levels of complex systems that teachers regularly participate in. In some systems (their own personal behaviour and at the school level) they feel more control than at the district level.

In future research, potential factors affecting faculty perceived spheres of participation should be considered alongside the provision of professional development training regarding the development of social media and Web 2.0 practices and policies. Further, since the case study district had relatively few schools, administrators, staff and potential stakeholder inputs, future research should consider whether smaller districts might be more nimble and responsive in the design and development of district-wide practices and policies such as those relating to social media and Web 2.0.

Due to the structure of the professional development sessions—‘one-shot’ presentations rather than workshops, or presentations with follow-up sessions—it was not surprising that evidence of impact on behaviours was not as strong as the influences on knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes, or that responses to open ended questions asked for more “hands-on” time to practice what was presented in the training sessions. These responses will inform future professional development design by the researcher (Hengstler) in this area. Additional follow-up sessions might be designed to complement the ‘one-shot’ presentation content focusing on the areas with lower positive responses (45-60%): professional uses of social media, personal uses of social media, and creating a positive professional digital footprint. This was a limitation of the professional development design that could be addressed by providing additional sessions in the case study district.
As the school district in the case study was rural and remote, access to professional development appeared to be an ongoing theme. Additional partnerships between post-secondary faculties of education and rural districts such as the one in this case study may help provide opportunities for further professional development. While not an intended focus of this research, an outcome was that a partnership between post-secondary faculty with the knowledge and skills in this area and British Columbia’s K-12 schools might provide a model to address this specific professional development gap while fostering relationships with the potential to encourage symbiotic learning partnerships, reduce duplicate efforts, and share knowledge and experience provincially, nationally, and internationally.

Conclusions

The results of the case study found that a professional development session focused on developing social media practices and policies in the teaching profession had a positive impact on teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and behaviours. The case study results provided insight into a potentially effective professional development model for enhancing teachers’ confidence in developing social media policy, changing classroom practice and their own professional social media practices. Case study findings highlighted benefits of additional cooperation between faculties of education and the K-12 and post secondary fields—connecting educational research and practice with the goal of increasing pedagogical skill and efficacy. The findings will be of increasing importance as districts and ministries of education strive to meet calls for 21st century learning in schools.
Appendix A: Education and Technology: Events, Influences, & Trends (J. Hengstler, 2012)

While schools made use of television in the early 1950’s, technology as defined by the emergence of the computer did not gain prevalence in North American schools until the 1980s (Murdock, n.d.). Many older educators in North American systems have lived through the emergence and proliferation of the personal computer within their professional and possibly middle school/high school student lives. Many educators have lived through the emergence and proliferation of the Internet as a teacher, but likely also as a middle or high school student. Few educators in the profession today have experience of Web 2.0 and mobile technologies—the Internet dominated by Amazon, Google, blogs, wikis, YouTube and the like, mobile devices—prior to their professional career. Below is a timeline of events, influences, and trends affecting the use of technology in education. The sources for this timeline were Everett Murdock’s (n.d.) “History, the History of Computers, and the History of Computers in Education” and various Wikipedia articles as cited.

- **Early 1950s:** first commercial mainframes sold to University of Manchester and University of Toronto; first mass produced computers (Wikipedia, February 2012)
  
  ![Example of a mainframe](Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 2005)

- **Mid 1950s to Early 1960s:** IBM develops smaller more affordable commercial computer; transistors replace vacuum tubes in computers significantly reducing size, purchase prices and maintenance costs; emergence of peripherals devices (Wikipedia, February 2012)

- **Mid 1960s:** some schools received mainframe and mini computers—computers that were using punch-cards for inputting data and outputting via line printers; where available most schools used computers “for administration of for school counseling (databases for information about and for students)” (Murdock, n.d.)

  ![Example of a punch card](Gwern, 2006)
• Early 1970s: “mainframes and minicomputers in some schools, but very little use in the delivery of instruction” primarily because they weren’t compatible with the “teacher/manager model of learning” in a single classroom; computers were widely used in business, microprocessor developed; early instructional programs for mainframe and microcomputers developed (Murdock, n.d.);

---

First commercial microprocessor, Intel 4004 (LucaDetomi, 2005)

---

• Mid 1970s: Apple sells first Apple computer, Apple I (Wikipedia, February 2012a); Apple begins to donate first personal computers to schools; some schools stick to the mainframe/microcomputer infrastructure in which they had invested time and effort rather than transition to the new PCs (Murdock, n.d.);

Byte into an Apple .......... $666.66*

---

The Apple I (Apple Computer Company, 1976)

---

• 1979: estimated 15 million PCs in use in the United States
• Early 1980’s: mainframe manufacturers develop PCs; computer assisted instruction “gains acceptance in schools”; early educational drill and practice programs developed for PCs; early simple simulations programs developed for PCs (Murdock, n.d.); first presentation software released (Wikipedia 2011, Bruno)

T180- Z80-microcomputer by Digital Equipment Corp. (Berberich, 2000)

• Mid 1980s: Apple Macintosh introduced; commercial software manufacturers begin developing computer-based tutorials and educational games; 25% of American secondary schools using PCs for “college career guidance, K-8 schools buying mostly Apple II and Macintosh computers, high schools buying mostly DOS-based clones” (Murdock, n.d.);

Apple II (Rama & Musée Bolo, 2000)

• Late 1980s: “60% of all workers in the US use computers”; emergence of laptop computers (Murdock, n.d.);

Toshiba T3200 Laptop (Liftarn, 2007)
- Early 1990s: multimedia PCs developed; schools use videodiscs; simulations, educational databases, and other computer assisted instruction delivered on CD-ROM, many incorporating animation and sound; early access to online information through Gopher servers (Murdock, n.d.); first search engine “Archie” from McGill University (Computer Hope, n.d.)

![CD ROM Drive (Wikimedia Commons, 2007)](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:CD-ROM_Drive.jpg)

- Mid 1990s: digital video, virtual reality, 3-d technologies emerge; business PCs more prevalent than multimedia PCs; object-oriented authoring systems; “most US classrooms now have at least one PC available for instructional delivery, but not all teachers have access to a computer for instructional preparation” (Murdock, n.d.);

![IBM PC running Windows 95 c. 1995](https://www.windows95.org/)

- 1995: Internet and world wide web grows in popularity; businesses, schools, and individuals begin creating web pages; computer assisted instruction is growing in popularity and is CD-ROM based (Murdock, n.d.); Amazon goes online (company started in 1994) (Wikipedia, March 6, 2012)

![http://](https://www.gettyimages.com/license/102864421)
• Mid to Late 1990s: Internet continues to grow in popularity; businesses, schools, and individuals begin creating web pages; computer assisted instruction is growing in popularity and is CD-ROM based; businesses use Internet for advertising and product/service delivery; new graphics and multimedia tools “for the delivery of information and instruction using the Internet; many schools are requiring for Internet access; a few schools install web servers and provide faculty with a way to create instructional web pages.” (Murdock, n.d.); early smart phones sold (Wikipedia, March 7, 2012); Google launched (Wikipedia, , wikis emerge (Wikipedia, February 20, 2012); blogs emerge (Wikipedia, March 5, 2012); social bookmarking emerges and tagging systems developed (Wikipedia, February 19, 2012); photo and video sharing sites emerge

Google logo (Google, Inc. 2011)

• 2000-2005: Wikipedia launched; proliferation of social media like Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Flickr; emergence of tablet PCs for consumers (Evans, 2011)

Compaq TC1000 c. 2003 (Lozére, 2005)

• 2006-2010: Apple launches first iPhone (Wikipedia, March 7, 2012), iPod Touch (iPod History, 2010), and Android operating system released (Wikipedia, March 7, 2012); Amazon Kindle released; Apple iPad released (Evans, 2011)

Original iPhone (Andrew, 2008)
Appendix B: Survey Items (J. Hengstler, 2012)

Anonymous Online Survey Questions: Social Media & Managing Digital Footprints: Investigating Influence and Impact of Professional Development

Note: These questions pertain to the professional development training in managing digital footprints and social media use provided to School District 10 (Arrow Lakes) by Julia Hengstler (Summer 2011).

Training Audience & Sessions

Instructions: Please indicate your response by clicking in the appropriate box. Where available, you may type a text response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am a School District 10: (please check all that apply)</td>
<td>[Text response]</td>
<td>Nakusp Elementary (District Wide)</td>
<td>School Board Office (Administrators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Session I attended: (please check all that apply)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reactions to Training Session & Trainer

*Instructions: Please indicate your response by clicking in the appropriate box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>I liked the Managing Digital Footprints session provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>The presenter was good at delivering the session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>The presentation was engaging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>The session topics were interesting, relevant and/or on point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Please answer the questions by typing your response in the text box provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) In your view, what were 2 important strengths of the training?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) In your view, what were 2 important weaknesses of the training?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning as a Result of On Site Professional Development

*Instructions: Please indicate your response by clicking in the appropriate box. Where available, you may type a text response.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Before this session, I knew a lot about social media and digital footprints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This session raised my awareness that there was a lot I didn’t know about digital footprints, social media &amp; web 2.0 use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I know more about managing digital footprints in social media than I did before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I know of the professional issues that can arise in using social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I know more about the issues that can arise for students in using social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I know more about the issues that can arise for schools in using social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I know more about the issues that can arise for districts in using social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) I believe more that students need support and scaffolding in use of social media.

9) I believe that the practices of the teacher in and out of the classroom can form student behavior with social media.

10) I believe that my school needs to directly address social media in our policies and procedures.

11) I believe that my district needs to directly address social media in our policies and procedures.

12) I felt more likely to use social media in my role as a professional.

13) I felt more confident about using or trying to use social media.
Behaviour as a Result of the Session

*Instructions: Please indicate your response by clicking in the appropriate box. Where available, you may type a text response.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The session affected my personal use of social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If the session affected your personal use, please briefly explain how.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Text box for response here.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The session affected my professional use of social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If the session affected your professional use, please briefly explain how.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Text box for response here.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The session influenced me to create a positive digital footprint for my professional identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If the session influenced you to create a positive digital footprint for your professional identity, please briefly describe some activities it prompted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Text box for response here.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The session influenced me to encourage students to create positive professional footprints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If the session influenced you to encourage students to create positive professional footprints, please briefly describe some activities it prompted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Text box for response here.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) The session influenced me to develop classroom practices and policies for social media use (e.g. permission, slips, and guidelines).
   a. If the session influenced you to develop classroom practices and policies for social media use. (E.g. permission, slips, guidelines), please briefly describe some classroom practices or policies it prompted you to develop.

6) The session influenced me to consider school-wide practices and policies for social media use (e.g. permission, slips, and guidelines).
   a. If the session influenced you to consider school-wide practices and policies for social media use. (E.g. permission, slips, and guidelines), please briefly describe some activities it prompted.

7) The session influenced me to consider district practices and policies for social media use (e.g. permission, slips, and guidelines).
   a. If the session influenced you to consider district practices and policies for social media use. (E.g. permission, slips, and guidelines), please briefly describe some activities it prompted.
### Value of Similar Training for Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for in-service teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for pre-service teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for school administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Developmentally appropriate sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Sessions similar to the one(s) I attended should be provided for parents and guardians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Comments?

Instructions: Please indicate your response by typing your text in the response box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Do you have any further comments for the researcher?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Potential for Further Contact

PLEASE NOTE:
- Providing your name and contact information means that the researcher, Julia Hengstler, will be able to identify you with these responses. Should you provide this information, the researcher will maintain the confidentiality of your responses.
- Please note that not all those who indicate their willingness to participate in a follow-up interview may be contacted to do so.

Instructions: Please indicate your response by clicking in the appropriate box. Where available, you may type a text response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Would you be willing to volunteer for a follow-up telephone interview of no more than 10-20 minutes with the researcher, Julia Hengstler?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Text box for response here." /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If you are willing to be contacted by the researcher to discuss or extend your responses to this survey, please enter your name and preferred contact details in the text box provided.

![Text box for response here.](https://example.com)
References


Wikipedia. (March 5, 2012). Blogs. Retrieved from

