OVERCOMING RESTRICTIONS OF INTERNET ACCEPTABLE USE POLICES IN K-12 SCHOOLS: SUPPORTING EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS IMPLEMENTING WEB 2.0 TOOLS

by

Tracy Cameron

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF
EDUCATION
(Leadership)

VANCOUVER ISLAND UNIVERSITY

We accept the Process Paper as conforming to the required standard.

_____

Randy LaBonte, Major Project Faculty Supervisor Date:
Faculty of Education,
Vancouver Island University

_____

Harry Janzen, Dean Date:
Faculty of Education,
Vancouver Island University

Acknowledgements

This journey has been a long, but rewarding path and one I could not have taken alone. I would like to thank my husband, Jason who has been incredibly supportive and understood the amount of time I needed to invest in my studying; thank you for your patience. I also could not have finished this journey without the very generous support from my loving parents Martin and Heather Cameron. Thanks, mom and dad! I know I always have your support in all forms of the word. To my brother and sister in-law, Scott and Jennifer Cameron, thank you for all of your encouragement! And to my wonderful in-laws, Ian and Susan Broome thank you for your keen interest in my studies and always cheering me on!

A special thank you to my supervisor Randy LaBonte. Your guidance and knowledge directed me down my path to successfully completing this project!

A final thank you to Mary O'Neill. Your kind words and understanding were always given at just the right times. I appreciated all of your support on this journey.

Abstract

Web 2.0 tools are increasingly being used by educators as learning tools for their students, yet some educators are unaware that to do so they must follow their school district Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) when using these types of online tools with students. The intention of this project was to help contribute to the understanding of restrictions placed on educators through a school district's AUP and to determine strategies that can support them in following acceptable use policies when implementing Web 2.0 tools into their teaching. To ensure educators have convenient access to the documents required prior to using Web 2.0 tools with students a website containing a vetted list of Web 2.0 tools based on School District 79 – Cowichan Valley's AUP was created. Clear documentation of the vetting process that was created was posted on the website. Web 2.0 tool documents were created to be easily shared with teachers, parents and students to better inform them of the acceptable uses of the specific tool. Feedback provided by peers in the field of education indicated a high need for such a resource in school districts and enthusiasm to access such a resource. The website created will need to be maintained in order to promote use among educators in School District 79 and to continue the growing the list of Web 2.0 tools offered on the list of accepted tools.

Keywords: Web 2.0 tools, Educational Technology, Internet Acceptable Use Policy

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

Purpose

Web 2.0 tools are being produced faster than school district Acceptable Use Policies (AUP) can be updated to guide teacher use of these new tools. While AUPs are living documents, that is being continually updated, many school districts are unable to keep up with changes as technology and standards are ever evolving. School District 79, Cowichan Valley, British Columbia has been continually updating their AUP since 1997 when the Internet was first available for use in School Districts. School District 79 Technology staff continues to revise their AUP to stay current. Teachers are not necessarily aware of the AUP governing the use of the tools they are using in their classrooms and, once aware, may become frustrated with the restrictiveness of the AUP. Hengstler (2013b) expresses concern that some educators believe rules are optional and that no one will enforce them. Unfortunately this is not the case. An educator found in breach of the privacy laws in B.C. can be fined between $2,000.00 and $5,000.00, and a school district fined upwards of $50,000.00 (Hengstler, 2013b, p. 3). Therefore, the intention of this project was to help contribute to the understanding of restrictions placed on educators through the school district's AUP and to determine strategies that can support them in following acceptable use policies when implementing Web 2.0 tools into their teaching.

Definitions of Terms

AUP - An Acceptable Use Policy is more commonly referred to as an AUP; this document, according to Conn (2002 as cited in Taylor, Whang and Tettegah 2006) contains "strategies that allow school districts to notify technology users of expected behavior and set forth the consequences of misuse" (p. 116). Osborne (2011) notes, "these policies must acknowledge both the risks and benefits of social media as well as have the users accept and understand the guidelines" (p. 6).

Cloud Computing – Instead of storing, accessing data and programs on a computer's hard drive it is achieved using the Internet; the Internet allows for many storage/online applications through both free and enterprise opportunities.

Filtering/Blocking Software – According to David Orenstein (2009) "[h]ardware and software filters, which sift through keywords placed in Internet search engines and online databases, work to limit the return of information."

Identifiable Information – Any information that will identify an individual such as: name(s), personal photo(s), personal address, personal phone number, social insurance number, birthdate, etc.

Living Document – A document that is constantly evolving when updates and expansion are warranted.

Privacy Protection – The British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA) was created "[t]o protect your right to personal privacy by prohibiting the unauthorized collection, use or disclosure of your personal information by public bodies" (British Columbia Ministry of Technology, Innovation and Citizens' Services, 2013, para. 1).

Storage Location – The location of the country in which the server is hosted and the uploaded information is stored.

Terms of Service Agreement – A set of rules and regulations set forth by a service provider (in the case of this project it is a Web 2.0 tool service provider) to which a person must agree to in order to use the service.

Web 2.0 tools - There is a large assortment of Web 2.0 tools that provide applications for work and communication, via the Web, for all users. Some examples of Web 2.0 tools are: wikis, blogs, social networking sites, collaboration sites, etc. The term Web 2.0 describes World Wide Web sites that use technology beyond the static pages of earlier websites. The term was coined in 1999 by Darcy diNuccie and then popularized by Tim O'Reilly in 2004 (Web 2.0 tools).

Research Rationale

When implementing Web 2.0 tools in teaching and learning Simkins and Schultz (2010) found that the noted difficulties were: "filtering software, lack of teacher interest and formal school and district policies" (p.13). While recognizing the rapid growth of the World Wide Web and the introduction of Web 2.0 tools, it is understandably difficult to keep revising a school district AUP to fit the current technology uses. School district AUPs can potentially restrict the use of Web 2.0 tools; however, restriction can actually drive individuals to be more outspoken and that can lead to the adoption of risky practices (Osborne, 2011). Collins and Halverson (2009) do urge AUP developers to embrace the change in technology use and create a policy to allow students and educators more freedom when using Web 2.0 tools. It is concerning that a school district AUP may restrict students from experiencing Web 2.0 tools that they potentially will be asked to use in their future workplace (Tinnerman, Johnson and Grimes, 2010). In an effort to be sure a school district's AUP is respected, it is important to support educators' professional choices when they consider using Web 2.0 tools with their students (Hengstler, 2013a).

Light and Polin (2010) convey the importance of creating a vetted, pre-approved school district list of Web 2.0 tools. In their research they found that there was a lack of awareness of Web 2.0 tools among educators, which was the largest impediment to using them. The notion of a pre-approved school district list of appropriate Web 2.0 tools could encourage educators to implement Web 2.0 tools in their teaching (Light and Polin, 2010). Having the school district show leadership in creating an easily accessible and convenient list of vetted Web 2.0 tools for use in their district greatly impacted the number of educators willing to incorporate Web 2.0 tools into their teaching (Light and Polin, 2010). Holcomb, Brady and Smith (2010) emphasize there is a growing collection of education-based Web 2.0 tools which offer educators and students high levels of safety and privacy. According to Lemke and Coughlin (2009), students can "deepen [their] learning through authentic, real-world

learning" when using Web 2.0 tools (p. 5). Web 2.0 tools can offer incredibly interactive and authentic learning environments that create communities of learners and allow students to communicate through many technological opportunities. Once educators realize there are educationally based Web 2.0 tools and social networking sites to use that do not compromise safety and privacy for their students, their use in education will increase exponentially (Light and Polin, 2010).

Personal Rationale

As stated in the research, the use of Web 2.0 tools by educators with their students is increasing, however the use of the AUP by educators when integrating Web 2.0 tools in their teaching has not increased. The project is valuable as it directly affects the use of Web 2.0 tools with my students personally through my teaching, and through other classes they attend with my colleagues. The impact of the project lies in improving access to Web 2.0 tools for my students by providing avenues for my colleagues and the parents of my students to have an understanding of the role of integrating Web 2.0 tools in the learning environment. Educators are responsible for ensuring their students are working in an online environment that is compliant with the district's AUP whether they are in a classroom setting or an online classroom setting. Educators are also responsible for ensuring the Web 2.0 tools add value to the students' learning. It is also expected that educators will inform parents of the tools the students are accessing so they can better understand how to support their child's learning outside of school. The project was intended to provide a clear and simple way for teachers in School District 79 to understand the implications of the AUP and incorporate Web 2.0 tools in their programs.

Some educators may not be aware that their district has an AUP, and this would likely influence their choice of Web 2.0 tools. Other educators may simply turn a blind eye to the school district's AUP because they want to use the Web 2.0 tool whether it's recommended for use by the district or not.

Hengstler (2013a) describes a parent "Googling her child's name only to find a Prezi[1] with scanned family photos and information" (p.2). As Hengstler points out, this parent had never been asked for permission to post her child's work, photos or information, let alone been given information on the possible privacy risks associated with such activities. The example used by Hengstler was real, and when she approached the educator to determine whether or not she obtained written parent permission she was informed by the teacher that the school media waiver covered the posting of the information. There is only a very small possibility that a school media waiver would meet the criteria set out in BC law and regulations for knowledge, notice and informed consent (Hengstler, 2013a). This lack of understanding of the AUP is not the kind of response for professional educators who have a responsibility to understand acceptable use and school or district policies. Before using Web 2.0 tools with students, educators must have an understanding of the very specific privacy and copyright laws which impact posting student's work online as well as hosting student's information outside of Canada. It is also the school district's responsibility to support Web 2.0 tool inclusion through clear communication with educators regarding the AUP. It was my intent through this project to inform my colleagues about effective Web 2.0 tools while protecting students, teachers, and the school district.

Goal

The goal of this project was to provide tools and support resources for my district colleagues to better understand and incorporate Web 2.0 tools in their classrooms following School District 79's AUP. Furthermore, the foundation of this project was to define the need for a school district vetted list of Web 2.0 tools that abide by the AUP document created by School District 79. A vetted list of Web 2.0 tools that abide by the AUP was created and hosted on a School District 79 WordPress site (http://mstracycameron.sd79.bc.ca/). Educators were able to access this district resource to learn about

[1] Prezi is a presentation and storytelling software that allows users to share ideas on a virtual canvas (http://prezi.com/)

specific Web 2.0 tools that were recommended for use and utilize documents provided to assist in the integration of those Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. It is important for the list of Web 2.0 tools to continuously be updated with the evolution of new tools. Accordingly, a place to provide suggested Web 2.0 tools by teachers was made available on the same site as the vetted list to keep interest high and a feeling of ownership for educators integrating Web 2.0 tools in their teaching.

Justification

Despite the demonstrated need for a vetted list of Web 2.0 tools based on each individual school district's AUP, few districts appear to have made such lists public. The Calgary School District is one of a few that used their updated AUP as a filter for creating a list of Web 2.0 tools recommended for use only in their school district (http://www.cbeilc.info/web2/). While this site is publicly accessible, it is understood that each school district has a unique AUP; therefore other school districts should not use this vetted list of Web 2.0 tools unless their AUP matches Calgary School District's.

Each Web 2.0 tool listed on the Calgary School District vetted list is accompanied by a *Background Information* document. Providing teachers with an information document for each tool enables teachers to efficiently be updated on the scope and appropriateness of the tool, allowing teacher energy to be focused primarily on integrating the tool. It also provides teachers with an understanding of how the tool was chosen in the context of the district AUP. For parents/guardians it provides an understanding of the tool and how it may be used with their child. Parents/guardians are then able to make the decision to sign the Web 2.0 tool information form to acknowledge their understanding of the tool, how it will be used in their child's instruction, and the behaviours expected from their child while using the Web 2.0 tool.

Brief Overview of the Project

The first step in the process of completing this project was the compilation of a list of commonly used educator/student Web 2.0 tools. A review of websites identifying popular and new Web 2.0 tools, suggestions of valued tools from colleagues, and my personal experience contributed to the initial list of vetted tools. It is important to remember the original list of ten vetted tools was simply a starting point; a component of the district WordPress (https://wordpress.org/site) was a suggestion area for additional tools designed to encourage educators to contribute to this evolving list. Each Web 2.0 tool was evaluated based on the following categories using a criterion-based rubric (Appendix A): curriculum connections, differentiation (ability levels), user friendliness, authenticity, student engagement (motivation), instructions and variations of peer interactions. The Web 2.0 tool was then given a score based on the criteria in the rubric and was either deemed recommended or not recommended for use. Each Web 2.0 tool was then vetted using a yes/no-formatted questionnaire (Appendix B) to confirm all areas adhere to School District 79's AUP. A Background Information document (Appendix C) and a Web 2.0 tool specific Information Form (Appendix D) for each approved tool was then created to accompany the School District 79 Acceptable Use form. The Background Information document was intended to serve educators, parents and students. Educators were able to learn about the specifics of a particular Web 2.0 tool before trying it with their students. They were then able to send the Background Information Document home to parents so they could better understand what the Web 2.0 tool would offer their child and then make the decision to sign the Web 2.0 Tool Information Form to acknowledge their understanding of the tool, how it will be used with their child, and the behaviours expected from their child while using the Web 2.0 tool.

The final step was to place all pertinent information and documents on a School District 79 WordPress site hosted in the *Learn SD79 Portal* for educator access. Here educators also had an avenue to request additional tools to be included on the site. Educators had access to the Web 2.0 tool

Evaluation Rubric to first determine if the Web 2.0 tool had value for students to further their learning. If the educator using the Web 2.0 Tool Evaluation Rubric deemed the Web 2.0 tool valuable then the tool was put forward to the assigned committee for consideration. If the assigned committee found the Web 2.0 tool adhered to the standards set forth in School District 79's AUP by using the Web 2.0 tool AUP Adherence questionnaire, all accompanying materials (Background Information Document and Web 2.0 tool Information Form) were created and added to the SD79 Learn WordPress site.

Measure of Success

Success of the project was measured through peer review feedback provided during beta testing of the site (Appendix E). The website address was shared with colleagues from Vancouver Island University's Online Learning and Teaching Diploma Program (http://www2.viu.ca/education/programs/diploma/oltd/brochure.pdf) private Facebook page and Google+ community site, publicly through Twitter, and personally through email to School District 79 colleagues. Those invited to proved feedback were asked to provide general feedback about their user experience. It was hoped that they would provide feedback in the areas of ease of use, quality and relevance of resources, and comment on their level of confidence in using this tool to further their use of Web 2.0 tools with their students. Feedback and anecdotal notes were collated and reviewed. Revisions were made to the website as well as the process of submitting Web 2.0 tool requests and examples.

A bound copy of the Process Paper and the release of the WordPress site to technology department personnel for management and general use will be provided to School District 79 upon completion of the project and approvals from Vancouver Island University. It is anticipated that the WordPress website will continue to meet the district objective of ensuring students and district staff follow the terms and conditions of the Internet Acceptable Use Policy. To support this, three recommendations were provided to the District Technology Advisory Committee (DTAC). The first

recommendation was to provide district educators with a current AUP and access to the Web 2.0 tool website. Next, it was recommended that the process of evaluating Web 2.0 tools with the provided rubric and questionnaire continue to be used when vetting the list of Web 2.0 tools for use in the School District as the tools provide a visible/transparent method that empowers educators. Finally, it was also recommended that if the DTAC cannot be responsible for continuing the process of vetting Web 2.0 tools then a specific committee be formed for handling new Web 2.0 tool requests.

Timeline

The allotted timeframe for this project was six calendar months. Literature was reviewed before the start of the project. The proposal and all pertinent documents (Web 2.0 tool Evaluation Rubric, Web 2.0 tool AUP Adherence Questionnaire, Web 2.0 Tool Background Information Document, Web 2.0 tool Information Form) that accompany the process of the project portion were created in the first two months of the six-month project term. Following the creation of the documents the process of vetting the list of Web 2.0 tools for use in School District 79 was completed in the third month of the six-month project term. In the fourth month all created materials were posted to a private School District 79 WordPress website. In this same month beta testing was conducted, and documentation of procedures and methods for chapter three of the project paper began. In the final months leading up to the end of the six-month allocation of time for the project, beta testing and findings for chapter four of this paper were reviewed and integrated with chapter five, conclusion and recommendations.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Web 2.0 tools provide countless opportunities for learning with technology, however educators are leery about implementing these tools as there are terms of service agreements and privacy concerns associated with using Internet based tools. In Collins' and Halverson's (2009) summary article, they argue that education is undergoing a colossal transformation. They urge educators and policy makers to rethink the important role of technology in our education system and to find ways to move beyond the traditional ways of learning with technology (p. 1). While there are many factors to consider when implementing technology, embracing technological change and moving toward an open model defined within a school or district's Acceptable Use Policy could be the starting point. An Acceptable Use Policy is more commonly referred to as an AUP; this document, according to Conn (2002 as cited in Taylor, Whang and Tettegah 2006) contains "strategies that allow school districts to notify technology users of expected behavior and set forth the consequences of misuse" (p. 116). Osborne (2011) notes, "these policies must acknowledge both the risks and benefits of social media" as well as "have the users accept and understand the guidelines" (p. 6). While school district technology staff often revises Internet Acceptable Use Policies as new technologies emerge, educators may feel as though they are restricted in their use of Web 2.0 tools because of existing AUPs. In an effort to be sure that the school district's AUP is being abided by, it is important to support educators to make proper choices when using Web 2.0 tools with their students.

Acceptable Use Policy

AUP documents were created by school districts in response to the Internet becoming more prevalent in teaching and learning. For School District 79 – Cowichan Valley, British Columbia, Canada, this was in 1997. How the Internet is used today, in 2014, is vastly different and in no way the same as in 1997. According to Osborne (2011), "social media necessitates faster, less formalized processes than traditional print or online media," so it makes more sense to create "appropriate

organizational policies, procedures, and guidelines" (p. 6). Therefore, school districts are finding the need to revise their AUPs to fit accordingly with today's technology uses. Revising policies in the AUP document to allow students and teachers the educational freedom needed to expand skills through Web 2.0 tools, while still creating safe and appropriate boundaries for use of the Internet and all it has to offer, has become challenging. Osborne (2011) believes that an outright ban on the use of social media in an educational setting is "rarely desirable or effective" (p. 6). Intense restriction can actually drive individuals to be more outspoken and that can lead to the adoption of risky practices (Osborne, 2011, p. 6). Osborne argues for social media guidelines and policies that are encouraging and nurturing in tone, that emphasize successful practice and define the suitable use of the technology and tools used.

According to Taylor, Whang and Tettegah (2006) there are a variety of ways to construct an AUP. Accordingly not every school will have the same AUP, which means school districts have some discretion when creating a document that works well for their staff and students. Osborne (2011) believes that the best starting point to create a social media policy or guiding document for your own organization is to "look at others' existing social media guidelines or policies in addition to your organization's existing institutional polices related to Internet use [and] appropriate conduct" (p. 6). Taylor et al. (2006), in discussing the results from Flowers and Rakes (as cited in Taylor et al. 2006) survey of respondents from different school districts across the US, point out that 73 percent of those surveyed indicated that committees wrote their school AUP while only 16.5 percent indicated that individuals wrote their school AUP. As the AUP is to be used by administrators, teachers, and students, Taylor et al. (2006) recommend creating a committee consisting of school personnel, parents and students within the school district to create the AUP, recognizing the many groups affected by the way in which technology is utilized in the school. They also recommend that the AUP be easy to comprehend, detailed and completely covering all of the possible outcomes that could arise from using the Internet (Taylor et al., 2006, p. 123).

Implementing Web 2.0 Tools in Education

Simkins and Schultz (2010) set out to survey educators' attitudes toward the use of Web 2.0 tools in the classroom. There is a large assortment of Web 2.0 tools that provide applications for work and communication, via the Web, for all users. Some examples of Web 2.0 tools are: wikis, blogs, social networking sites, collaboration sites, etc. Simkins and Schultz created a survey for administrators and other educators to share their thoughts and experiences with Web 2.0 tools. It was found that, of those people surveyed, 90 percent felt there was potential for Web 2.0 tools in education. Interestingly, Web 2.0 tools that were most perceived as being used in an educational setting were tools that educators used at home and outside the classroom (p. 13). This could simply mean that educators gravitate to what is familiar to them and therefore use it in their teaching. Simkins and Schultz also recognized that there are many stumbling blocks to implementing Web 2.0 tools into one's teaching and learning. Some of the noted difficulties were: filtering software, lack of teacher interest and formal school and district policies (AUPs). Simkins and Schultz discovered while there are obstacles in implementing Web 2.0 tools into education, there is enough willingness to try among educators and administrators that it is promising.

Blocking Web 2.0 Tools in Education

Cramer and Hayes (2010) reiterate Collins' and Halverson's (2009) points by affirming that schools need to continuously adapt to incoming technology so as to keep current for students' learning. Students require the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be adaptable technology learners in society. However, policies on technology use in schools are limiting the use of devices and Web 2.0 tools. Cramer and Hayes go on to note that school districts have "left students without access to many of the technologies that are familiar in other aspects of their lives" (p. 39). It would be sensible to suggest designing suitable technology policies that allow the exploration and learning with technology devices and Web 2.0 tools.

Authentic Learning with Web 2.0 Tools

With the arrival of Web 2.0 tools in the world of technology, according to Lemke and Coughlin (2009), students can "deepen [their] learning through authentic, real-world learning" (p. 5). Web 2.0 tools can offer incredibly interactive and authentic learning environments that create communities of learners and allow students to communicate through many technological opportunities. Lemke and Coughlin also found that educational attitudes and school philosophies do not support learning in the 21st century. They did, however, find inspiring information that ladders onto Simkins' and Shultz's findings that school district administrators do recognize the importance Web 2.0 tools play in their student's learning environment.

Building on Lemke and Coughlin's findings that the use of Web 2.0 tools for learning purposes provide authentic learning experiences, Rodgers and Garcia (2013) also acknowledge that Web 2.0 tools, such as social media outlets "present a new world of opportunity and a new wave of potential problems" (p. 2). While Rodgers and Garcia recognize the importance of Acceptable Use Policies in schools to protect student's privacy, they also conclude that filters found in Acceptable Use Policies prevent the use of some Web 2.0 tools in schools and this discourages teachers from implementing any type of Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. They also concede that most school's Acceptable Use Policies were written before the advent of social media (p. 3). This is the case in School District 79 (Cowichan Valley), British Columbia, Canada, where they have not revised their AUPs since 1997. They have an estimated date of May 2014 in which they will produce a new AUP that is more inline with today's technology use. Rodgers and Garcia recommend that administrators and educators find ways of "embracing and adapting [AUPs as opposed to] blocking" Web 2.0 tools (p. 134).

Restrictive Acceptable Use Policies

Tinnerman, Johnson and Grimes (2010) are concerned that students are not being given the opportunity to explore and experience the Web 2.0 tools that they will one day be asked to use in their

future workplace. They note that the reason why students are missing out on the use of web tools in their education is because of the restrictions from school district Acceptable Use Policies (p. 5). It is understood that web filters, based on an AUP, can be helpful when used in an appropriate manner and still allow access to the sites and Web tools that teachers and students need in order to participate in collaborative online spaces. As there are typically many people involved in the creation, implementation and use of a school district's AUP, it is imperative that they all work together effectively in order to meet the needs of all involved. Teachers need to feel empowered when implementing technology and when they are met with many roadblocks they become frustrated and deterred from using technology in their teaching.

Continuing with the theme of frustration, Willard (2010) discusses the irritation that AUPs are causing teachers when it comes to implementing Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. She states that, "without robust access to [Web 2.0] technologies in school, trying to prepare students for their future as effective users of online information is like trying to teach children to swim without a swimming pool" (p. 55). In her research Willard administered a survey to teachers that found 95 percent identified filters and 91 percent blocking of social networking sites to be the means in which the Internet is controlled by school district technology administration. It was also found that the majority of teachers took issue with filtering of forums, which included any site with a comment option. This typically means most Web 2.0 tools, particularly anything based on social media. She makes several suggestions of strategies to create a more realistic way of managing Internet use in schools. Some of the suggestions made by Willard are: "emphasize educational purpose, shift from reliance on ineffective blocking to more effective 'watching', provide teachers with override authority and establish a safe and secure Web 2.0 environment" (p. 60).

British Columbia Online Privacy Laws

While educators seem to understand the benefits Web 2.0 tools can offer students in their learning, Hengstler (2013b) reminds them that they must also be cognizant of the risks associated with using these types of tools with minors. She shares the importance of educators becoming responsible for understanding British Columbia's privacy laws and the need to follow policies and procedures set out by school districts. Hengstler is concerned that some educators believe that the rules are optional and no one will enforce them; this is not the case. An educator found in breach of the privacy laws in B.C. can be fined between $2,000.00 and $5,000.00 and a school district upwards of $50,000.00 (Hengstler, 2013b, p. 3). Based on her experiences and research, Hengstler is encouraging teachers to consider the following when posting student's work online: copyright and ownership of the work; student's are the sole owners of the work. Teachers also need to consider identifiability, content and risks. It is imperative that when one posts student content that it not have any identifiable information available (i.e. name, personal photo(s), home address, etc.) (Hengstler, 2013b, p. 5). Hengstler reminds teachers they are required to obtain a legal guardian's written consent if any student identifiable information is posted on the Web (Hengstler, 2013b, p. 5).

Another important consideration that Hengstler makes is regarding storage location and risks; educators cannot assume that, because they have posted student's work to a password protected site, that they are now safe and exempt from following any other privacy laws. They still need to be aware of individual Web 2.0 privacy policies, as information is often stored on third party servers outside of Canada. Educators must receive written consent for a minor (anyone under 19 years of age) to post their work online, at school, under the supervision of educator (Hengstler, 2013,b, p. 6). However, this does not mean that educators need written consent to use a Web 2.0 tool with a minor. Finally, she shares the importance of having a media waiver, which needs to specifically address the intended activities. It is clear that AUPs play a very important role in keeping students safe when learning

online. Educators need to ensure they stay current with policy and procedure changes regarding posting student's work online. Having the responsibility of staying current with the school district AUP is what some educators are finding overwhelming, which in turn deters them from using Web 2.0 tools.

Hengstler (2013a) reiterates her thoughts on posting student's work online in her blog called, "Educational Technologies & More". She shares the fact that British Columbia teachers have more restrictive regulations surrounding the use of Web 2.0 tools than any other province of Canada or the USA (Hengstler, 2013a, para. 1). It is important for educators to be informed about school district AUPs and Hengstler expresses the importance of training sessions for educators so that they can become familiar with the use of Cloud, Web 2.0 and social media technologies that conform to their school district's Internet policies and procedures. Hengstler makes a further recommendation for there to be guides for teachers to implement Web 2.0 tools, which could be very specific to particular tools and ease the tension for teachers not knowing if they are following the AUP. It is also recommended by Hengstler that parents be provided with a background letter about the specific Web 2.0 tools and how they will be implemented in the classroom. It is imperative that teachers be prepared before implementing a Web 2.0 tool in their teaching with minors. There are many steps in assuring the proper procedures are been taken and that the policies are abided by.

From personal experience as an educator working with students online and listening to colleague's concerns, this is the part that teachers find frustrating and need guidance with. Before an educator can plan a lesson that uses Web 2.0 tools, they need to know the constraints based on the AUP. Technology leadership is necessary to provide direction to those educators who are unaware there are rules that need to be followed when using this type of technology. Leaders implementing new technology can help relieve some of the stress on educators by creating an "approved" Web 2.0 list of tools.

Responsible not Restrictive Online Learning

In order for school districts to ensure the safety of their students when learning online, they need to create an up-to-date AUP. According to Bosco and Krueger (2011), (Bosco was Principal Investigator and Krueger was Chief Executive Officer for the Consortium for School Networking), there is a wide range of restrictiveness with regard to Internet access in schools districts. He suggests that students not be restricted in their learning with Web 2.0 tools, but rather taught how to be responsible online users. They need the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be successful learners online so when they are learning on their own, they can make informed decisions about appropriate uses. Bosco and Krueger do admit that Web 2.0 tools have added a new dimension of issues related to the online safety aspects for schools and he sets out a directive in the hopes of informing educators and administrators on the need to rethink and revise their AUPs.

School District Pre-Approved Web 2.0 Tools

Echoing Bosco's and Krueger's (2011) insights into the restrictiveness of AUPs, Holcomb, Brady and Smith (2010) present a similar notion and express the need to find ways to implement education based Web 2.0 and social networking sites into the education system. Holcomb et al. found that educators cited privacy and safety as their major concerns when implementing Web 2.0 tools into students learning. Their research found that there is a huge misconception that all social networking and Web 2.0 tools are unsafe for students to use. Once educators realize there are educationally based Web 2.0 tools and social networking sites to use that do not compromise safety and privacy for their students, their use in education will increase exponentially. Holcomb et al. make it quite clear there is a growing collection of education-based Web 2.0 tools that offer educators and students high levels of safety and privacy. Before implementing such tools, they need to be compared to the particular district's AUP. Having a pre-approved, school district list of Web 2.0 tools that are in accordance with the AUP will allow educators to, very simply, determine if a particular Web 2.0 tool is acceptable for

use in their classroom. All pertinent documents relating to a particular Web 2.0 tool would also be accessible to educators in the district, allowing them send the proper waivers, background information about the Web 2.0 tool, etc. home for parents and students to read and sign. This provides for safe and purposeful use of Web 2.0 tools and lessens the chance of misuse.

Light and Polin (2010) add another valid point regarding the importance of a vetted, pre-approved school district list of Web 2.0 tools. In their research they found that the largest impediment to teachers using Web 2.0 tools was that they didn't even know they existed, or very few, at the least. They were unaware that there was such a vast amount of Web 2.0 tools available for use in their teaching. This continues to support the notion that having a pre-approved school district list of appropriate Web 2.0 tools will encourage educators to implement Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. Light and Polin also found that educators wanted to keep the implementation of technology simple; having an easily accessible list of Web 2.0 tools with accompanying documents for students and parents would make the implementation of Web 2.0 tools, in one's teaching and learning, as seamless as possible. Furthermore, the authors expressed that making the transition into using Web 2.0 tools easy and transparent will shorten the learning curve and increase use. Overall through their research, Light and Polin found educators have requested the implementation of Web 2.0 tools be convenient and uncomplicated. Having the school district demonstrate leadership by creating an easily accessible and convenient list of vetted Web 2.0 tools for use in their district could greatly impact the number of educators willing to incorporate Web 2.0 tools into their teaching.

While educators realize that Web 2.0 tools offer "real opportunities for innovative and engaging practice with authenticity and informality, both notable features of successful social media academia" (Osborne, 2011 p. 10), it has become clear they desire support and ease of use when implementing Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. While there are many suggestions that will aid in the use of Web 2.0 tools in the classroom, one of the most important areas of focus is the proper use of the school district's AUP.

Educators must have knowledge of this document and understand the importance of its use. Osborne (2011) reminds policy creators "social media guidelines and policies are useful tools in supporting the use of social media" (p.10) and other Web 2.0 tools, "but these should not stifle creativity" (p. 10). Providing support to teachers through a vetted list of Web 2.0 tools for use in their classroom and all the accompanying documents, such as the AUP, parent consent, student use contracts and Web 2.0 tool parent information sheet, will help insure teachers are following proper school district procedures for using Web 2.0 tools with their students. Additionally, providing support to teachers through a vetted list of Web 2.0 tools will help bring a sense of ease to their desire to implement Web 2.0 tools in their teaching.

Chapter Three: Procedures and Methods

Timeline

The allotted timeframe for this project was six calendar months. Literature was reviewed prior to the start of the project timeline. The proposal and all pertinent documents (Web 2.0 tool Evaluation Rubric (Appendix A), Web 2.0 tool AUP Adherence Questionnaire (Appendix B), Web 2.0 Tool Background Information Document (Appendix C), Web 2.0 tool Permission Form (Appendix D)) that accompany the process of the project portion were created in the first month of the six-month allocation. Following the creation of the documents the process of vetting the list of Web 2.0 tools for use in School District 79 was also completed in the first month of the six-month timeline. In the second month all created materials were posted to a private WordPress site created by School District 79. In this same month recording Procedures and Methods for Chapter 3 of the project paper began. By the third month beta testing was in progress and changes to the process and WordPress site were in progress. By the end of the third month, the WordPress site was fully functional and Chapter 3 of this paper was completed. In the final months, leading up to the end of the six-month allocation, findings discussed in Chapter 4 were completed and conclusions and recommendations were written for Chapter 5.

Project Design

The creation of this project was based on the author's observations of the restrictions placed on educators through a school district's Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and desire to support educators to adhere to the AUP while integrating Web 2.0 tools into their teaching practice. Current research was used to validate the necessity for the project as well as to determine what needed to be included in the project.

A Web Tool Evaluation Rubric was created based on the author's work in OLTD courses and used to determine if the Web 2.0 tool in question was a valuable tool for use with students, and one that would further their learning. If it was deemed valuable it was then assessed with a questionnaire to determine if it adhered to School District 79's AUP. If it made it past this stage of the vetting process a Web 2.0 tool Background Information Document and Web 2.0 tool Background Information Form were created to share with parents. All of the documents, and pertinent information were then placed on a WordPress site available to educators in School District 79. Beta testing was used to determine the project's success.

The design of this project was intended to address the problem of restrictions placed on educators through the school district's AUP and how to support educators to adhere to the AUP when integrating Web 2.0 tools into their teaching. By creating a space where educators could visit and learn about Web 2.0 tools that are already recommended for use in School District 79 hesitations of use would potentially be reduced. The second step of creating all accompanying documents for each Web tool was done to reduce the risk of educators using Web 2.0 tools with students without the proper documentation and information forms for parents. With these two steps being followed by educators within School District 79 the adherence to the AUP should increase.

Awareness of the site and process was key in its success and it will be recommended to School District 79 that the site be shared at a principal's meeting by the District Technology Advisory Committee (DTAC), and then be shared at staff or Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings with teachers. DTAC is responsible for collaborating and making decisions regarding technology in School District 79. They also serve as a sounding board of educators for District Technology Staff so they have a better understanding of what educators need in order to integrate technology into their teaching. This committee has members that are highly involved with technology in their own teaching

and understand the importance of following the AUP when working with students online. They will be able to share the Web 2.0 tool website with educators and successfully answer any questions.

Project Development

The first step in the process of completing this project was to compile a list of commonly used educator/student Web 2.0 tools. Research, educator and personal input directed this. Reading Web 2.0 tool reviews online by educators and experts in the field of Web 2.0 design provided a solid foundation for the list of Web 2.0 tools that would be included on the website. Fellow educators within School District 79 were also informally asked if they had any suggestions of Web 2.0 tools that they found to be educationally sound and engaging for students. And finally, the author of the website included her own personal favourite Web 2.0 tools that she had previously used in her Online Learning and Teaching Graduate Diploma (OLTD) courses. It is important to remember this was simply a starting point for the vetted list as a Web 2.0 tool suggestion area was created for educators to continually put forth Web 2.0 ideas. Each Web 2.0 tool was evaluated based on the following categories in a self-created rubric: curriculum connections, differentiation (ability levels), user friendly, authenticity, student motivation (engagement), instructions and variations (Appendix A). The Web 2.0 tool was then given a score out of a possible 28 points based on the rubric. If the Web 2.0 tool received anything less than 14 points it was not recommended for use within School District 79. The basis for the scoring was essentially meeting 50% of the criteria to be deemed acceptable for use. The rubric was created based on the author's previous coursework in OLTD 508 – Mobile Learning and Gaming where she created a rubric to evaluate Applications Software (APPS). This original rubric was expanded to include more areas of evaluation and altered to address Web 2.0 tools instead of APPS.

The motivation for selecting a Web 2.0 tool is directly related to emphasizing competencies like self-reliance, problem solving, critical thinking, collaboration, and creativity. Educators hope to provide authentic learning experiences that help to connect students to the world beyond school. While

there are many different criteria to consider when choosing an educational Web 2.0 tool, the focus was on the premise that as students differ significantly in their needs, learning styles, abilities and experiences, then an educational Web 2.0 tool must be responsive and flexible to match this diversity, while also engaging and motivating students.

The initial considerations for selection were based on meeting the learning outcome(s) and reinforcing the skills and content. Web 2.0 tools were chosen and then given a suggestion for grade level use. Suggestions for particular skill areas were given for each tool, however no specific curriculum focus was given as Web 2.0 tools have the ability to support many subject areas. As educators work with varying levels of learners, differentiation is key. It was imperative that the criteria evaluated how well a Web 2.0 tool met the needs of learners. This component fits well with the inclusionary practice where the unique learning needs of all students must be supported and valued in the classroom. Overall, there were seven key indicators of sound educational performance, which were based on the following set of questions:

1. *Are the skills reinforced in the app strongly connected to the learning outcome and key concepts?*
2. *Does the app meet the needs of all students, while also addressing variations in learning needs and learning style?*
3. *Is the app easy to use? How much direct teacher instruction is required? Can students use the app independently?*
4. *Is the app entertaining, motivating and engaging?*
5. *Are skills practiced in an authentic format/problem-based environment?*

The bigger picture when selecting technology for learning is to look beyond the devices and Web 2.0 tools; instead, educators must look at evidence-based pedagogy, such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL), differentiation, inclusion, personalization, and self-regulation. When considering the

"big picture" regardless of the type of device or operating system, educators should consider the following:

1. *How the technology can be used to accelerate conventional learning.*
2. *How the technology can contribute to the acquisition of information and skills.*
3. *How the technology can enable students to demonstrate their performance.*
4. *What role the technology plays in education* (Zaied, 2007).

The process of completing the rubric will be requested of educators putting forward a suggested Web 2.0 tool. By having educators complete this rubric as the first step in the process it should eliminate non-educational Web 2.0 tools from being put forward to go through the other steps in the vetting process. The completed form will appear in both the approved tools list and not approved tools list on the website.

The list of Web 2.0 tools submitted was then vetted using a self created questionnaire to confirm all areas adhere to School District 79's AUP (Appendix B). This questionnaire included questions in the following areas: curriculum connections, personal email requirements, downloads or installation of software, monitoring of student progress, interaction with the public, allow multiple administrators, visual features are the same on all operating systems and parent access. These categories were created based on the rules set out in School District 79's AUP and input from a retired School District 79 District Technology Coordinator. The questions form a flow-chart style of yes/no responses that guide the vetting committee to an educated decision on whether the Web 2.0 tool adheres to the school district's AUP. Based on the answers to the questions the Web 2.0 tool was either denied for use in the School District, recommended with caution along with restrictions and requirements to be met before use with students, or recommended for use. DTAC or another similar assigned committee will eventually complete this particular step in the vetting process. Educators are

not responsible for completing this part of the process, but will have access to view the completed questionnaire for both approved and not approved Web 2.0 tools.

Once the Web 2.0 tools were confirmed and recommended for use in School District 79, a Web 2.0 tool Background Information Document was created. The author first completed this document in OLTD 506 – Social Media. The bulk of the information stayed the same for each Web 2.0 tool Background Information Document and only parts pertaining to the actual Web 2.0 tool being shared were altered. The document was created not only to help educators learn more about a particular Web 2.0 tool they were considering for use with their students, but also to provide information regarding the Web 2.0 tool for parents. The document information was created as a support tool and was intended to help educators adhere to the AUP and assist them to introduce students and parents to acceptable uses of the tool. The document also shared the URL link to the Home page of the Web 2.0 tool, the Privacy Policy and Terms of Service Agreement of the Web 2.0 tool so parents could investigate the Web 2.0 tool for themselves. This document was to aid in the parent's understanding of the Web tool so they could confidently sign the Web 2.0 Information Form.

While School District 79 does not require parent consent for use of the Web 2.0 tools at school, it was still necessary to create a Web 2.0 tool Information Form for each Web tool that was recommended for use through the vetting process. The Web 2.0 tool Information Form included the reasons for use of the Web tool with students, acceptable use understanding, security information, expectations of student behaviour, conduct and responsibilities while using the Web 2.0 tool, as well as all parent and student signatures acknowledging their understanding and agreement to abide by the expectations.

Once all of the pertinent documents had been created, a WordPress site was created, as School District 79 uses WordPress to build and create all of the district's websites. Using WordPress would ensure transfer of the final product to School District 79 website would be a smooth transition. The

objective of the site was to house all of the documents needed to meet the AUP requirements for using Web 2.0 tools with students. Educators could visit the site, choose a Web tool and either learn more about it or move forward with it's use by printing the Background Information Document and Information Form to send home to parents/guardians.

While only ten Web 2.0 tools were vetted for this project, it was expected that the scope of the project would grow and School District 79 technology staff would oversee the continuation of the project. With this in mind a place for educators to submit requests for new Web 2.0 tools was created. Educators will have access to the Web 2.0 tool Evaluation Rubric to first determine if the Web 2.0 tool is a valuable tool to use with students that would further their learning. If the Web 2.0 tool is deemed valuable and is recommended for use then it would be put forward to the assigned School District 79 committee for consideration. Then the tool would be evaluated based on the Web 2.0 tool AUP Adherence Questionnaire. If the Web tool passed the questionnaire with a recommendation for use, the Background Information document and consent form for the Web tool would be created and added to the vetted list of Web tools on the WordPress Site hosted on School District 79's server.

Success of the project was measured through beta testing. Beta testing is used to find errors in software before it is released to the general public or intended users. It is usually the second stage of testing, the first being alpha testing, which was completed by the author and her Masters program supervisor. Colleagues completed a peer review. The website address was shared with colleagues through Vancouver Island University, Online Learning and Teaching private Facebook page and Google+ community, publicly through Twitter, and personally through email to School District 79 colleagues. They were asked to provide general feedback about their user experience. It was hoped that they would provide feedback in the areas of ease of use, quality and relevance of resources, and comment on their level of confidence in using this tool to further their use of Web 2.0 tools with their

students. Feedback and anecdotal notes were collated and reviewed. Revisions were made to the process, examples, and WordPress site.

Implementation

A bound copy of the Process Paper and the release of the WordPress site to technology department personnel for management and general use were provided to School District 79 upon completion of the project. It was anticipated that the website would continue to meet the district objective of ensuring students and district staff follow the terms and conditions of the Internet Acceptable Use Policy.

Chapter Four: Beta Testing and Findings

The goal of this project was to provide tools for School District No. 79 (Cowichan Valley) teachers to better understand and incorporate Web 2.0 tools in their classrooms, tools that met School District 79's AUP. Furthermore, the foundation of this inquiry-based project was to define the need for a school district vetted list of Web 2.0 tools that abide by the AUP document created by School District 79. A vetted list of Web 2.0 tools that abide by the AUP was created and hosted on a School District 79 WordPress site. Educators could then access this district resource to learn about specific Web 2.0 tools that were recommended for use and utilize the documents needed to integrate those Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. It is important for the list of Web 2.0 tools to continuously evolve with the development of new tools, so a place to provide suggested Web 2.0 tools by teachers on the same site as the vetted list was also created in order to keep interest high and create a feeling of ownership for educators integrating Web 2.0 tools in their teaching.

Testing Methods

The method used to test the intended outcomes of this project was done so through beta testing. Beta testing is used to find errors in software before it is released to the general public or intended users. It is usually the second stage of testing, the first being alpha testing, which was completed, by the author and her Masters program supervisor. Participants completed a peer review through several different avenues. The website address was shared with colleagues through Vancouver Island University, Online Learning and Teaching private Facebook page and Google+ community, publicly on Twitter, and personally through email to School District 79 colleagues. Participants were asked to provide general feedback about their user experience in the categories of: Content, navigation, visual design and usefulness. They provided their feedback through an anonymous Google form that would allow the feedback to be collated and reviewed (Appendix E). After reviewing the feedback revisions were made to the process, examples, and WordPress site.

Process used to Implement Beta Testing

A group of educators that teach different grade levels, different subjects and even specialist teachers were invited to participate in beta testing the Web 2.0 tool website. Instructions and the website link were posted to Vancouver Island University, Online Learning and Teaching private Facebook page and Google+ community, publicly on Twitter, and sent personally through email to School District 79 colleagues. Feedback was given at their convenience during their personal time if they chose to participate. It is important to note that these areas were chosen for sharing the website address in order to reach members that would be using this type of website and have background knowledge as to what it is for.

Justification for Methods and Process

I presented my published site for peer review from September 27, 2014 to October 11, 2014 in order to give my colleagues enough time to review the website and gain a deeper understanding of its purpose and form meaningful feedback. The choice to share the website link via the Online Learning and Teaching private Facebook page was to reach colleagues that were directly involved in the Vancouver Island University Masters of Educational Leadership and share a common Online Learning and Teaching Graduate Diploma. Sharing the website with the Online Learning and Teaching Google+ community also allowed for feedback from colleagues that were in the process of obtaining their Online Learning and Teaching Diploma. Their feedback would come from a place that had background knowledge and was most likely meaningful. Distributing the website to School District 79 colleagues through their personal email addresses and on their own time would allow feedback from the very people that would be using the website. This feedback would provide the most critical of responses because if they were not engaged by the website it was not going to be utilized by educators in School District 79.

Intended Outcomes of Beta Testing

It was hoped that users providing feedback would address the areas of: Content (practical resources/clear explanations), navigation (hyperlinks active/smooth transitions/clear paths), visual design (layout/engagement/pleasing to the eye) and usefulness (convenience/effectiveness). These categories were given in order to provide the participants with some suggested areas to address their feedback. Having participants provide feedback in these areas would allow for improving the overall functionality of the website. The main goal of receiving feedback in the suggested areas was to take note of possible ways to enhance the website. Ultimately the feedback from beta testing would enhance the usability of the website and show user's enthusiasm for the information now available to them to properly integrate Web 2.0 tools in their teaching.

Findings of Beta Testing

Beta testing participants were asked to spend time engaging with the Web 2.0 tool website and when finished provide their thoughts and feedback on how to improve the site. I received a total of eleven responses, all of which were incredibly helpful and positive thoughts and suggestions. Some were simple navigation changes and some were ideas on how to expand the project. Each participant commented on the four suggested areas for feedback and were most enthusiastic about the website.

Participants acknowledged how well the website was laid out, and the resource materials were clearly labeled and easily found. They had no trouble navigating the site and noted that the links for each tool were easily accessible via the drop-down menu. It was suggested that some of the font size was smaller than desired on the Policies and Forms page. There was also a very positive response to the colour pallet of the website and the visual appeal of the Web 2.0 tool icons.

Feedback regarding the content of the website indicated it was very well received. Most participants acknowledged that there is a definite need for this type of resource in school districts and they would be excited to use it! They also pointed out how useful this project would be for educators

by taking the guesswork out of choosing tools that abide by their school district's AUP. A suggestion of having a place for Web 2.0 tools that were once submitted for review, but did not pass the vetting process to be listed would save educators time in the process of submitting tools. This was considered at the time of site creation, however it was thought that this would be negative toward the creators of the Web 2.0 tools that did not make the vetted list. Another suggestion was to have the ages or grade levels for each tool listed, however this already was shared with users on the Web 2.0 tool Evaluation form that is listed on each tool's page. Overall, participants felt that the project hosted a great collection of resources for educators to use and will encourage those educators that are apprehensive about using technology in the classroom to start integrating it into their teaching.

The beta testing of this project provided helpful suggestions that will enhance the Web 2.0 tool website, which will in turn benefit the users of the website. I did not receive as much feedback as expected, however the quality of the feedback was ideal. This project was intended to be ever evolving as the policies, procedures and needs of users change. The baseline that was created through this project has the ability to progress and stay current for educators. It is hoped that this project could become a valued resource for educators and help to change educator's awareness for AUPs.

Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations

Literature

Web 2.0 tools are being promoted as excellent learning tools for the classroom, however Acceptable Use Policies (AUP) play an important role in advising educators on what is acceptable for student use and was it not. Teachers are not necessarily aware of the AUP governing the use of these tools and, once aware, may become frustrated with the restrictiveness of the AUP guidelines in their school or district. Hengstler (2013b) fears that some educators believe that the rules are optional and no one will enforce them; this is not the case. An educator found in breach of the privacy laws in B.C. can be fined between $2,000.00 and $5,000.00 and a school district upwards of $50,000.00 (Hengstler, 2013b, p. 3). Therefore, the intention of this project was to understand the restrictions placed on educators through the school district's AUP and find a way to support them in following the AUP when implementing Web 2.0 tools in their teaching.

The design of this project was intended to address the restrictions placed on educators through the school district's AUP and how best to support educators in adhering to the AUP when integrating Web 2.0 tools into their teaching. By creating a space where educators could visit and learn about Web 2.0 tools that are already recommended for use in School District 79, hesitations of use could be reduced. The second step of creating all accompanying documents for each Web 2.0 tool was intended to reduce the risk of educators using Web 2.0 tools with students without the proper documentation and information forms for parents. With these two steps being followed by educators within School District 79 the adherence to the AUP should increase.

Light and Polin (2010) convey the importance of a vetted, pre-approved school district list of Web 2.0 tools. In their research, they found that there was a lack of awareness of Web 2.0 tools among educators, which was the largest impediment to using them. The notion that having a pre-approved school district list of appropriate Web 2.0 tools Light and Polin found encouraged educators to

implement Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. Having the school district demonstrate leadership in creating an easily accessible and convenient list of vetted Web 2.0 tools for use in their district greatly impacted the number of educators willing to incorporate Web 2.0 tools into their teaching. The aforementioned research is what guided this project and thus the creation of the Web 2.0 tool website.

Results and Findings

As the project progressed the website was shared with colleagues through Vancouver Island University, Online Learning and Teaching private Facebook page, personally through email to School District 79 colleagues and finally through Vancouver Island University, Online Learning and Teaching Google+ community. Participants were asked to provide general feedback about their user experience in the categories of: Content, navigation, visual design and usefulness. They provided their feedback through an anonymous Google form that would allow the feedback to be collated and reviewed (Appendix E).

The suggestions that were shared through peer feedback identified a few navigation errors, font changes and a way to enhance the project further. The peer feedback also reiterated the need for such a resource in all school districts and how much easier this resource would make implementing Web 2.0 tools into teaching. Those that provided feedback and are not educators in School District 79 were hopeful that their district would soon develop such a resource for educators that fit with their AUP. It was also suggested that this project could be a guide for other districts in creating their own Web 2.0 tool website. One participant suggested adding a place for Web 2.0 tools that were vetted and deemed not acceptable for use with the school district's AUP be listed somewhere on the website so that educators could check the list before submitting a Web 2.0 tool request for that same tool. This suggestion was taken and implemented. There is now a separate page on the website to allow for a list of tools that were rejected for use. Each suggestion that was shared during feedback was valid and will

guide quality revisions to the website to better enhance this resource for educators in School District 79 and hopefully others.

Perceived Limits

While the project had equal amounts of preparation in terms of document creation and the actual building of the website to host the documents, the most time consuming portion of the project was managing the website as it is not self-sustaining. Therefore, it is hoped that the School District 79 technology committee will be able to continue maintaining the website and keep it evolving as the years pass. The committee will need to approve Web 2.0 tools as the suggestions are made and add that new tool's information to the vetted list on the website. It is estimated that it could take about twenty minutes to approve and post the pertinent information for a new tool. In the project's infancy it is not expected that there would be a high volume of Web 2.0 tool suggestions as awareness of the website will take some time to build. While the tools that have already been posted to the website were vetted using the current School District 79's AUP, when changes are made to that document there may potentially be changes needed to the current list of approved tools. Depending on the depth of changes to the AUP this could potentially be a large undertaking for the committee in charge of keeping the documents posted current.

Success and Reflection

Upon reflecting on the project, while there may be some difficulty in maintaining the website at the School District level, it is believed that the value of the website will be seen by educators and those that will be responsible for maintaining it. Such a resource is critical now in the day of AUPs and responsible online use with students. Educators can and will be held accountable for their choices when learning online with students and this resource will better equip them with the knowledge, confidence and tools needed to safely integrate Web 2.0 tools in their teaching.

While there was a lot of time and creativity put into the creation of the website, the use of WordPress was forced by School District 79 as that is what is used for all of their websites, and it was rather limiting in the realm of creativeness. It was difficult to adhere to such a cookie cutter template, with very few options for educators to provide their Web 2.0 tool suggestions and the form that is to accompany their suggestions. With enhanced options for creating the website, it would allow for more freedom to build a more organized way to present the tools, submit Web 2.0 tool suggestions and search specific tools by age, subject, genre, skill, etc. Collaborating with website design experts is recommended to enhance the usability of the website.

Recommendations

Several recommendations were provided to the District Technology Advisory Committee (DTAC). The first recommendation was to provide district educators with a current AUP and access to the Web 2.0 tool website. Highlighted was the fact that the website and process needed full exposure to educators. Next, it was recommended that the process of evaluating Web 2.0 tools with the provided Web 2.0 tool Evaluation Rubric (Appendix A) and Web 2.0 tool AUP Adherence Questionnaire (Appendix B) continue to be used when vetting the list of Web 2.0 tools for use in the School District as the tools provide a visible/transparent method that empowers educators. Finally it was also recommended that if the DTAC cannot be responsible for continuing the process of vetting Web 2.0 tools then a specific district committee be formed for handling new Web 2.0 tool requests.

The recommendation to have full exposure of the website and its use to School District 79 educators is imperative to its success. It can first be shared with the district technology committee, where it can then be shared at a monthly principal's meeting, which can then be passed on to educators at a monthly staff meeting. It is also being recommended that the website resource be shared at School District 79's May-day Professional Development by either the author or a member of the district technology committee. Educators can also request presentations be made at their Professional Learning

Communities on early dismissal days. There are many avenues in which to reach educators in the district and share this resource. Once the information has reached the majority of educators in the district it is hoped that the website's use will become commonplace.

In order for this resource to be successful there will first need to be a committee such as the district technology committee, a new committee created, or a single person employed by School District 79 to continue the maintenance of the website. This committee would be responsible for vetting the Web 2.0 tool suggestions, creating new Web 2.0 tool Background Information Documents for new tools, staying current with any changes made to the AUP, and maintaining the website. This role has potential to become quite involved and is definitely a role that should be compensated by the school district. If School District 79 values the use of their AUP by educators, it is believed this to be a worthwhile expense.

While this project was created specifically for School District 79, as their AUP was used to make the resource specific to the district, it can still be shared with other school districts as a guide to creating their own specific Web 2.0 tool resource website. This can shared in similar ways as mentioned above, but may require some compensation or support, which could be arranged by School District 79 or the author of the project and the school district seeking the information.

This project was not only completed to meet the criteria for Vancouver Island University, MEdL program, but also to build a Web 2.0 tool resource for School District 79 that would support educators in abiding by the AUP when integrating Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. The idea was produced from the desire to be a leader of technology in School District 79 and support fellow colleagues in their quest to properly integrate Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. With the continuation of the project by School District 79 technology staff this resource has the potential to grow exponentially in the number of Web 2.0 tools approved for use, and create an ease of use among educators using the AUP to guide their use of Web 2.0 tools in their teaching. It is also hoped that with the continuation of

the project it will inspire other school district's to consider creating their own AUP specific Web 2.0 tool website.

References

Bosco, J. & Krueger, K. (2011). *Moving from 'Acceptable' to 'Responsible' Use in a Web 2.0 World.* Education Week, 30(17). Retrieved from: http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/07/20/37bosco.h30.html

British Columbia Ministry of Technology, Innovation and Citizens' Services (2013). *Guide to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.* Retrieved from: http://www.cio.gov.bc.ca/cio/priv_leg/foippa/foippa_guide.page

Collins, A. & Halverson, R. (2009). *Rethinking Education in the Age of Technology: The Digital Revolution and Schooling in America*. New York: Teachers College Press. Retrieved from: http://llk.media.mit.edu/courses/readings/Collins-Rethinking-Education.pdf

Conn, K. (2002). *The Internet and the law: What educators need to know.* Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cramer, M., & Hayes, G. (2010). *Acceptable Use of Technology in Schools: Risks, Polices and Promises*. Pervasive Computing. 9(3), 37-44. Retrieved from: http://www.gillianhayes.com/wpcontent/uploads/2011/01/J8_IEEEPervasive_CramerHayes2010.pdf

Flowers, B. F., & Rakes, G. C. (2000). *Analysis of acceptable use policies regarding the Internet* in selected K-12 schools. Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 32, 351–365.

Hengstler, J. (May 17, 2013a). *A K-12 Primer for British Columbia Teachers Posting Students' Work Online.* Educational Technologies & More. Message posted to http://jhengstler.wordpress.com/2013/05/17/a-k-12-primer-for-british-columbia-teachers-posting-students-work-online/

Hengstler, J. (2013b). *A K-12 Primer for British Columbia Teachers Posting Students' Work Online.* Retrieved from: http://heres-

how.weebly.com/uploads/4/4/9/9/4499967/primer_on_posting_minor_students_final.pdf

Holcomb, L., K. Brady & Smith, B. (2010, March). *The Emergence of "Educational Networking": Can Noncommercial, Education-based Social Networking Sites Really Address the Privacy and Safety Concerns of Educators*? MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 6(2), Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/vol6no2/holcomb_0610.pdf

Lemke, C., & Coughlin, E. (2009). *Leadership for Web 2.0 in Education: Promise and Reality.* Consortium for School Networking. Retrieved from: http://metiri.com/share/CoSN%20Report%20042809Final%20w-cover.pdf

Light, D. & Polin, K. (2010). *Integrating Web 2.0 Tools into the Classroom: Changing the Culture of Learning*. EDC Center for Children and Technology. New York, NY: Retrieved from http://cct.edc.org/sites/cct.edc.org/files/publications/Integrating Web2.0.PDF

Orenstein, David. (2009) *Filtering Access to Internet content at Higher Education Institutions: Stakeholder Perceptions and Their Impact on Research and Academic Freedom.* ProQuest 1-166. Retrieved from: http://search.proquest.com/docview/305166345

Osborne, N. (2011, December 20). *Using social media in* education*, part 1: Opportunity, risk, and policy.* Developer Works. Retrieved from: *http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/library/wa-ind-educ-social-media1/*

Rodgers, D., & Garcia, P. (2013*). The Social Media Dilemma in Education: Policy Design, Implementation and Effects*. Los Angeles, CA. USC Libraries. Retrieved from: http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/cdm/ref/collection/p15799coll3/id/53189

Simkins, Michael & Randy Schultz. (2010). *Using Web 2.0 tools at school*. *39*(3), 12-38. Association of California Schools Administrators. Retrieved from:

http://www.acsa.org/FunctionalMenuCategories/Media/LeadershipMagazine/2010-Archives/JanuaryFebruary-2010/Web-20.aspx

Taylor, K. R., Whang, E. W., & Tettegah, S. Y. (2006). *Acceptable Use Policies in School Districts: Myth or Reality?* Technology and Education: Issues in Administration, Policy, and Applications in K12 Schools. Advances in Educational Administration. Amsterdam: Elsevier JAI. 8, 115-123 DOI: 10.1016/S1479-3660(05)08009-1

Tinnerman, L., Johnson, J. & Grimes R. (2010). *Technology Assisted Collaborative and Project Based Learning of Blogs, Wikis, and Networking.* Informally published manuscript. Retrieved from http://www.roddrangrimes.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Technology-Assisted-Collaborative-and-Project-based-Learning.pdf

Web 2.0 tools. (n.d). In *Wikipedia.* Retrieved October 18, 2014 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_2.0

Willard, N. (2010). *Teach Them to Swim*. *Knowledge Quest*, *39*(1), 54-61. Retrieved from http://s640if.wikispaces.com/file/view/Teach Them To Swim.pdf

Zaied, A. N. (2007). A framework for evaluating and selecting learning technologies. *The International Arab Journal of Information Technology*, *4*(2), 141-147. Retrieved from http://www.ccis2k.org/iajit/PDF/vol.4,no.2/8-Zaied.pdf

Appendices

Appendix A - Web 2.0 tool Evaluation Rubric

Web 2.0 tool Evaluation Rubric

Evaluator:
Web Tool:
Skill(s):
Grade Level(s):
Operating System(s): Mac ☐ PC ☐ IOS ☐ Android ☐
Cost: $

CONTENT	1	2	3	4
CURRICULUM CONNECTIONS	Skill(s) reinforced in the Web tool are not clearly connected to learning outcomes. ☐	Skill(s) reinforced in the Web tool are somewhat connected to learning outcomes. ☐	Skill(s) reinforced in the Web tool are connected to learning outcomes. ☐	Skill(s) reinforced in the Web tool are strongly connected to learning outcomes. ☐
DIFFERENTIATION *(Ability Levels)*	No flexibility to alter settings to meet student needs. ☐	Limited flexibility to alter settings to meet student needs. ☐	Increased flexibility to alter settings to meet student needs. ☐	Maximum flexibility to alter settings to meet student needs. ☐
USER FRIENDLY	Teacher may need to give students several reminders of how to use the Web tool. ☐	Teacher may need to give students some reminders of how to use the Web tool. ☐	Teacher may need to give students one reminder of how to use the Web tool. ☐	Students will be able to independently use the Web tool. ☐
AUTHENTICITY	Skills are practiced in repetition form and do not provide opportunities to critically think. ☐	Skills are practiced in replication form and provide limited opportunities to critically think. ☐	Skills are mostly practiced in a realistic learning environment and provide increased opportunities to critically think. ☐	Skills are practiced in a realistic and authentic environment and provide maximum opportunities to critically think. ☐
STUDENT MOTIVATION (Engagement)	Very little student engagement. Students will not be interested in using this Web tool. ☐	Students will be somewhat engaged. Students will not be keen to use this Web tool. ☐	Students will be engaged. Students are keen to use this Web tool. ☐	Students will be highly engaged. Students will be very keen to use this Web tool. ☐

INSTRUCTIONS	Instructions are very brief or non-existent with no examples provided. ☐	Instructions are not very clear and minimal examples are provided. ☐	Instructions are clear, with some examples provided. ☐	Instructions are very clear, easy to follow and many examples are provided. ☐
VARIATIONS	No opportunities for peer interactions during learning. ☐	Limited opportunities for peer interactions during learning. ☐	Increased opportunities for peer interactions during learning. ☐	Maximum opportunities to interact with peers during learning. ☐

Total /28*points*

Based on the score from the above rubric this Web 2.0 tool is:

☐ **<14*points* Not Recommended**	☐ **>28*points* Recommended**

Considerations:

Appendix B – Web 2.0 tool AUP Adherence Questionnaire

Web 2.0 tool AUP Adherence Questionnaire

Web Tool:
Grade Level(s):
Operating System(s): Mac ☐ PC ☐ IOS ☐ Android ☐
Cost: $

Question	Yes	No
#1. Does this tool have strong curriculum connections?	**Continue to question #2.**	**STOP! This tool is not recommended for use with students.**
#2. Does this web tool require students to login with a personal email address?	Proceed to question #3 with caution: SD 79 non-identifiable student emails can be used, contact Technology department.	Continue to question #3.
#3. Does this web tool require downloads or installation of software?	Proceed to question #4 with caution: Special permission and further assistance from the Technology department will be required.	Continue to question #4.
#4. Does this web tool allow monitoring of students' progress?	Proceed to question #5 with caution: There must be no student identifiable information shared.	Continue to question #5.
#5. Does this web tool allow students to interact with the general public?	STOP! Interacting with the public does not conform to FOIPPA regulations. Continue to question #6.	Continue to question #7.
#6. Can the feature of interacting with the public be disabled?	Proceed with caution: This tool can only be used if the feature of interacting with the public IS disabled.	STOP! Do not use this web tool with students.
#7. Does this tool allow for multiple administrators? (Can multiple teachers/principals log in?)	Continue to question #8. Reminder: administrators (principals) are required to have their own login privileges.	STOP! Do not use this web tool, as it is required that administrators have their own login privileges.
#8. Does this tool look the same and have the same features on multiple operating systems?	Continue to question #9.	Proceed with caution: This may present issues with BYOD policies.
#9. Does this tool allow parent access to published work?	Success! This would be an acceptable web tool to use with students.	Proceed with caution: Parents have a right to view their child's work.

Appendix C – Web 2.0 tool Background Information Document

Backgrounder

Dear parents/guardians,

I wanted to provide you with further information regarding to aid in your decision to give consent for your child to use . Please read the following and if possible visit the links provided.

What is ?

Why would your child use ?

Are there privacy issues with ?

While no Internet-based experience can ever be 100% risk-free, know that I will take every reasonable measure to manage expected risks.

Please refer to the Privacy Policy for further information: agrees to treat your personally identifiable information in accordance with the terms of their current privacy policy, which is available for review at:

The Privacy Policy will be reviewed and discussed with students prior to using .

When using we will be abiding by the School District No. 79 (Cowichan Valley) ***District Wide Network and Internet Appropriate Use Policy***. Please find this document attached.

Why is BC so sensitive to privacy laws regarding data?

"Shortly after the 9/11 attacks on the US in 2001, the American government enacted the US Patriot Act that allowed the US government to search private and public data housed on servers on US soil. At the time, The BC Medical Services Plan was hosting our provincial medical records in the US. Unions in BC expressed concern over the ability of the American government to search through British Columbian's personal medical records and histories. Ultimately, the rules is: if you transfer or authorize the transfer of your personal information outside of Canada, that data is subject to the laws and practices of the country where it sits – be it US, China, or India. (Remember that minors, under the legal care of an adult, cannot authorize such a transfer.) Not all locations have similar notions about your right to privacy. Since cloud computing is a relatively new technology, the laws and best practices governing it are still changing and there is a need to stay current." [1](Hengstler, 2013)

What's 'personal information'?

"People have different standards of what they consider 'personal' information. Sharing over social media has done a fair bit to reset our expectation. Regardless of personal definition, if the information, data, or content could be used to identify you, it's 'personal information' – though professional or business contact information may be treated separately." [1](Henglstler, 2013)

Why is a consent form necessary?

"Various provinces in Canada – and other jurisdictions across the world – have enacted laws to protect personal privacy. In BC, the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act or FIPPA covers us http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/96165_00. It is one of the most defined privacy protection frameworks in Canada. FIPPA states that 'public bodies' such as schools and public organizations have defined legal requirements for handing your personal information when it is within their 'custody' and 'control'. Generally, public bodies must make sure that your personal information cannot be stored or accessed outside of Canada without your expressed permission – 'consent' (Note: there are certain expectations in the law like data covered by treaties, etc.). FIPPA states that your consent must be in writing, state to whom your personal information may be disclosed, and how your information will be used. Also, if you post personal information about others, their permission must also be secured." [1](Hengstler, 2013)

What if I don't want to consent?

You have the right as a parent/guardian to withhold consent to your child using [redacted]. Alternate activities will be provided to students in the event that parents/caregivers choose to withhold consent and that selection of an alternate activity will not affect a student's grade.

Further information:

[redacted] **Home**: [redacted]

[redacted] **Terms of Service**: [redacted]

If you have any questions or concerns please do not hesitate to email me at: [redacted]

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Julia Hengstler is the Educational Technologist with the Faculty of Education at Vancouver Island University & an Instructor in Educational Technology. Please visit this site for more background information about her: http://www.viu.ca/education/faculty/profiles/hengstler_j.asp

Appendix D – Web 2.0 tool Information Form

Information Form for _____

Student Name: _____ Grade: _____

School: _____ Date: _____

TECHNOLOGY FOR SCHOOL USE

Home:

REASON FOR USE

ACCEPTABLE USE

The Cowichan School District (79) has actively pursued making advanced technology and increased access to learning opportunities available to students, staff and the general public. With this new learning tool, students and educators must understand and practice proper and ethical use.

The purpose of the use of is to facilitate learning opportunities by providing access to unique resources. To remain eligible as a user the use of your account must be in support of and consistent with the educational objectives.

Transmission of any material in violation of any Canadian or International regulation is prohibited. This includes, but is not limited to, copyright material, threatening or obscene material, illegal material or material protected by trade secret. Use for commercial activities is generally not acceptable. Use for product advertisement or political lobbying is prohibited.

The District reserves the right to review any material on user accounts and to monitor file server space in order to make determinations on whether specific uses of the network are inappropriate.

NO WARRANTIES

The District makes no warranties of any kind, whether express or implied, for the services provided by . The District will not be responsible for any damages a user suffers. This includes loss of data resulting from delays, no-deliveries, mis-deliveries, or service interruptions caused by the District's negligence or by the user's errors or omissions. Use of any information obtained via the Internet is at the user's own risk. The District specifically denies any responsibility for the accuracy or quality of information obtained through its services. All users need to consider the source of any information they obtain and consider how valid that information may be.

SECURITY

- Security on any computer system is a high priority, especially when the system involves many users. A user must never allow others to use his/her password. Users should also protect their passwords to ensure system security and their own privileges and ability to continue use of the system.
- If you feel you can identify a security problem on you must notify a system administrator. Do not demonstrate the problem to other users.
- Attempts to logon to as a teacher/administrator will result in cancellation of user privileges.
- The teacher/site administrator will deny any user identified as a security risk for having a history of problems with other computer systems to .

Privacy Policy*:*

Privacy Implications & Risks of Use: Connect Safely: Smart Socializing Starts Here

http://www.connectsafely.org/online-safety-30-empowering-and-protecting-youth/?doing_wp_cron=1378173788.8623321056365966796875

ENCOUNTER OF CONTROVERSIAL MATERIAL

Users may encounter material, which is controversial, and which users, parents, teachers or administrators may consider inappropriate or offensive. However, on the Internet it is impossible to control the content of data and a user may discover controversial materials. It is the user's responsibility not to initiate access to such material. The District shall not be held liable for any decision to restrict or regulate access to Internet materials.

Terms & Conditions for Uploading, Using and Sharing Personal Information

I, _____, agree that my child, _____, will adhere to the expectations, terms and conditions attached as **"Specific Expectations, Terms and Conditions of Students Using Technology"** when using the above-named technology for a class assignment. I realize that if my child does not abide by these terms and conditions they may expose theirs or other people's personal information to unauthorized third parties, leading to an invasion of their or other people's privacy.

I, _____, agree to the collection, use, disclosure and storage of my child, _____'s, personal information inside or outside of Canada while using the technology described above for the purposes of engaging in classroom activities. I am aware of, and understand the identifiable privacy risks as described above.

I, _____, have read the above information regarding my child/my access to the online learning tool, 3rd World Farmer. I understand that my child's access to this site is for him/her alone and will not be shared.

Parent Signature: _____Date:_____

"Specific Expectations, Terms and Conditions of Students Using Technology"

Student Name:_____ Date:_____

Teacher Name: _____ Class Division: _____

Please review the following **"Specific Expectations, Terms and Conditions of Students Using Technology"** with your child. These expectations will be reviewed again in class prior to using .

ETTIQUETTE

All communications and information posted on via the Internet should be assumed to be the private property of those who posted it. All users are expected to abide by the generally accepted rules of network etiquette. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. All users are expected to behave as they would in any other environment where they represent their school. It is important that users conduct themselves in a responsible, ethical, and polite manner in accordance with the standards of propriety in the District.

B. Users **may not**:

- use abusive, vulgar, profane, obscene, harassing, or other inappropriate language;"
- criticize the spelling, writing or keyboarding of others;
- re-post personal electronic mail received to public forums without the permission of the author.
- share password(s) with others;
- distribute or use anyone else's account name and password;
- reveal your personal address or phone numbers of students or colleagues.
- transmit or post threatening, abusive, obscene or harassing material

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____

Parent Signature: _____ Date: _____

Digital Citizenship - Parental Responsibilities

Students will have access to their from home, therefore you, as a parent/guardian will need to be aware of your responsibility when allowing your child to post in .

Your parental responsibilities are to:

- ensure they always get your permission before sharing personal information or accepting anything. Reinforce what is meant by personal information and where on the Internet they may be asked for it.
- reinforce the public nature of the Internet and make sure your child understands that you will monitor their online activity.
- monitor use of posting/commenting online.

For further information regarding your role from home please visit:
https://www.kidsintheknow.ca/app/en/top5_risks

Appendix E – Peer Review Form

Web 2.0 Tool Website Feedback

* Required

Feedback given on this form is done anonymously and comments will not be used for anything other than improving the website.

Content (practical resources/clear explanations) *

Navigation (hyperlinks active/smooth transitions/clear paths) *

Visual Design (layout/engagement/pleasing to the eye) *

Usefulness (convenience/effectiveness) *

Submit