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Abstract
Although teachers recognize the use of technology in their classrooms has a positive influence on their students, efforts to learn the technology integration are often limited by barriers. The purpose of this project was to document the whole process of designing and developing a professional development program for technology integration to break out barriers. By conducting a literature review I gained a better understanding for professional development of instructional technologies. After collaboratively conducting the context analysis with my colleagues, I designed, developed and implemented thirteen sessions of the professional development sessions. I got the on-going feedback as the formative evaluation. I also conducted a beta-testing for the summative evaluation. This report ends with the plan for future changes.
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Abstract

Although teachers recognize the use of technology in their classrooms has a positive influence on their students, efforts to learn the technology integration are often limited by barriers. The purpose of this project was to document the whole process of designing and developing a professional development program for technology integration to break out barriers. By conducting a literature review I gained a better understanding for professional development of instructional technologies. After collaboratively conducting the context analysis with my colleagues, I designed, developed and implemented thirteen sessions of the professional development sessions. I got the on-going feedback as the formative evaluation. I also conducted a beta-testing for the summative evaluation. This report ends with the plan for future changes.
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The Design of a Professional Development for Technology Integration

Technology encompasses all aspects of our students’ daily lives, and they are fast becoming adept at using it. Our teachers, however, are not keeping up with their students and students are frustrated and increasingly dissatisfied by the digital disconnect they are experiencing at school (Levin & Arafeh, 2002). Although teachers recognize that the use of technology in their classrooms may have a positive influence on their students, efforts to learn the technology are often limited by barriers. There are a number of possible reasons why teachers have fallen behind: lack of support, lack of technology, fear of the technology, lack of efficacy, or just not having the knowledge of how to use it (Schrum, 1999). Instructional technology professional development is one possible solution to address this issue.

To facilitate instructor development, the Iowa Department of Education set up the Teacher Leadership and Compensation System (TLC), recognizing that, “Improving student learning requires improving the instruction they receive each day.” In 2014, Linn-Mar Community School District, the district where I work, received the Teacher Leadership Grant. A part of this grant included hiring five Technology Integration Coaches; three for the elementary level, one for the middle school level, and one for the high school level. As one of those coaches, I serve 128 high school staff members. My role as a Technology Instructional Coach is to provide support to staff on effective instructional technology strategies. I assist teachers with the development and design of their students’ digital learning. I promote and model teaching strategies. I also help teachers engage in professional growth and leadership with instructional technology to help combat the fast approaching technology gap.

Slow instructor response to a fast-changing technological environment has increased the gap seen in our district. Over the last six years, Linn-Mar has made a number of changes with
technology, going from a Google school district to an Office 365 school district, to a dual platform that uses both; while providing little or no training and support. In response, teachers have had to fend for themselves. Some teachers took classes on their own time to learn more about technology, while others learned it on their own. Finally, there are others who haven’t pushed themselves to learn more and don’t easily understand it and therefore do not incorporate it into their classrooms. This makes the gap between students and teachers even larger and at many different levels. Now with the help of the Technology Integration Coaches, the support teachers so desperately need can be provided. But how? In the current design of the five district professional development days, there is little time for technology sessions. Teachers work contracted hours, 7:30-3:30, and almost every minute is filled with instruction. What kind of professional development could I offer that maximizes the teachers limited amount of time and has a direct impact their instruction?

Technology presents teachers with opportunities to educate even the brightest students to their highest potential. Teachers have the knowledge of their content and they understand how their students learn, however, effective use of instructional technology can help improve learning in critical thinking, collaboration, communication and creativity (NEA, 2010). Today’s students need these skills in order to meet the challenges of adapting to our constantly changing workforce (NEA, 2010). Teachers confidently using technology view it not merely as a tool for delivery, but as the ability to positively impact student achievement. My role is to provide the technology professional development and the support they need in order for them to do this.

I addressed this challenge by creating an additional professional development opportunity for teachers. The professional development sessions were offered during the contract hours, not during the regular scheduled professional development days. These sessions offered training in
technology tools and the integration of those tools. I refer to these sessions as the “Fish Bowl.”

These sessions are named the “Fish Bowl” because of the room where the sessions are held. The room is enclosed in glass and resembles a fish bowl. The training sessions are short, 30-minute sessions showing teachers about a technology tool and how they could use the tool in their instruction. The sessions are voluntary; teachers may choose to attend for however long their schedule permits. The design and development of this project was meant to give teachers another option to engage in professional growth with technology integration in order to increase their efficacy and increase their use of instructional technology within their classrooms. I received feedback from my instructional specialist and teacher colleagues who participated in the program as the on-going formative evaluation of the program. I also conducted a beta-test as the summative evaluation. It is my hope that data collected from this beta-testing would provide some evidence whether the technology professional development was worthwhile and beneficial and the suggestions for improving the professional development sessions for the next school year.

**Literature Review**

As mentioned above, my project involved creating a professional development opportunity for teachers that did not currently exist. The overall goal of this opportunity was to increase teacher efficacy with technology and encourage them to make changes in their instruction with the new knowledge they gained by attending the technology sessions. In order to get a better understanding of professional development strategies for instructional technology, I have reviewed twelve peer-reviewed journal articles relating to professional development of educators in the use of instructional technologies. Three major themes emerged from my literature review: students’ perceptions, barriers, and professional development.
Student Perceptions

Students’ frustration and increased dissatisfaction with the digital disconnect mark their school experience (Levin & Arafeh, 2002). Even though schools have made changes to Internet and device policies, increased network capabilities, and allowed for the Internet and digital tools to be more accessible, teachers have not made the necessary changes in their instruction. An example of students’ opinions of teachers and their inability to use technology is expressed in a student’s statement in an online essay about Internet use, “Our teachers usually … don’t know what to do with it” (Levin et al., 2002, p. 7). A study of 2147 Advance Placement (AP) and National Writing Project (NWP) teachers agrees, it states 42% of teachers feel their students know more than they do when it comes to digital tools (Purcell, Buchanan, & Friedrich, 2013). An anonymous respondent from a 2012 study done by Janna Anderson (Anderson & Rainie, 2012) of 1021 technology stakeholders and critics said,

Most teachers today can’t comprehend the necessary paradigm to implement the tools effectively: “Those who are teaching the children who will be teenagers and young adults by 2020 are not all up-to-speed with the internet, mobile technologies, social interfaces, and the numerous other technologies that have recently been made mainstream. . . (p. 21)

So if students are saying they are dissatisfied with their teachers’ lack of technology knowledge, critics are saying it and teachers know it, then why is there still a gap?

Barriers

Numerous studies identify barriers impacting technology integration. Identifying and understanding these barriers might allow us to develop strategies needed to overcome them. For example, in a classic study, Peggy Ertmer (1999) discusses first-order and second-order barriers.
First-order barriers refer to those that are extrinsic to teachers (e.g., equipment, time, training, support) that are either missing or lacking. Second-order barriers are less tangible and more personal than first-order barriers.

Jonathan Brinkerhoff (2006) has grouped the barriers into four categories: Resources, Institutional and Administrative Support, Training and Experiences, and Attitude or Personality Factors. These barriers relate to teachers’ beliefs about teaching with technology in meaningful ways. The study of 348 full-time faculty at the State University of West Georgia identifies a number of barriers to integrating technology into instruction; the fear of failure, availability of support staff when problems occur, some worry technologies may alienate and diminish communication and social skills of their students, some question if student performances will be improved by use of the technology. Other barriers include infrastructure, lack of time to learn and develop course materials (Beggs, 2000).

Each of the above mentioned studies have identified common barriers to technology integration. In order to best consider approaches to overcome them, it may be useful to group them in four areas as Kopcha (2012) does; Access to technology, the Vision of how technology is utilized, teacher Beliefs in the use of instructional technology, and with a focus on the Professional Development.

**Professional Development**

Professional development is critical in ensuring that teachers keep up with changes in statewide performance standards, new methods in teaching, and effective instructional use of new technologies. There is much known and unknown about the professional development to support integration of technology into teaching and learning (Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007). What constitutes effective methods of technology professional development? Wells (2007) has
identified a professional development design that incorporates Key Design Factors that impacts a lasting change in teachers’ attitudes and beliefs which ultimately resulted in a change in practice. The 10 Key Design Factors were a part of the design and process of the professional development model; Duration of Process, Learner Centered, Engagement, Collaborative, Support, Evaluation Driven, Contextual, Inquiry Based, Theory/Research Based, Sustainability with the first five appearing provided the greatest influence. Brinkerhoff’s study (2006) of the effect of teachers’ technology skills, self-efficacy, technology integration, and beliefs and practices due to a long-duration technology professional development academy resulted in the following recommendations: the long-duration of the professional development was valuable and there is a need for incorporating extended contract hours for instruction and practice of technology skills. It also reported that teachers should be held accountable for creating and implementing lessons using technology tied to content objectives and assessment. It reported that professional development instruction should center around a participant’s teaching interest whether it be small group or large group, and using hands-on activities with a shared end product. Finally, Brinkerhoff (2006) suggests the goal for the professional development be clear whether its intent is to teach technology skills, support infusion of technology into teaching practices, or promote instructional reform.

In conclusion, no matter which type of professional development model a school uses, a common theme emerges that indicates professional development opportunities to learn about technology need to be available and those sessions need to meet the needs of the teachers. Therefore, this project sought to give teachers an opportunity that did not previously exist and in the end examined the participants to see if it met their needs.
Description of the Project

Instructional Design Model for Guiding the Design

Initially, I did not consider an instructional design model for the project, however, as the design developed, I used the ADDIE Model which is commonly used by instructional designers (Culatta, 2016) as a guide. The ADDIE Instructional Design Model has five phases, the Analysis Stage, Design Stage, Development Stage, Implementation Stage, and Evaluation Stage. The following sections are organized according to the five phases as the documentation of the design process.

![ADDIE Instructional Design Model](image)

*Figure 1. ADDIE Instructional Design Model. This figure is a graphical representation of the ADDIE Instructional Design Model.*

Stage 1: Context and Learner Analysis

**Learner analysis.** There are 128 certified staff members (teachers) in the high school. Teachers are expressing their desire to learn technology related skills but their opportunities to receive the training they need are limited. For example, teacher responses from the Clarity Survey completed in November, 2015 indicated that 72% who answered the survey wanted to learn more about effective use of technology for teaching and learning, 59% indicated they did not feel confident in managing classrooms where students were using technology, and 46%
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

indicated they felt they could not find new technologies for their classrooms easily (Clarity Survey, 2015). Aligning this with the limited offerings for technology professional development which included two, one-hour sessions during four of the five professional development days for a total of eight hours. Of the 1,080 instructional teaching hours teachers are to have in a calendar year, eight total hours offered on technology is not a lot of time. To make matters worse, teachers were not required to attend these technology sessions, there were other sessions offered that they could choose to attend; for example: “Growth Mindset for Teachers” or “Key to RTI and Enrichment.” During the school year there was only one other, not required, technology professional development opportunity offered by the Teacher Quality Student Achievement (TQSA) committee, in two 7.5-hour sessions courses that occurred after school in October with five teachers in attendance and the other in November with eleven. Sixteen teachers attending these sessions out of the entire 128 staff is not a high percentage. Within this context, I found there was a need to provide teachers additional opportunities to receive technology professional development other than the structured time during professional development days and TQSA offerings. In order to achieve this, I developed what I call the “Fish Bowl,” in-house, voluntary, 30-minute, teaching sessions over instructional technology.

In order to give staff members the opportunity to receive the professional development; all staff members from the high school, including the associates, teachers from the alternative high school, and the district’s instructional coaches were invited. It was important to be mindful of the limited amount of time teachers have during the school day, so the sessions were set for just 30 minutes long and held in a comfortable, non-threatening environment, a room named the “Fish Bowl.” If the times that the sessions were offered did not work for the staff, they had the opportunity to make an appointment at a time that
worked better for them. The technology sessions in the "Fish Bowl" room provided more opportunities for teachers who feel stressed about time, but wanted to learn and improve their use of technology in their classrooms.

Context analysis. As the high school Technology Integration Coach, it is my role to provide teachers with instructional support with technology. My job has many facets: consulting, model teaching, co-teaching, observing, cognitive coaching, and helping with the development of professional development opportunities. There have been a number of roadblocks or maybe better said “barriers” to this position and bringing technology to the forefront of instruction. I wanted to take an action that could possibly increase teachers’ chances of receiving professional development in the area of instructional technology. I felt that the current offerings of professional development did not give teachers who wanted more training an option. I was uncertain if the teachers would attend sessions knowing that their daily schedules are busy, but thought it was important to at least create an opportunity for the teachers.

Stage 2: Program Design

In order to help determine the technology needs of the staff, I worked with the four other Technology Instructional Coaches (one-middle level, three- elementary level), the three high school Instructional Coaches and the high school Technology Committee. The Technology Committee consisted of 23 high school staff members representing the departments English (3), Fine Arts (4), Social Studies (5), Science (4), and Career and Technical Education (3), Math (1), Physical Education (2), Student Support Services (1) and the Media Specialist departments. The Technology Instructional Coaches and the High School Instructional Coaches met on a weekly basis. The High School Technology
Committee met every professional development day (October, January, February and May). The committee agreed to add to its agenda the “Fish Bowl” as a discussion item in order to help facilitate what sessions should be taught based on teachers needs and wants. The following is the documentation of the development of my design.

**Infrastructure design.** In October, 2015, I brought up the idea of the sessions in the “Fish Bowl” in October. After sharing my idea with the colleagues, I took the idea to the principal. He was in favor of my proposal and not only granted me permission but provided me with the necessary resources. The month of October was spent setting up and developing the Fish Bowl. The room being called the “Fish Bowl” was a newly-constructed room in the Science wing of the high school. The room’s outside wall is covered in glass from top to bottom, hence the nickname the “Fish Bowl.” The original purpose of the room was for staff members who shared rooms who needed to use the space during their preparation time. The room was also used by students to take tests or as a work area. The room was repurposed for the “Fish Bowl.” A banner was placed around the doorway stating *Fish Bowl - In House - Weekly - Voluntary - Learn & Watch - 30 Min*, a sign was posted *Teacher Training In-Session*, and technology related magazines and articles were strategically placed on the counters. A 52” monitor was mounted on the wall with HDMI and VGA cables to plug into a computer or device for presenting. Figure 1 shows the room before and after.
Session design. Knowing that the design of the sessions needed to be meaningful and time sensitive for teachers, an emphasis was set that the sessions were to be 30 minutes in length. The intention of the 30-minute session was for teachers to “Learn and Watch” how the technology could be used in the classroom. The 30 minutes was not intended for teachers to get a full step-by-step tutorial or training on how to use the tool; instead it was meant for the introduction of the tool. If the teacher decides to learn more, the teacher could set up a meeting with me to follow-up at a later date. Those meetings would lead to instructional coaching conversations, that would help the teacher plan to use the tool in the classroom and I would either model, co-teach or support the instructor.

It took some consideration on when to schedule the sessions. I kept in mind that I wanted to maximize my time with teachers in the “Fish Bowl” but also needed to allow sufficient time for individual coaching/meetings with teachers on topics other than the “Fish Bowl” sessions. Not knowing exactly when the best time to have sessions would be, I decided to split the sessions into two days; Wednesday mornings and Thursday afternoons. The sessions started 10 minutes after the start of the period. Table 1 shows the session times.
Table 1

“Fish Bowl” Session Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday Mornings</th>
<th>Thursday Afternoons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:40 – 9:10</td>
<td>12:00 – 12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>1:15 – 1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 – 10:50</td>
<td>2:05 – 2:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 – 11:40</td>
<td>2:55 – 3:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each session started with an introduction of showing an example of a finished product. This was to show the teachers how the product could be used within their classes. Next, was a question for the teachers on how they might see the tool being used in their classroom. The reflection was meant to spark an idea or two and to lead to more questions. The rest of the session plan was to meet the needs of the teachers; to either spend time answering questions or show more examples of the tool. For the closing of the session the following questions were asked: Was this information helpful? What support do you need from me now? The purpose of the questions was to make sure the teachers felt that the information they received was relevant for them and to also offer additional support if needed.

Numerous promotional materials were posted and sent to staff members. These materials included posters pinned in high traffic staff areas, emails with catchy slogans, and flyers placed in teachers’ mailboxes. An example flyer is included in the Appendix.

Stage 3: Program Development

As stated before I enlisted support from the high school Instructional Coaches, the four other Technology Integration Coaches and the high school Technology Committee to help with the topics of the sessions. Through weekly meetings with the Instructional and Technology coaches and monthly meetings with the Technology Committee topics were suggested through
an ongoing basis. Session suggestions either came from recent professional development sessions that the Technology Integration Coaches attended or comments from the Technology Committee that they felt the staff needed. In the end, 13 sessions of the professional development were developed. These sessions fell under four major themes; Video Getting Started, Video and Formative Assessments, The Best of Both Worlds: Google and Office, and Presentation and Formative Assessment Apps. Table 2 shows the dates of the sessions, the session theme and the session topic.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Dates, Themes, and Topics of the Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In November 2015, I began with an introductory lesson on setting-up one’s YouTube channel and basic recording tips. The first couple of weeks started out fine. Each week had three to four teachers attend; two of those teachers were repeat attendees. However, after the fourth week the attendance started to linger. A conversation with the Technology Integration Coaches discussed a few options for why teachers were not attending and what I could do in order to bump up attendance. We agreed that I would repeat a couple of the sessions, for teachers who were unable attend earlier. In addition, there were only two weeks of school in December and it was agreed not to add anything new to teachers’ “plates” before holiday break.
During the January Technology Committee, we reviewed how the sessions were going and what sessions would be next. In the meeting it was agreed not to hold sessions until mid-February, after the new semester started and teachers were settled in with their classes. Discussion occurred about how few teachers have attended the sessions. The lack of time for teachers to get away and that teachers have so much on their plates, were some of the reasons verbalized as possibilities for the low attendance. At the end of the conversation, the consensus was: technology sessions are a good idea that should be continued, more promotion should be done, and February technology sessions should focus on student presentations and formative assessments. The committee had mentioned that teachers would like to “see” how technology is being used in classes. Since I was not having sessions in the “Fish Bowl” I began to record what teachers were doing in the classroom. My goal was to create promotional videos based on the application or tool and showcase its use.
The Dates, Topics and the Number in Attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Dates</th>
<th>Session Topic</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 4-5</td>
<td>YouTube Setting your Channel and Playlists</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11-12</td>
<td>Create, Share, Upload w/Doc Cameras, Digital Cameras, Phones, and Tablets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-23</td>
<td>Editing YouTube, WeVideo, Movie Maker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2-3</td>
<td>Editing YouTube, WeVideo, Movie Maker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9-10</td>
<td>EdPuzzle and Kahoot!</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16-17</td>
<td>Google Forms and YouTube Annotations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24-25</td>
<td>Google and Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2-3</td>
<td>Google and Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9-10</td>
<td>Office Mix</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16-17</td>
<td>Office Mix</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>GoFormative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14</td>
<td>Buncee.com</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28</td>
<td>Green Screen with Screen Chomp</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 5: Evaluation

Throughout the design process, there was continual evaluation of the sessions topics and attendance. The paragraphs below describe the formative evaluation to continuously improve the sessions.

On-going formative evaluation. As mentioned above, the formative evaluation started during the January, 2016 at beginning the implementation. As a committee, we met regularly to discuss the implementation. The month of February was a struggle for the “Fish Bowl.” The first
three weeks I was not able to have sessions due to either illness in my family or myself. When I was in school those three weeks, there were other items that needed my attention. On February 22, the Technology Committee met. The discussion was status quo from the last meeting; to continue the sessions. The sessions would focus on student presentations and formative assessments. The reasoning behind this type of session was because the end of the quarter was in four weeks and many teachers would have students do presentations for end of quarter work.

The committee also reviewed the survey questions. It was discussed that more information was needed on why teachers were not attending the sessions. We agreed I would make changes to the survey.

In March, working with one of the high school Instructional Coaches and an elementary Technology Instructional Coach, we reviewed the survey questions. My focus for the survey had changed slightly from when I first created it. At that time, I wanted to find out if the teachers who had attended the “Fish Bowl” were becoming more comfortable with using technology and had changed their instruction because of attending the sessions. Now, because of the lack of participants, I am also wanting to know why they are not attending. What is it that is keeping them from stopping in? What changes should I make? Or, should I even continue with the “Fish Bowl” next year? I was beginning to feel that answering these questions were a necessity.

With the help from the two coaches, it was decided to use the survey to ask questions for both groups; those who have attended and those who have not. The focus on those who have attended would stay the same as it was. For those who hadn’t attended the focus questions would now be to answer why and what changes could be made in order for them to attend. The surveys would be sent in April. Table 3 shows the survey questions after they were modified.
It was brought up in one of the conversations with the Instructional Coaches that teachers might be confused on session times and dates. The sessions were scheduled for Wednesday mornings and Thursday afternoons, that maybe just having all of the sessions on one day might make it easier for teachers to remember or to make plans to attend. Based on this conversation it was decided to make a change in day, so now all sessions will be on Thursday only. It was also suggested that when messages were sent to staff members about the weekly sessions to also add an invitation to their Outlook calendars to the “Fish Bowl” for the day. Having this invitation on their calendar hopefully would have a positive effect and remind them to attend or it could have a negative effect because they are irritated it is on their calendar and they don’t know how to take it off. (This makes me chuckle a little, because if they came to a session I could easily tell them how to take it off.)

In April, promotional materials had been sent to staff for sessions continuing the “Presentation and Formative Assessments Apps” theme. A calendar reminder had not been sent out at this time, but will be sent out with the message about the “Green Screen” session. It will be interesting to see if there is any sort of reaction, positive or negative to this. Figure 4 shows the “Fish Bowl” set up for sessions on “Green Screen” and an example of a teacher’s recording.
Participants had been asked to complete the survey starting on April 7. The data has now been collected. Sessions will continue through the end of May.

**Conducting a beta test as summative evaluation.** In order to understand the effect of the design, I used the convenient purposeful sampling to get teachers’ feedback as a summative evaluation. A total of 17 teachers (4 from Science; 2 from Social Studies; 2 from English, 1 from Math; 1 from Business; 1 from Agriculture; 1 from Talented and Gifted; 1 from Student Support Services; 1 from Art; 1 from Industrial Technology; 1 from Family Consumer Sciences; 1 from Teacher Leadership) from the high school participated in this beta test. Teachers had between 2 and 38 years of experience; 9 females and 8 males. Each teacher who attended a session was asked to participate in the research project. Ten additional teachers who did not attend a session were randomly selected with an online random name generator and asked to participate in the study.
Ethical Considerations

I verbally asked for teacher participation before making a more formal invitation to those teachers willing to participate. None were coerced and only those willing to take part were given invitation letters. Permission to conduct the beta-testing was obtained by the high school principal and district superintendent. My research was approved by the Institute Review Board (IRB) at the University of Northern Iowa. As stated in the IRB application there were no anticipated risks to the participants. Data collection was in the form of an end-of-the-year survey given in April. The survey created was a modification of the 2014-2015 FishBowl End of Year Survey shared with me by Steve Katz from the Korean International Schools. The following modifications were made; first was the deletion of the question option about not learning well from one of the Technology Integration Coaches. This was removed, because the Korean International School has multiple Technology Integration Coaches and I am the only one in this position at my school. Secondly, an open-ended question was added that asked for clarification on how implemented technology affected student learning.

Other information collected from the survey included; how often teachers attended sessions, why they decided to attend sessions, how they felt after they attended sessions, and if they had incorporated what they learned into their instruction. In addition, I collected data to identify reasons for why teachers were not attending. After reflecting on my session attendance I felt this additional data collected would help for future planning.

As mentioned above, the ultimate goal for the "Fish Bowl" is to provide additional opportunities for staff to receive technology professional development and be provided support due to the limited number of opportunities offered by the high school. Was the action of the "Fish Bowl" effective? Did it increase the opportunities for teachers to participate in professional
development due to their involvement? Did their efficacy in their teaching with technology improve? Did they change their instruction based on what they learned?

A survey created with Google Forms had been sent out to the selected participants. The data has been downloaded into an Excel document for ease of use. The data analysis for this study has been separated into two groups: those who have attended the technology professional development sessions (Group 1) and those who have not attended the sessions (Group 2). Items in the surveys are same but with some variations among the groups. For instance, data from Group 1 -- participants-- particularly asked the two original questions: has attending the technology professional development sessions increased their efficacy with technology and has attending sessions increased their use of instructional technology in the classroom. The questions for Group 2--non-participants-- are primarily open-ended and ask what were the reasons for them not to attend sessions and what should change in order from them to attend. The answers have been coded with the following themes: Interest, Time, Topics and Technology. The data has been shared and cross-referenced with one of the high school Instructional Coaches whose expertise is looking at data. Additional data was collected from both groups of teachers about their general demographics and their usage of technology compared to last year.

Fortunately, all the selected participants (17) returned the survey by April 15, 2016. The seven teachers who participated in sessions returned the survey, ten teachers who did not participate in the training returned the survey. The following paragraphs are related to the major findings from the survey. The results are arranged according to the groups of teachers.

A comparison of the groups. The first findings are related to all participants in the survey. The results of a survey question asking about the teacher's personal and professional use of technology is reported in Table 4. The importance of this information is that the percentages
were higher for those willing to try new technologies after they found out "why" the technology was important; 40% for personal use, 73% professional use. This information is useful knowledge to have for the development of future training sessions. The ability to design learning sessions that show teachers "why" a technology tool is useful may help the overall response to using technology in their classes.

Another question asked of all the teachers was to compare their use of technology from this year to last year. Table 5, shows that of the teachers who attended sessions (n=7) 71% indicated their use of technology had increased, while 28% indicated it stay the same, none of the teachers indicated it decreased from the previous year. For the teachers who had not attended (n=10), only one indicated it had decreased. Interestingly, this one was a teacher who had only taught for two years. After working with this one teacher on an individual basis, I had observed that as second year teacher they are still struggling to learn their content and curriculum and have had very little time to think about how to implement technology. My overall conclusion from this data is that most teachers are using technology willingly. This goes along with the general data collected from the Clarity Survey (mentioned earlier) that teachers are wanting to use technology in their classrooms. This information is good for me to know, because I can be for certain that I am working with a highly motivated staff.
Table 5

*Comparison of “Fish Bowl” Attendees and Non-Attendees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Professional use of technology compared to last year has</th>
<th>% of Selected Participants (n=17)</th>
<th>% of Total Participants (n=7)</th>
<th>% of Total Non-Participants (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the use of technology compared to last year with years taught. Teachers ranging in years of teaching experience from 38-18, 7 of the 8 increased use of technology from last year. Teachers ranging in years of teaching experience from 17-9, 6 of the 9 stayed the same, while the other two increased. Those who fall in the veteran teacher category are increasing their use, the others who are used to using technology are either increasing or staying the same, non are decreasing. This information is significant because it indicates that teachers are using technology, no matter what their age. All of this data helps me with the designing of future sessions, in that I can focus on teaching why a particular technology may be a useful tool to use in the classroom and not have to spend time convincing teachers that the overall use of technology in the classroom is important.

**Results from the participants who attended (Group 1).** Overall the teachers’ views about the usefulness of the technology sessions were positive. All participants had indicated a positive sense in their feelings after attending a session. One teacher said, “I have a better understanding.” Another stated, “I will be able to use this new learning in a productive manner.” One simply stated, “Excited.” Each of the teachers indicated they had implemented something they had learned from the session in their lessons. “I have used Kahoot! both professionally and
personally and I am using Outlook more effectively,” stated a teacher who had attended multiple sessions. Each teacher had also correlated their use of technology and the importance of student learning. One teacher had attended multiple sessions of the video training. They now create videos for their students when they know they will have a substitute in class. One teacher stated in the survey, “It allows my students to stay on pace. They get the lesson from me instead of having a sub try to get through my notes, or having me rush through two lessons in one day to keep them up to date.” The general consensus was appreciation for the opportunity to attend the sessions and they were beneficial and meaningful. Each teacher stated his/her desire to do something in the future as a result of the “Fish Bowl” sessions, one even stated “attend more ‘Fish Bowl’ Session when possible.”

**Results from the participants who did not attend (Group 2).** Survey questions from participants who did not attend a technology session focused on two main questions; reasons why they did not attend and what changes should be made to allow them to attend. Answers to these questions were open-ended. Three themes have been identified: Time, Topic, and Technology.

**Time.** Each of the participants in this survey indicated they are interested in incorporating technology in their classes, however the primary reason stated why they were not able to attend sessions was due to time. One participant stated “I would love to implement more technology into my curriculum, but I just can’t find the time.” Another stated, “There have been times I would like to go, but I am swamped.” A third mentioned “I don’t attend for a combination of reasons, but mostly due to a busy schedule and it’s not convenient . . .” These three examples are an indication of teachers having a lack of time in their schedule to afford attending the sessions. Other teachers indicated their concern of the amount of time it would take for them to learn and
then incorporate the technology, “I’m by nature not a tech person. It’s not my nature. I’m a slow
to take on new technology.”

A few suggestions concerning time were given when asked what to change. These
suggestions were to somehow build the training into a teacher’s schedule. One way mentioned to
do this was to build time into a department’s Planning Learning Community (PLC). Another
mentioned there should be time available to schedule outside of the day. Some suggested it was
their responsibility to make the time.

**Topic.** The second theme is topic. It was stated that the topic of the session must be
relevant and interesting. A couple teachers indicated they already knew some of the topics and
that is why they did not attend. Another teacher stated, “Some of the topics simply didn’t interest
me and I didn’t see implementing them into my classes.” Others indicated topics should be based
on teacher ability and more individualized to the teacher. It was also stated that topics should be
more “department specific.”

**Technology.** Technology was the third theme. Participants indicated concern for
“availability of technology for students,” and the lack of technology resources available to them.
Teachers do not have devices readily available for student use when they want them. A teacher
addressing this stated “Frankly, if I can’t get the devices on a normal basis without planning two
months ahead, chances are I won’t use it.” In addition to the limited number of devices, is the
limited connectivity. With the school under construction, there are four fewer hardwired labs and
the WiFi connection is slow and cumbersome.
Reflection, Future Direction and Recommendations

Reflection

The overall concept of having technology training sessions in the room identified as the "Fish Bowl" is a good one. The feedback from the participants showed that teachers who attended these sessions did in fact increase their knowledge level of technology and incorporated the techniques they learned as a result. However, the feedback also showed that there were a number of teachers who did not attend the sessions and there were plenty of reasons stated why they did not. I am at the point in needing to decide to continue the training sessions for next year or not. If I do, what changes need to be made in order to reach a larger number of teachers? I also need to consider that the changes I make are reasonable and attainable for myself to manage.

The literature that I reviewed indicated that professional development needs to be available and relevant (Brinkerhoff, 2006). For those teachers who attended the session, they indicated they did so either because the topic had interested them or they were looking to incorporate more technology in their classrooms. For the teachers who did not attend, many of their responses for not attending were because the topic did not interest them or they had already known about it. Suggestions for next year included statements that suggested to somehow make the sessions more specific to the teacher and department (Challenge 1). Other literature discussed the barriers that don’t allow for teachers to utilize instructional technology (Beggs, 2000). A common theme from this research was “time.” Approaching how I can control time when it comes to delivering the professional development will be an important factor deciding how to continue for next year (Challenge 2).
Due to the nature of the data collected, all of the answers of how to exactly make changes to the technology training sessions work for all teachers were answered. As I read through the results, I jotted down a list of “things I must consider” for deciding what direction to take

1. Time is a huge factor.
2. Whatever change I make, make sure it is relevant to the teachers.
3. I have wasted time, how can I utilize my time and their time better?
4. Schedule it! Put it in their day somehow.
5. Implement a rotation through each department.

The next steps of deciding what to do with the data need to somehow incorporate those ideas. I need to address what I can control to make the professional development meaningful and relevant for the teachers while also minimizing the barriers. As more teachers have the opportunity to attend the training sessions, it is possible that the gap between them and the students may begin to diminish.

Recommendations

My recommendation is to continue with the technology sessions in the “Fish Bowl” but instead have the focus be more of a pre-planning approach rather than a stop-in-and-see approach. I suggest this to be done with three components in mind. The first would be to look towards the specific needs of a department. Starting with one department, identifying what they want or need as a group, then setting up individual or small group training sessions with them. For example, if the Student Support Services department wants to learn more on how to use Excel better to analyze their data and create charts, then a one to two-week training session that would be scheduled just for that department. Other examples might include the Science department wanting to incorporate technology to help engage the students to analyze data or the
CTE department looking to enhance their students’ skills with collaboration. This direction of training would address the specific needs of the department or individual teachers so that the training sessions are more relevant and meaningful to them.

The idea would be for each department to come up with their own technology goal. Some departments may have specific needs already in mind. For those who don’t, I could suggest they consider how they can use technology to enhance one of the 4 C’s: creativity, critical thinking, communication, or collaboration. In order to do this, meetings with each of the departments would need to be set up within the first two weeks of school. These meetings would be a pre-planning meeting with the intention of identifying what are the overall technology needs for the department then to schedule out the trainings.

The second component is the verification that each department or teacher has been trained for the classroom management system that works best for them. The district offers Moodle, Google for Class, OneNote for Class and will be introducing new staff pages on its updated district website in August. I suggest to have a one-on-one conversation with each teacher asking them to identify what system they would like to use for their classroom, then provide them an opportunity to sign up for training sessions for the application that best suites them. These training sessions will be offered before, during, and after school hours. Each teacher would then receive an email reminder of the time they choose for the training session. These sessions may occur as small group or individual, depending on when teachers signed up. This personation will address the need for what one teacher stated I needed to consider, “offer what tech best suits our abilities.”

The next component is to offer “TIC Tips” on a weekly basis. These tips would take the place of me offering just one application on a weekly basis. These tips would be shared with all,
with an open invitation to set up an appointment with me if someone needed support to implement the technology. These tips would come from a number of popular educational technology publications, with a primary emphasis on creativity, critical thinking, communication and collaboration. There could also be a caveat, if a teacher decides to try out the technology in the classroom, they need to invite me in their classrooms to see it.

**Conclusion**

The original purpose of this paper was to document an action research project asking teachers if their instruction changed and efficacy in technology improved due to attending the technology professional development sessions in the “Fish Bowl.” As the project developed and evolved, the purpose of the paper changed. Due to the limited number of participants and the data collected from them, I decided to shift my focus on the design process of the professional development sessions in the “Fish Bowl.” I realized that it was too early in the process to gather the data I was originally interested in, that the data collected best answered questions on how to improve the professional development sessions. What became important, was the process.

It has been a major step in making the decision to try something completely new at my school. First, the position of the Technology Integration coach is new and teachers were not sure how to embrace the support that has been offered to them, then to make a complete change to how professional development is done in the school is a new concept for teachers. Some are afraid of change, others believe there are things in their way to make a change, time being the most prevalent. This is completely understandable because change sometimes does not come easily even though learning is ongoing and ever changing.

I am looking forward to Year Three in the Technology Integration Coach position and Year Two of the “Fish Bowl” professional development sessions. I believe little by little;
teachers will begin to take the steps necessary to make learning technology a priority. The overall process of developing the project was exciting. I have had numerous people indicate that the “Fish Bowl” sessions are a great opportunity for teachers. It has also been extremely frustrating. No matter how great the opportunity and the sessions are, the number of teachers participating has not met my expectations. I feel, too many teachers are not developing their skill set with technology. The gap has not yet been closed.

The survey data collected has given me good insight on what possible changes need to occur in order for more teachers to attend next year. I will consider the recommendations from each of the teachers along with suggestions from the other Technology Integration Coaches, the high school Instructional Coaches, and the high school Technology Committee. I also feel that additional and ongoing research needs to be done in order to make sure the “Fish Bowl” professional development sessions are meeting the needs of the teachers. As the project evolves, some of the research questions may change. However, I want to continue to ask has attending the professional development sessions helped to increase their efficacy with technology and have they transferred that knowledge to make changes to their instruction.
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### Table 1.

**Technology Sessions Presented**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Dates</th>
<th>Session Theme</th>
<th>Session Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 4-5</td>
<td>Video Getting Started</td>
<td>YouTube Setting your Channel and Playlists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11-12</td>
<td>Video! Getting Started</td>
<td>Create, Share, Upload w/Doc Cameras, Digital Cameras, Phones, and Tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-23</td>
<td>Video! Getting Started</td>
<td>Editing YouTube, WeVideo, Movie Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2-3</td>
<td>Video! Getting Started</td>
<td>Editing YouTube, WeVideo, Movie Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9-10</td>
<td>Video and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>EdPuzzle and Kahoot!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16-17</td>
<td>Video and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>Google Forms and YouTube Annotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January Break</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24-25</td>
<td>Best of Both Worlds</td>
<td>Google and Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2-3</td>
<td>Best of Both Worlds</td>
<td>Google and Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9-10</td>
<td>Presentation and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>Office Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16-17</td>
<td>Presentation and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>Office Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>Presentation and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>GoFormative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14</td>
<td>Presentation and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>Buncee.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Presentation and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>Green Screen with Screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28</td>
<td>Presentation and Formative Assessments</td>
<td>Socrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

*Session Attendance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Dates</th>
<th>Session Topic</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 4-5</td>
<td>YouTube Setting your Channel and Playlists</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11-12</td>
<td>Create, Share, Upload w/Digital Cameras, Digital Cameras, Phones, and Tablets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-23</td>
<td>Editing YouTube, WeVideo, Movie Maker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2-3</td>
<td>Editing YouTube, WeVideo, Movie Maker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9-10</td>
<td>EdPuzzle and Kahoot!</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16-17</td>
<td>Google Forms and YouTube Annotations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24-25</td>
<td>Google and Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2-3</td>
<td>Google and Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9-10</td>
<td>Office Mix</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16-17</td>
<td>Office Mix</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>GoFormative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14</td>
<td>Buncee.com</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Green Screen with Screen Chomp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28</td>
<td>Socrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many years have you been teaching?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Which best describes your PERSONAL use of technology?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to experiment with new technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to try out new technologies after I find out why they are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to try out technologies after I have proof they work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like to try new technology when I have something that already works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which best describes your PROFESSIONAL use of technology?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to pilot new technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to try out new technologies after I find out why they are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to try out technologies after I have proof they work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like to try new technology when I have something that already works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My professional use of technology compared to last year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has stayed about the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has decreased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have you attended a Fish Bowl Session?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participants who did not attend a session in the Fish Bowl

I do not attend Fish Bowl sessions because:  
The topic doesn't interest me.  
I already know the content.  
I’m too busy.  
The location is not convenient.  
I prefer to learn in other ways (please explain below)  
It isn’t relevant to my teaching.  
Other (please explain below)

### In a perfect world, I would attend the Fish Bowl if . . .

### Participants who attended the Fish Bowl

This year I attended sessions (on average)  
Once a week  
2-3 times a month  
Once a month
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options/Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once per quarter</td>
<td>Once per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I attend a Fish Bowl session, I do so because:</td>
<td>The topic interests me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to use more technology in my classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m expected to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I leave a Fishbowl session I feel:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After attending a Fish Bowl session, I incorporate that content into my</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An example of something I did this year as a result of a Fish Bowl session is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is important to student learning because:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something I plan to do in the future as a result of a Fish Bowl session is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a perfect world, I would attend the Fish Bowl more regularly if . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the Technology Integration Coach plans for next school year (beyond the Fish Bowl), I hope they consider...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback or suggestions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.

*Technology Use Professional and Personal.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes your use of Technology</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Personal Use</th>
<th>Professional Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to pilot/experiment with new technologies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to try out new technologies after I find out why they are important</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to try out new technologies after I have proof they work</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like to try new technologies when I have something that already works</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

*Technology Use Compared to Last Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Professional use of technology compared to last year has</th>
<th>% of Total (n=17)</th>
<th>% of Total who Attended Fish Bowl (n=7)</th>
<th>% of Total who did Not Attended Fish Bowl (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.

*Use of Technology Compared to Last Year by Years of Teaching Experience.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Stayed the Same</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Figure 1. ADDIE Instructional Design Model.*
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*Figure 2. “Fish Bowl” room before and after*
**Figure 3** "Fish Bowl" Promotional Flyer and Email

**Figure 4** Teaching a session in the "Fish Bowl"
Figure 5. “Fish Bowl” Green Screen session
Appendix

Session 1 Handout

**VIDEO GETTING STARTED**

**YOUTUBE TIPS AND TRICKS & SETTING UP YOUR CHANNEL**

**RESTRICTED ERROR**

Using the Chrome browser and getting a Restricted error? Sorry, but it is a Linn-Mar Network and Chrome thing. Try using another browser like IE or Firefox.

**TIRED OF THOSE ADS?**

You may download an ad blocker extension, like Chrome’s AdBlock (works on Firefox too)

Or try one of these:

- **View Pure**
  

- **Safe Share**
  
  [http://safeshare.tv/](http://safeshare.tv/)

**WHEN SHARING URL’S WITH STUDENTS**

1) You may want them to go directly to the video, again without all the ads or other information on the page. Send them a modified link.

Instead of [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tbeV5a1Gf4k&list=PLCebWTVqpdrix-yZ6nG6dpp49HpEoCx](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tbeV5a1Gf4k&list=PLCebWTVqpdrix-yZ6nG6dpp49HpEoCx)

- Delete watch?
- Replace the # with /

[https://www.youtube.com/v/tbeV5a1Gf4k&list=PLCebWTVqpdrix-yZ6nG6dpp49HpEoCx](https://www.youtube.com/v/tbeV5a1Gf4k&list=PLCebWTVqpdrix-yZ6nG6dpp49HpEoCx)

2) What to start the video at a certain point?

a. Go to the Share option under the video window
b. Check mark Start at, then either type or move the cursor on the movie to the point you want to start the video in
c. Copy the url and post

**UNSURE YOUR INTERNET WILL WORK?**

Download the video and save it to a location of your choice

Type ss before the y

[https://www.ssyoutube.com/watch?v=tbeV5a1Gf4k](https://www.ssyoutube.com/watch?v=tbeV5a1Gf4k)

---
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Session 1 Handout Continued
SETTING UP YOUR CHANNEL

Go to YouTube and then sign into with your Linn Mar account information.

Select My Channel

The address in the url is the address to your channel.

- You can post the channel
- All videos you make that are public are listed here
What to organize your videos? Create Playlists

Add Playlists – Similar to Folders

Then add the videos to your playlists
VIDEO GETTING STARTED

CREATING VIDEO

Before your create, have a place in mind where you will be saving your files to
- GoogleDrive
- YouTube
- OneDrive

You can use a number of devices to create video
- iPad – use Capture app
- Elmo (Document Camera) – must have Driver downloaded on PC and USB cable
- School camera – Kodak Play Sport – Check-out from the Media Center; uses SD Card or USB cables
- Phone – Upload to a location like YouTube, GoogleDrive – Must have YouTube channel set up if using YouTube
- Screencast - I suggest two:
  - Screencast-O-Matic – Download on PC
  - Screencastify – Chrome and Firefox extension

UPLOADING/SHARING

YouTube and Google Drive allow for easy sharing. For both you can share the link. For Google Drive, you can share the file or the folder the file is located in.

These easily upload to YouTube or Google Drive
- iPad Capture
- Phone
- Screencast

The following do not upload to YouTube or Google Drive right away, instead they save to a drive as a file. You can then either upload to a video editor or upload to YouTube or Google Drive
- Elmo will saves to a drive as .avi
- School camera saves to a drive as .mp4

Video editors prefer .mp4 file format, some will take .avi. If your video file type is something other than .avi or .mp4, you may need to convert the file. FreeMake, on the student computers is a file converter. Once converted, you can upload into the video editor.

VIDEO TIPS

Camera angles are important. Consider using the “Rule of Thirds.”

See videos:
- https://youtu.be/theVsx1Gf4k?si=29

-----
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Session 3 Handout
EDITION VIDEO

There are a number of video editing software, some free, some paid. Each have the basic editing features and some have a few more than others.

- Trim
- Split
- Title/Text
- Transitions
- Affects
- Sound/Audio

UPLOADING VIDEOS/IMAGES/SOUND

For each video editing program you will need the video, pictures and audio you want to use in order to make your video. Consider having these files saved in a convenient location; GoogleDrive, OneDrive, YouTube, Desktop.

Let's look at YouTube, MovieMaker, and WeVideo.
YouTube has the basic features. Trim, split and add text.

Transitions can be added between videos and pictures.

Once the video is created you update the Information and Settings, Add Enhancements and Annotations.
MOVIEMAKER

Should be on your computer. If it is not, download the Windows Essentials package. I suggest you customize when you download and only get MovieMaker and PhotoGallery.

Movie Maker has a number of Transitions and Pan and Zoom effects.

Adding text using the Title, Text or Captions feature is easy.
Movie Maker has a number of Visual Effect to add to your pictures.

Editing the video is easily done with the Trim Tool and Split feature.

Audio files can be easily added too.

As you complete your Video Project, you Save Movie as an .mp4 or with a Microsoft Account (not our school account) can share it with one of the popular social media outlets.
WEVIDEO

Has a few more features, even the free version. It still has the basics, but the extras are worth taking a look at. You can sign up for an account with your Google+ account. There is a 30-day trial then a Free version. The Free versions limits you to 2GB and 5 min. of video a month. $12

WeVideo has great Themes, Graphics, Overlays, Audio, Transition and Text features.

As you complete your Video Project you Finish and save as an .mp4