

CBAM Principles and SAU 16's Teacher Website Initiative  
Kathy Weise  
Lesley University, ECOMP 6101.80 Summer 2005  
January 15, 2006

The SAU 16 district in southeastern NH covers six towns, seven elementary schools, one middle school, one high school and one vocational-technical school. Increasing technology use across the district has been an emphasis for the past four years. Online course tools (WebCT and Moodle) and teacher website tools (Blue Wrench, FirstClass/RWD, Frontpage) and a homework posting website (HomeworkNow.com) have been made available to teachers. Training and encouragement have been provided but generally there were only a few "early-adopters" from each school that were utilizing these tools and enhancing their class materials with internet-based resources.

In January of 2005, the technology committee met and decided that there were not enough teachers learning to use these technologies and we were not meeting goals of the technology plan. The Asst. Superintendent of Technology approached the Joint School Board (there are 7 school boards for the 10 schools and the joint board is all representatives of all boards that meets 3 times per year). They decided that all teachers should have an online presence by the end of the first term of the 2005-06 school year and that any teacher that assigns homework must post it online.

In her book, Taking Charge of Change, Shirley Hord et al describes the change process, particularly as it applies to the functioning of education. Their conclusions were summarized in the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM):

- Change is a process, not an event.
- Change is accomplished by individuals.
- Change is a highly personal experience.
- Change involves developmental growth.
- Change is best understood in operational terms.
- The focus of facilitation should be on individuals.

All administration and each school's technology coordinator were informed of the board's decision and timeline. Each school handled it differently, but at most schools, training on the use of specific tools was scheduled. The Asst. Superintendent of Technology visited several schools that were having difficulty with the teacher opposition to this mandate. He addressed their stages of concern (most were at the self-centered areas of concern at that point in time, although many expressed consequence concerns, since they were not convinced that this was a good strategy for student learning).

The technology committee spent considerable time discussing the importance of teachers learning how to use various online tools, the importance of integrating tech. tools and resources into their curriculum and the ultimate goals of having teachers utilize online course tools or web tools in all areas and grades. I don't think that this goal was effectively communicated to the teachers and certainly

not in a way that developed teacher buy-in for this project at several schools. The development of a program configuration and sharing the goals and components with staff at all levels would have better communicated the different aspects of this project and I think it would have contributed to more teacher buy-in. Personally I would have benefited tremendously from this tool. I was the trainer of many of the technical sessions, and I was surprised when several of the training sessions began with questions such as “what kinds of things should I post on my website?”, “how will this affect student performance?”, “how much time will this take me to do and how will I fit it into my schedule?” I wasn’t prepared to deal with the personal aspects of this change.

### *Stages of Concern*

<u>School</u>	<u># Teachers</u>	<u>Awareness</u>	<u>Informational</u>	<u>Personal</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>Collaboration</u>	<u>Refocusing</u>
SCS	26	1	2	2	6	1	1	0
EKS	15	1	1	3	4	1	0	0
KES	14	0	1	2	4	2	0	0
EX-MSS	35	0	1	4	11	2	1	0
EX-LSS	31	0	0	5	12	2	2	0
NES	14	0	0	1	2	1	1	1
SMS	40	2	6	7	9	0	0	0
CMS	95	0	2	4	6	9	5	7
EHS	125	8	12	15	15	17	3	3
SST	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>

The schools with more teachers having awareness, informational and personal concerns have only been involved in the project in the last year. The schools with more teachers having collaboration and refocusing concerns have been working with internet and web tools for more than two years.

The area of concern of collaboration is interesting. The middle school has been very successful in implementation due to a large number of teachers having worked with an online course tool (WebCT) for an extended period of time, having a motivated tech. coordinator and several teachers that were early adopters. The teachers in this school work in a team configuration and have learned and progressed by sharing with others on their team. In talking to them, their current collaboration concerns deal with them wanting to share with teachers of the same subject on other teams which is more difficult to plan and schedule. Team planning and communication time is built into their weekly schedule, but cross-team time is not. To address this, a teacher in-service afternoon is planned each fall and spring to allow them opportunities to share in subject groups, as well as for teachers of other schools to share in similar fashion.

The administration currently believes the high level of personal and management concerns are due to the forced nature of the project and the number of teachers that are still at an early stage of implementation. There were many teacher meetings held at the early stages to address the self-focused concerns. Technical

training is ongoing. As time goes on, the administration plans to re-survey and address ongoing concerns. They feel that teachers spending time working on this project, technical competence gained by use of the tools, the understanding that this expectation will not go away, and ongoing training and principal support will address the majority of these concerns.

### *Levels of Use*

<u>School</u>	<u># Teachers</u>	<u>Non-Use</u>	<u>Orientati on</u>	<u>Prepar ation</u>	<u>Mech. Use</u>	<u>Routine</u>	<u>Refine ment</u>	<u>Integra tion</u>	<u>Renewal</u>	<u>Length of Time</u>	<u>Principal Support</u>	<u>Tech. Support</u>
SCS	26	3	1	3	11	6	2			< 1 yr.	Some	Some
EKS	15	2	1	5	6	1				< 1 yr.	No	Some
KES	14	2	0	2	8	1	1			< 1 yr.	Some	No
EX-MSS	35	2	2	4	22	2	1	1	1	1 yr.	No	Yes
EX-LSS	31	3	1	3	16	5	2	1		1 yr.	Some	Yes
NES	14	0	0	0	4	6	1	2	1	2 yrs.	Yes	No
SMS	40	6	5	13	10	3	1	1	1	< 1 yr.	No	Some
CMS	95	0	2	4	11	18	42	11	7	3 yrs.	Some	Yes
EHS	125	6	9	23	54	17	8	5	3	< 1 yr.	Some	Some
SST	16	0	0	1	3	4	2	2	4	2 yrs.	Some	Yes
<b>Totals</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>17</b>			

Each of the schools is in a different stage of implementation. This is due to several factors – the length of time the school has been involved in the project, the level of principal support and emphasis, the amount of technical expertise available at the school, and the focus and drive of the technology coordinator for the project.