

ADDENDUM on Cell Phone PILOT Research: Lessons Learned

Dr. Marco Muñoz, Data Management & Research

Introduction

1. Purpose of the evaluation was not to prove, but to improve (Data Mgmt. philosophy on pilots).
2. Pre-Posttest Design (Before and After One-Year of Implementation).
3. Surveyed Students (spring data from 8 schools, 1,487 out of 10,476, 14%) and Teachers (5 schools had pre and posttest data, 203 Teachers out 399 Total Teachers, 51% response rate).
4. Walkthroughs were unannounced and used to assess practices rather than just capturing survey perceptions for purposes of data triangulation.

Surveys

- Results mirror the *new digital divide* that exist between teacher and student views on (a) access to technology, (b) skills related to the use of technology, and (c) views of the benefits and use of technology. It is the difference between technology natives (students) and technology immigrants (teachers) due to a generational gap (millennial/generation Y for students vs. generation X/baby boomers for teachers). For example,
 - When looking at the spring data, teacher support for cell use in the classroom was 43%. Student support was 95%.
 - In the spring, teachers believed that cell phones support learning (42%). In the spring, students believed that cell phones support learning (92%).

Note: These numbers support *previous research*. A survey of 1,121 teachers from Kentucky and Tennessee high and middles schools (roughly half from JCPS) found that 39% support use of cell phones in the classroom (Thomas & O'Bannon, 2013).

- Results indicate teachers are using cell phones for *low-level integration* (e.g., texting, e-mail, Internet) and not to support the development of 21st century skills. This is aligned with the research of Ertmer and Ottenbreit-Leftwich (2010) that shows that teachers, without proper training, only use technology at a "low-level" of technology integration.
- Teacher concerns about *disruption* are aligned with research. The most common argument against the use of mobile phones in the classroom is the disruption they cause (Lenhart et al., 2010).
 - Cell phones CAN be a disruptive force in the classroom if clear management policy and consequences are not created and conveyed to all stakeholders (Thomas & O'Bannon, 2013). Training is needed for teachers on classroom management and it was offered by CES over the entire pilot year.
 - Teachers who participated in training sessions indicated a desire for more training on classroom management.

Classroom Walkthroughs

- Walkthroughs indicated that only 1% of teachers and 4-8% of students were using cell phones in the classroom. Furthermore, unannounced 3-minute observations indicated that 62% of students in the spring had no use of technology in the classroom.
- These numbers of *no or low use* of the cell phones/technology appear to support the use of Bring Your Own Device (BYOD)—we have yet to successfully implement using cell phones in the classroom.

Training

- Traditional barriers to integration include *lack of training* and —more importantly- *teacher attitude* (Ertmer, 1999).
 - Limited training was provided. This is insufficient for a technology, cell phones, which has been referred to as the “Swiss Army Knife” of technologies.
 - In the fall, from the beginning, 92% of teachers’ perceived cell phones to be a distraction and 81% perceived the cell phones as a disruption. As a result, teachers’ attitudes appear to have been negatively skewed in regard to the initiative from the beginning. Changing teachers’ attitudes will take time.
 - For the relative few teachers who did attend training (off-site or on-site) indicated that training helped with how to integrate, engage students and manage in the classroom.
 - Teachers who did attend training sessions reported positive change in attitude toward BYOD.
- More on-site proactive training appears to be a key component to this initiative—again, we have yet to successfully implement using cell phones in the classroom.

Conclusion

1. *The main lesson learned is training, training, training before new waivers are approved for future schools (i.e., proactive approach to PD), including providing intensive on-site training. We need immersion PD camps for already waiver-approved schools.*

The ban was lifted and students were essentially given a waiver to use their cell phones while the teachers were given opportunities for PD. However, limited attendance resulted in little-to-no training on how to manage them in a classroom setting, integrate them to engage students, and to support instruction.

2. *Identify earlier adopter teachers to support change in attitudes.*

Early adopters carry no assumptions and come with no preconceived idea of what our initiative should or should not do. They are the best at really trying the initiative, and giving us honest feedback on what we are doing right and wrong. We can move with these early adopters beyond the low-level integration of technology.
3. *Expand the program to other schools if we are successful in implementing the initiative in our forthcoming school year 2014-15.*