**1.3 Diffusion of Innovations & Change**

Candidates research, recommend, and implement strategies for initiating and sustaining technology innovations and for managing the change process in schools.

Reflection

The Individual Teacher Technology Assessment/ Needs Assessment (Needs Assessment) was completed to assess the technology perceptions of one willing colleague. In completing the needs assessment, each group of candidates created a LoTi-like assessment and administered it to one teacher in our respective schools. In so doing, we were each responsible for documenting the International Society for Technology in Education’s (ISTE) Essential Condition of Equitable Access- “Robust and reliable access to current and emerging technologies, digital resources, and connectivity for all students, teachers, staff, and school leaders” (Williamson and Redish, 2009, p.12). Although a group collaboration on the LoTi-like survey, I worked with one specific teacher in my building for the documentation of this innovation of change artifact.

Standard 1.4 Diffusion of Innovations and Change outlines the criteria where candidates research, recommend, and implement strategies for initiating and sustaining technology innovations and for managing the change process in schools. The artifact I chose, showcases my ability to research, recommend and implement strategies for initiating and sustaining technology innovations for managing the change process in schools. Along with members of the group I was assigned to, we created a LoTi-like survey using Google docs and email to add our questions, make changes, and offer input or suggestions. The creator of the Google became the unofficial spokesperson and submitted our finalized survey. We collaborated on scoring one another’s contributions to the survey artifact. After we published/ finalized the survey, we asked volunteers at our respective schools to take the survey and offer us feedback. After I asked three colleagues to complete the survey, they did, but I did not know how each volunteer responded, so I asked on teacher if I could ask her the survey questions orally, and she agreed. She agreed to answer the survey questions in person in an informal non-judgement format. After the oral survey, the teacher and I discussed several discrepancies in her responses like, “when asked about the frequency in which students use technology-based critical thinking skills, her response was “Never”, but she indicated that she “Sometimes” use technology for formal assessments like Kahoot fifty percent of the time, and “Consistently” use online learning for student engagement eighty-five percent of the time” (Storey, 2018, p. 1). During the analysis of the teacher’s responses, she would most likely rate at the Exploration level- Loti Level 2. This individual teacher implements technology consistent with teacher-centered activities with low order thinking applications on the part of the student. A few days after completing the LoTi-like survey, I followed up with an Adaptor Survey, which was a collaborative group effort as well. The same teacher completed the survey. After the adaptor survey, the teacher ranked herself as open to use technology to enhance learning for her students. I will agree that the teacher is “open” but she falls short in the area of actual “implementation” of said digital tools.

As a result of having completed the individual teacher needs assessment, I learned how to create a LoTi-like survey, and I also learned how to create an Adaptor survey. Using both the LoTi and Adaptor I was able to make recommendations for technology use and instruction for one teacher. I observed that the individual teacher is always in motion- moving from one place to another, from one activity to another, just busy, but tasks hardly seem to get done. I would recommend that this teacher start one task and continue working until it is complete, so that she can have a since of completion and accomplishment. Often the teacher will ask follow-up questions to the topic at hand only to find out, that nothing ever became of the information inquired by the teacher. At one point, she admitted that she lacks the confidence to implement strategies that involve technology, no matter how basic. She often uses word and phrases like “I cannot…, do you remember how to…, tell me again what you said about..., and by the time I sat down to…I forgot what you said (or what you showed me).” If I were to make any changes, I would recommend that she implement only one change at a time, and to give her a deadline to complete the task. It seems as though she is not good with time management and would respond better with the challenge of having to meet or keep deadlines. I might suggest that she keep a single notebook or journal to keep track of technology tasks including questions, and answers so that she will have a running list of technology strategies, innovations, instructions, or digital resources that she can refer to as often as she needs until the task becomes a habit or a learned skilled. I might also suggest that she use an audio recording device for multiple step directions involving technology related tasks or procedures. Initially, I might provide her with handouts or directions preprinted ahead of time, so that she can add her notes, questions, or insights to the handout as I explain tin real time.

I believe that the time the teacher and I spent together was productive, albeit time consuming. Whenever I was right there, she would make an attempt to implement a new strategy. The challenge was for me to coach the teacher into making each strategy a new habit. Gathering the information gave me practical experience serving in the role as a technology coach providing one-on-one coaching to an individual teacher. The change in the teacher’s actions where not sustaining, only temporary. According to Knight (2007), “A good coach is an excellent teacher and is kind-hearted, respectful, patient, compassionate, and honest. A good coach has high expectations and provides the affirmative and honest feedback that helps people to realize those expectations” (p. 15).