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**Executive Plan Summary**

**Discussion of Need**

Success of a training program is not measured by the completion of its participants. According to a self-assessment issued by the State of New Jersey, Ewing Public School District has been underperforming in areas of state compliance, specifically training for handling bullying and its consequential topics. In order to ensure that each incident is handled properly by Ewing Public School employees, an evaluation of the training modules is needed.

**Objective for Evaluation**

The objective for the evaluation process is to gather insights to the training modules that are currently in place so that a determination can be made as to whether it needs to be modified or replaced completely. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the full training process, from employee participation in the learning modules to their application of knowledge in the classroom.

**Summary of Evaluation Plan**

The evaluation will use an industry standard framework developed by Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006). The Four Levels of Evaluation will gauge training participant reactions, learning, and behaviors to calculate results that will determine how effective current training is and provide data which directly impacts decisions on how to approach compliance training in the future. The current proposal discussed through this document outlines a year long process and a visual representation of this process can be found in Appendix A.

**Potential Findings**

Possible findings from the evaluation will include a few elements. First, immediate reactions from participants will illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of the training modules, as well as illustrate participant thoughts on content presentation, which influence the learning experience. Second, an evaluation will discover just how well participants absorb the information taught in training through a learning measurement. This will help in understanding what aspects of training can benefit from an adjustment. Finally, discoveries in behavior change will work to uncover barriers that employees face when applying the procedures that they learn in training.

**Possible Recommendations**

Recommendations following the evaluation process will be focused on ways that the training modules can be improved for better transfer of learning to employee behavior. These recommendations will be based off of the results gathered from the evaluation instruments, which cover a range of information such as employee reactions to training, knowledge acquisition, application of content/knowledge to the workplace, and barriers employees face when implementing what they have learned in training. Ultimately, the question of whether to continue using the current form of compliance training will be answered based off of the findings.

**Project Goals and Scope**

**Learning Program Description**

As part of the State of New Jersey, the Ewing Public School District (Ewing) needs to abide by state and federally mandated compliance standards. The compliance standards cover a broad range of topics, including safety concerns such as blood borne pathogens, hazard communications, and active shooter situations, to more student-centered topics like anti-bullying, intervention and referral services, and ADHD. Each state has its own required topics and each district can select additional topics for their employees to be informed on.

The compliance standards are continuously revised and therefore Ewing needs to ensure that their employees are always up to date. Initially, training for compliance standards occurred in faculty meetings and workshops. However, the large investment of person hours and questionable retention of information prompted Ewing to search for a more suitable delivery method for the training. Ewing’s district administrative team settled on using the internet-based training service Global Compliance Network (GCN), which provides all of the up-to-date standards and requirements for both federal and state compliance. “GCN has over 125 tutorials available in OSHA, HR, and Professional Development topics. The GCN tutorials meet the minimum standards for compliances as mandated by state and federal laws and care continually updated” (GCN Training Info, n.d.).

GCN topics are broken into separate learning modules that vary in the length of time needed to complete them. The training consists of a series of slides, which include text, images, and audio that the learner clicks through. In addition to the on screen text, the slides are also read to the learner, including slightly more information than is provided on screen. Upon completion of each module, the learners take a multiple choice test, which will provide the correct answers if learners choose the incorrect ones, with no ramifications. Unfortunately for Ewing, the delivery can be quickly clicked through and completed by the learner. Since the correct answers in the concluding quiz are not a requirement, learning from the compliance training is still questionable.

**Evaluation Need**

Success of a training program is not measured by the completion of its participants. According to a self-assessment issued by the State of New Jersey, Ewing Public School District has been underperforming in areas of state compliance, specifically training for handling bullying and its consequential topics. Incidents related to the compliance standards can be unpredictable in their frequency and Ewing has trouble determining if training has any impact on employees when the time comes to use what has been taught. In an effort to provide the safest possible environment for students, Ewing Public School District aspires to reduce the number of mishandled incidents. By evaluating the GCN training program, Ewing can ensure that administration and faculty fully understand the necessary information and procedures in which to properly and quickly resolve incidents. Evaluation will also also provide an understanding of the training effectiveness, which will aid in deciding whether to continue using the GCN training or if improvements should be made.

**Purpose of Evaluation**

The purpose of this evaluation is to:

1. Provide Ewing Public School District with formative evaluation data through trainee reactions and learning to further improve compliance training.
2. Provide a measurable way for Ewing Public School District to determine if trainee behavior positively changes upon completion of the compliance training.
3. Compare training results with reported number of incidents related to the compliance training.

**Audience Description**

Ewing Public Schools requires that all faculty, support staff, and administrative staff participate in compliance training. All positions that fall into those three categories interact with students on a daily basis and are subject to being in situations that might require knowledge learned from the compliance training. Age of the participants varies greatly, ranging from as young as 22 years old to over 60 years. As with many school districts, Ewing hosts most faculty for the entirety of their career. Many faculty members are hired while young, under age 30, and stay through retirement, age 60 and above. Administrative and support staff employees generally have shorter spans as many of them decide to move on to other opportunities. The education level between participants also varies, but not as greatly. A majority of participants are college-educated, with some having progressed further to have earned a master’s degree. Gender is a mix of both male and female, with a skew toward more female participants.

**Stakeholders**

The key stakeholders for the compliance training include the State of New Jersey, the Ewing district administrative team, and the training team tasked with implementing the training. As mentioned earlier, New Jersey sets the annual compliance standards and needs to ensure that each district across the state abides by them. The district administrative team is responsible for developing methods with the training team to educate the district on the new standards and for delivering the final reports of compliance to the state. The training team is responsible for the implementation of training and the successful completion of the program by all required. While not directly tied to the evaluation process, parents and students are the additional stakeholders for Ewing. Parents are concerned for their children’s safety and learning environment, both of which improve when Ewing faculty and staff can quickly mitigate unfavorable situations between students, both personal and public. Students also demand a satisfactory learning environment and benefit when the surrounding adults are competent in handling some of the daily struggles and dangers that they may face while at school.

**Evaluation Process and Timeline**

The full evaluation process and timeline can be found as a visual representation in Appendix A. The evaluation will be performed by using Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick’s (2006) Four Levels of Evaluation. “The four levels, [level 1 reaction, level 2 learning, level 3 behavior, and level 4 results,] represent a sequence of ways to evaluate programs. Each level is important and has an impact on the next” (Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick, 2006. p. 21). Although each level becomes more time consuming than the next, it is beneficial to follow through the entire process because valuable information is uncovered at each level (Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick, 2006. p. 21).

The training team will begin the evaluation process by selecting a sample group of 250 participants comprised of 50 employees from each of the five schools within the district. The sample group will represent all job categories and a mix of both male and female participants relevant to the current ratio within the district. The training team will then ask participants to complete two of the GCN modules required by Ewing within a two-week span. The modules included in the evaluation process will be on Cyber Bullying and Suicide Prevention. While all aspects of the compliance training are important to the well-being of the students, these two modules were chosen to be evaluated by Ewing because of their prominence in everyday situations and because Ewing has existing metrics regarding harassment, intimidation and bullying, which are directly related to the two modules.

The evaluation process will take place over the course of one fiscal year. To mimic the delivery of the compliance training, participants will be emailed links to internet-based level 1 reaction and level 2 learning evaluation instruments. The level 1 link for each module will be sent at the onset of the evaluation period and the level 2 link will be sent two days after each level 1 survey is submitted. The participants will be asked to complete each of the level 1 and level 2 evaluation instruments as soon as they can after receiving them. Because the compliance standards are continuously changing and Ewing is required to administer the compliance training annually, a pretest is not necessary. Ewing is only concerned with their faculty and staff being competent in the standards that presently apply to the district and not the previous year’s material, even if there is an overlap. Additionally, the once-per-year frequency that the participants engage in the training serves as an excellent reinforcement of information which they may have already learned previously.

After levels 1 and 2 are completed within the two-week period, three months will pass to allow the participants to adjust and adapt the training information and skills. During this time, the training team will compile the collected data. At the end of the three months, the participants, as well as a control group of the same size made up of employees not participating in the training evaluation, will be sent an email to a level 3 behavior survey to complete within one week. Upon completion of the survey, 25 participants in the sample group and 25 members of the control group will be chosen at random to engage in focus group discussions. Those who choose not to be a part of the group will be replaced with another random selection.

Over the next two weeks, the training team will begin the second measurement by hosting one focus group discussion with five participants each day. This process will be repeated with the same participants two more times, at six months and again at nine months. Having participants return for subsequent discussions will provide unique perspectives regarding their behavior change over the course of the year, as well as note any changes to their environment. When the evaluation approaches a full year, Ewing Public School District will conduct their annual Self-Assessment for Determining Grades Under the Anti-Bullying Bill of Rights and compare the result with level 3 behavior results to determine if training is effective.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

**Level 1 – Reaction Measurement**

As stated by Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006), the goal of any instructional design team is to “present the training program in a way that enables the participants not only to learn what they need to know but also to react favorably to the program. Reaction is easy to do, and [it should be measured] for every program. Trainers should proceed to the other three levels as staff, time, and money are available” (p. 26). Reaction measurement will be performed through an online survey created by the training team and can be seen in Appendix B. Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) discuss the need for immediately collecting participant reactions after training (p. 35). Unfortunately, Ewing offers the training online for participants to complete at their convenience, so links to the survey will be emailed to the sample group at the onset of the evaluation process. They will be informed to complete a separate reaction survey for each of the two modules that will be evaluated. Since the two modules’ content is not related, gathering the reactions from both independently is important to have the most accurate representation of the participants’ thoughts on each topic. The survey asks the same set of questions for each module. Because Ewing wants their employees to be positively engaged with the training so that they are prepared for critical situations on the job, the questions for the reaction are focused on the areas of delivery, relevancy, and physical design. These areas will help to determine the attentiveness of the participants as well as how applicable they believe the content will be to real situations. All questions use a 5 point Likert scale for the participants to rate the level at which they agree or disagree with the statement made in the question. Each question also provides the option for the participant to provide anonymous additional comments, should they want to elaborate on a more specific aspect or concern related to the question. A final section for additional written comments about the entire training module will be available to the participants at the end of the survey. By utilizing two data collection methods, both quantitative and qualitative data will be produced from the reaction survey.

**Level 1 – Reaction Reporting**

Reactions and comments provided by participants offer data to the training department so that they may gain insight to aspects that participants found especially useful or ineffective. These insights may be used to further adjust the training module to better suit the needs and preferences of the Ewing employees. Level 1 responses from each question will be added together then divided by the total number of participants to yield an average score for each question. These calculations will be completed by the algorithms within the online survey. An example report displaying this method can be found in Appendix C. A baseline of 4.0 will be used as acceptable score for each question. The individual scores will give the training department participants’ positive or negative impressions so that they become aware of any discrepancies between the audience and the content of the modules. Scores that fall below 4.0 will be assessed by the training department so that they may modify the current module’s content, implementation, intuitiveness, or in the worst case scenario, structure an entirely new program.

The additional comments provide qualitative information that may not have been articulated in the survey questions. Common answers will be tallied by the training team and reported in a quick-reference chart along with full list of comments. An example of the comment report can also be found in Appendix C. Reactions are critical to any evaluation because it allows trainers to view deficiencies present in instruction and these scores and comments provided by the participants will be impetus to produce higher quality training.

**Level 2 – Learning Measurement**

Learning measurement will be though the administration of a post-test. “It is important to measure learning because no change in behavior can be expected unless [knowledge has been gained, skills have been developed or improved, or attitudes have been changed]” (Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick, 2006. p. 42). While the post-test may not be an effective measure of altered attitudes, the test will provide evaluators and trainers with an understanding of participant comprehension and if the participants are able to implement that knowledge into realistic situations. The post-test provided in Appendix D accomplishes both. Upon completion of the reaction survey, participants will be emailed a second link within two days. This link will take them to an online test where they will be assessed on what they learned in the module. The test will be brief at seven questions, but it takes the most important aspects of each module into consideration. Questions vary from fill in the blanks, to true/false, and multiple choice and each questions covers one important aspect of the module that the training department deemed as critical information, as seen in the chart below. While some questions are created to have participants recite information and facts that they have learned through training, others, such as question 2, provide the participant with the description of a realistic situation that may have been previously misidentified as being a form of cyber bullying. These questions are much more useful in that participants will need to consider the questions carefully and do their best to apply knowledge in the way that it would be used in the classroom.

|  |
| --- |
| **Cyber Bullying Training Module Objectives** |
| * Be able to identify general characteristics of cyber bullying * Define cyber bullying * Be able to identify the roles of the bully, victim and the bystanders relative to cyber bullying * Be able to identify ways in which schools and adults can reduce school violence and cyber bullying |
| **Suicide Prevention Training Module Objectives** |
| * Be able to understand basic Suicide facts and risk factors * Be able to understand the relationship between suicide and bullying * Be able to identify early and late warning signs * Be able to prevent situations that could lead to suicide * Be able to provide help resources to the student, initiate an intervention, and handle an attempt on school premises |

Objectives taken from the 2016 Global Compliance Training online modules.

**Level 2 – Learning Reporting**

Learning data is rather straightforward for this particular evaluation. Individual questions answered correctly will be divided by the total amount of attempts to produce an average score. A score of 85% from each participants is required for the program to be considered successful. The required score is set high because of the importance of the content in each of the modules. Ewing employees will need to be able to recognize the critical situations taught in the modules and act upon them as soon as possible. Answering more than one question wrong and scoring below 85% will indicate that the participant does not have a thorough understanding of one or more of objectives in the module. All results will be tabulated by the online survey and provided to the training department so that they will have an understanding of which aspects of the training were effective. There is only one correct answer for each question, so the results will be easily deciphered. Should learning not display a score of 85% or better on the level 2 evaluation, the reaction scores of the participants can be referenced.

The learning data, in combination with the reaction data, will present the discrepancies of the instruction that were not motivating the participants to transfer the knowledge. An example cross reference between level 1 and level 2 reporting can be found in Appendix E. The data comparison can be used to help the administrative and training teams determine why the GCN training modules may have been ineffective. Based on the information that is discovered, the training may be adjusted as the trainers deem necessary to make learning more effective and reach the standards Ewing has for their employees and, more importantly, the standards set by the State of New Jersey.

**Level 3 – Behavior Measurement**

“Trainees cannot change their behavior until they have an opportunity to do so [and, in addition,] it is impossible to predict when a change in behavior will occur” (Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick, 2006. p. 52). Couple this information with the fact that occurrences related to compliance training, such as bullying and student suicide, follow no schedule of regularity and it becomes a challenge to assess if the training effectively initiated a change in behavior. In order to keep awareness alive throughout the year following the training and achieve a useful measurement on behavior change, two forms of data collection will be introduced. The first is a survey, available in Appendix F, in which participants will self-report their own perceptions in their behavior changes. The survey will ask participants how their attitudes toward the content has changed, if their work environment allows them to properly handle situations, how well they remember the information outlined in the training, and if the training has helped them in any recent incidents. As with Level 1, all questions use a 5 point Likert scale for the participants to rate the level at which they agree or disagree with the statement made in the question. There will also be an additional space at the bottom of the survey for additional comments. A control group of 250 additional participants following a similar make up to the sample group will also take the survey. Doing so will help to illuminate the positive or negative impact that the training module had on change in behavior.

The second form of measurement to be used will be focus groups. These groups will be brief discussions between an administrator, training team member and 5 participants who will be randomly selected. The discussions will be facilitated by the training team member with a series of questions regarding the impact that training had on their behavior change. A sample of discussion points can be found in Appendix G. This opportunity will allow an organic conversation to commence with the intention of surfacing thoughts and experiences that might not have been covered in previous surveys. During this discussion, the training team member and administrator will both take notes regarding the comments made during the discussion. A recording device will not be used so that the participants remain anonymous and so they are more likely to provide honest, informative responses. There will be a total of 5 focus group sessions, as well as 5 sessions featuring those in the control group. The comparison of key topics and opinions from each discussion will help to determine the difference in behavior for those who have participated in the training.

**Level 3 – Behavior Reporting**

Reporting the results for the behavior measurement survey will be similar to the level 1 reaction survey reporting process found in Appendix C. Results from the scale will be tallied in the same manner and final comments will be aggregated in the same fashion as well. A baseline of 4.0 for each of the survey questions is the target score. This target is chosen because Ewing not only wants their employees to display a positive response to behavior change, but also because they want to know that their work environment is conducive to the change as well. Sample group results will be tallied separately from the control group’s results. Where the level 3 behavior survey differs from the level 1 reaction is that the scores from the sample group will be compared with those from the control group. While the training team hopes to achieve their target score, an increase in sample group scores over the control group is anticipated and will prove that training was a factor that influenced behavior change.

Reporting the focus group discussions will be performed in the same manner as the comment reporting in Appendix C. The administrator and training team member will tally the common discussion comments and themes and list their notes from each discussion underneath the tallied results. Sample group results will be tallied separately from the control group’s results. A comparison of the reported information will provide insight as to whether or not behavior change has been initiated by the training.

**Level 4 – Results Measurement**

Level 4 measurement is the point at which a decision whether to continue or improve the GCN training can be made. The outcomes of level 3 behavior measurements help to determine if trainee behavior positively changes upon completion of the compliance training and the level 3 behavior results will provide the valuable information as to whether or not training is successful and is moving Ewing forward in terms of New Jersey State compliance.

Currently, Ewing has an existing report that covers various metrics on their assessment of harassment, intimidation, and bullying (HIB). This chart can be found in Appendix H. The report is conducted by Ewing Public School District as a self-report on whether they are meeting the state compliance standards. The chart is available on their website, along with additional information about their personal HIB policy, for parents and students to view. The self-report chart displays that training on a board of education approved HIB policy is the lowest scoring category. By using the data gathered in level 3 behavior, the training team and administrators will be able to directly compare training effectiveness to the performance of the district on their self-report.

**Level 4 – Results Reporting**

The process to view a positive change in training could be a multi-year process in which a self-report is conducted at the completion of each fiscal year. Each year, improvements to training can be made based upon the results from levels 1 through 3 until the training score on the self-report has achieved a higher score. If after three self-reports an improvement is not realized, then a final decision as to whether or not to continue using GCN training can be made. Measuring the evaluation with an existing metric allows Ewing to view success in a format that is already accepted by stakeholders and is relevant to their efforts as a district.
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Appendix B: Level 1 Reaction

Please answer the following questions honestly based upon your experience with the GCN training module that you recently completed.

**The training identified sound methods for my school district to implement in order to provide solutions to potential situations outlined in the module.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I felt that the solutions outlined within the training module were within my abilities to perform.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I found the module’s content relevant to an educational environment with students aged 18 and under.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Important facts and materials were easily identifiable during the training session.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I appreciated the feature that read the content to me while participating in the training module.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**On a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 being not very well and 5 being exceptionally well, how well do you think the objectives presented in the module were covered during training?**

1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5

Not Very Well Exceptionally Well

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**The virtual instructor was easily understood and explained the material in a manner that I could identify with.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I felt that the visuals added to my engagement with the module.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I found the navigation of the GCN system and modules intuitive and easy to use.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I found aspects of the instruction very relevant to modern situations that my students might encounter while at school.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

Please provide your comments (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**If you have any additional thoughts about the training that were not covered in the questions above, please write them in below.**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix C: Example Reaction/Behavior Survey Reporting – Questions

**The training identified sound methods for my school district to implement in order to provide solutions to potential situations outlined in the module.**

* Disagree: 1 point multiplied by 0 Respondents = 0 points
* Somewhat disagree: 2 points multiplied by 5 Respondents = 10 points
* Neutral: 3 points multiplied by 23 Respondents = 69 points
* Somewhat Agree: 4 points multiplied by 100 Respondents = 400 points
* Agree: 5 points multiplied by 122 Respondents = 610 points

1089 points divided by 250 participants = **4.356 average response score**

Example Reaction/Behavior Survey Reporting – Comments

**I felt that the visuals added to my engagement with the module.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Top Comments Made by Participants** | **Number of Participants** |
| “The visuals were outdated” | 56 |
| “The visuals helped to simplify content delivery” | 24 |

Total number of comments made: 132 of 250 participants

Actual Comments:

1. “The graphics looked like they were from 1998.”
2. “The charts helped to emphasize important information.”
3. “Graphics were a nice break from the heavy text, but they need to be updated.”
4. “The diagrams were really helpful.”
5. “I found myself reading the charts rather than listening to the speaker.”

etc…

Appendix D: Level 2 Learning for Cyber Bullying Module

1. **Check True or False:** Cyber bullying is defined as when a student aggressively and covertly attacks another student through the use of contemporary electronic devices.

\_\_\_\_\_ True

\_\_\_\_\_ False

1. **Identify whether this situation is cyber bullying:** You overheard Zac telling another student that Jordan hacked into his Instagram account and was posting inappropriate photographs that were questioning Zac’s sexual orientation.

Yes, this is cyber bullying.

No, this is not cyber bullying.

1. **Complete this phrase from the training.** Cyber bullying only occurs between \_\_\_\_\_\_ or when a \_\_\_\_\_\_ is the aggressor.
2. **Check True or False:** Cyber bullies are often less aggressive toward their victims online than they would normally be if they were to engage their victims face-to-face.

\_\_\_\_\_ True

\_\_\_\_\_ False

1. **Choose the correct answer about Bullying Prevention Education.**
2. Bullying Prevention Education should teach students to immediately terminate communication with others who solicit personal information and contact a responsible adult when confronting a situation online.
3. Bullying Prevention Education should teach students when to disengage from communication with others who are making them uncomfortable over the internet.
4. Teachers should be aware of each student’s personal situation to ensure that no student is being cyber bullied.
5. **Identify whether this situation is cyber bullying:** Kari recorded a private conversation that she had with Robin and posted it to Snapchat without her knowing. Robin later found out from a few other friends what she had said in the conversation and that they had seen it on Snapchat. Kari only did this one time, as she thought it would be funny, but it made Robin very upset.

Yes, this is cyber bullying.

No, this is not cyber bullying.

1. **You found out that Jordan has been cyber bullying Zac. What is your first approach?**
2. Send Jordan to an administrator.
3. Ask Jordan to immediately stop bullying Zac and have him understand how his negative behavior caused Zac to be upset and ridiculed.
4. Inform Jordan’s parents of the situation.
5. **Complete this phrase from the training.** As the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of the offense increases, such as repeated cyber bulling, physical violence as a result of cyber bullying, so too must the response actions of the school administration.

Answer Key:

1 - True

2 - Yes

3 - minors & minor

4 - False

5 - A

6 - Yes

7 - B

8 - seriousness

Appendix E: Learning Report – Comparing to Level 1 Reactions Example

**Example Learning Evaluation Result**

1. Complete this phrase from training.Cyber bullying only occurs between \_\_\_\_\_\_ or when a \_\_\_\_\_\_ is the aggressor.

Percentage of participants who answered correctly: 77.6% or 194 of 250 participants

Because the question listed above falls below the desired average of 85%, it needs to be examined. This particular question highlights an important phrase from training and corresponds to the reaction question listed below.

**Example Reaction Evaluation Result**

Important facts and materials were easily identifiable during the training session.

* + Disagree: 1 point multiplied by 0 Respondents = 0 points
  + Somewhat disagree: 2 points multiplied by 5 Respondents = 10 points
  + Neutral: 3 points multiplied by 23 Respondents = 69 points
  + Somewhat Agree: 4 points multiplied by 100 Respondents = 400 points
  + Agree: 5 points multiplied by 122 Respondents = 610 points

1089 points divided by 250 participants = **4.356 average response score**

**Example of How It Could Help Determine Instructional Revision**

Participants felt that the important information was well represented during the training module, however their scores on question 3 were below our expectations. Perhaps the content that we believe to be important and necessary was not emphasized properly within the module. It could also be that the phrase was too specific and the question could be rewritten to fulfill our requirement of identifying the type of person/student that is involved in cyber bullying. Unsatisfactory comments made in the reaction survey should also be considered to give us more insight.

Appendix F: Level 3 Behavior Survey

**Instructions:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the extent to which those who participated in the GCN training have applied the principles and techniques they have learned to the school environment. The results of the survey will help to assess the effectiveness of the program and identify ways in which it can be improved to be more practical for those who use it in the future. Please be honest in your responses. (Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick, 2006. p. 58). For the purposes of our reporting, if you find that you have not experienced something that a question asks, please leave it blank and provide a brief explain in the comment section.

Please check the appropriate response for each question.

**I had no difficulty in remembering what I needed to do when presented with a situation related to the training.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 – Agree

**My environment provided ample additional support in handling a situation after I identified it.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 – Agree

**I think that the material from training adequately prepared me for the realistic situations that I have encountered.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

**The method for carrying out procedures outlined in the training were well implemented at my school.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

**Knowing the background information on state laws and school requirements positively influenced my attitudes toward applying what I learned in training.**

* 1 - Disagree
* 2 - Somewhat disagree
* 3 - Neutral
* 4 - Somewhat Agree
* 5 - Agree

**If you have any additional thoughts about implementing what you learned in training that were not covered in the questions above, please write them in below.**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix G: Level 3 Behavior Focus Group Discussion Topics

Training and Administration team members: Below are the starting questions to facilitate the five-person focus group discussions. Remember to ask the participants to answer honestly and remember to ask follow up questions to information that is unclear or could use additional detail to determine changes in behavior.

1. How have your attitudes toward what was learned in training positively changed or have they remained the same?
2. Has anyone had to handle an incident? Could you describe the manner in which you handled it?
3. Do you ever feel as though you are uncertain in what to do when you identify a situation?
4. Are you finding any difficulty with administration in implementing what you have learned from training?
5. How could the the process of handling incidents be improved?

Appendix H: Ewing Public School District Self Report

**14-15%20ABR%20Self%20Assessment%20122215.pdf**

(Ewing 2014-2015 Self-Assessment, 2015)