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Abstract

Student well-being and behaviour is assessed daily by classroom teachers at school and teachers are also asked occasionally to complete evidence-based psychology reports regarding a particular student in their class to inform clinical practice and help with diagnoses. This critical qualitative study considers the role of surveillance in schools as a tool to keep students safe and ensure well-being. Data from a two-year qualitative study provides insight from teachers, administration and IT staff regarding the use of surveillance in schools and considers ways that data can be used to assist in cognitive behaviour therapy, as well as discussing the protection of data for vulnerable and marginalized students from a FOIPPA compliance perspective. Discussions emerge as to the potential use of data tracking and data collection for staff to identify and conduct cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) in schools. The ability to use digital education records combined with advancements in technology might enable the same deep learning in education as in medicine in the areas self-regulation. Results from the study indicate. Information Technology (IT) staff struggle with their application of privacy matters and may not be using data tracking as a means to develop and document well-being for students and staff.
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Abstract: Student well-being and behaviour is assessed daily by classroom teachers at school and teachers are also asked occasionally to complete evidence-based psychology reports regarding a particular student in their class to inform clinical practice and help with diagnoses. This critical qualitative study considers the role of surveillance in schools as a tool to keep students safe and ensure well-being. Data from a two-year qualitative study provides insight from teachers, administration and IT staff regarding the use of surveillance in schools and considers ways that data can be used to assist in cognitive behaviour therapy, as well as discussing the protection of data for vulnerable and marginalized students from a FOIPPA compliance perspective. Discussions emerge as to the potential use of data tracking and data collection for staff to identify and conduct cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) in schools. The ability to use digital education records combined with advancements in technology might enable the same deep learning in education as in medicine in the areas self-regulation. Results from the study indicate. Information Technology (IT) staff struggle with their application of privacy matters and may not be using data tracking as a means to develop and document well-being for students and staff.

1. INTRODUCTION

Student well-being and behaviour is assessed daily by classroom teachers at school and despite the lack of clinical training, teachers are also asked occasionally to complete evidence-based psychology reports regarding a particular student in their class to inform clinical practice and help with diagnoses. The potential for staff to identify and conduct cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) in schools to avoid exclusion or in alternative school settings and is often seen in the form of self-regulation training that require the student to be able to identify when a regulation strategy is required, what behaviour needs regulation and to be active participants in their own process.

The ability to use digital education records combined with advancements in technology might enable the same deep learning in education as in medicine in the areas self-regulation. While it is not currently publicized or an emerging trend, the ability of a school district to use data collected from students is already a possibility based on current surveillance capabilities and Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA) compliance policies. Information Technology (IT) staff and consequentially school districts struggle with their application of privacy matters for the electronic storage of, or access to, personally identifiable information.

This critical qualitative study considers the role of surveillance in schools as a tool to keep students safe and ensure well-being. Data from a two-year qualitative study provides insight from teachers, administration and IT staff regarding the use of surveillance in schools and considers ways that data can be used to assist in cognitive behaviour therapy,
as well as discussing the protection of data for vulnerable and marginalized students from a FOIPPA compliance perspective. Key findings noted Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA) may only be completed by IT staff for Apps hosted on US servers and not for all personally stored information stored on the district server; and IT staff and consequentially school districts may be unsure of their application of privacy matters for the electronic storage of, or access to, personally identifiable information.

2. THEORTICAL FRAMEWORK

The current study addresses ethical considerations in education and the frameworks that regulate human computer interactions of vulnerable and marginalized groups with emerging and disruptive technologies (Author, 2017; 2019). Previous data collected presents evidence from technology staff of emerging issues and considerations related to privacy policies (Author, 2022).

For staff members, this paper is theoretically positioned at the intersection between leadership monitoring of toxic work environments and technology and workplace related privacy considerations at school, on school electronic resources and away from schools such as social media.

For students’ social media accounts and on- or off-site monitoring of the technology agreement may not be clearly understood. Finally, for policy makers, the considerations and reflections on current practice may ask staff to consider the intention (well-being or punitive) of surveillance.

Many schools have developed policies about taking pictures or recording others with these devices, and cell phones have been typically used by staff and students to communicate while on school grounds (Author, 2022). The Technology agreement in most schools researched to this point have general applications that are believed to be covering the appropriate and ethical use of electronic resources and communication devices while on-site, and some consider behaviour and profiles off-site (Author, 2022).

3. METHODOLOGY

For the purposes of this research and paper BYOD “bring your own devices” is inclusive of more than the BYOD movement that is officially a part of some schools. Discussions included the use of technology (cell phones, iPads, laptops, technology agreement) as it pertains to personal devices that were brought onto the school grounds, or that may be used in classrooms by teachers, administrators, IT staff or students (teacher/administration observations of, challenges with, surveillance of) and reactions to inappropriate behaviour such as taking pictures of others, recordings, or accessing websites with personal data.

Participants were selected based on their background and experience with bring your own device and technology use at school. A screening process related to participant background and experience was used. Participant background and experience was determined by the length of time a participant had participated with bring your own device policies in education settings. This was important to acknowledge because it indicated the participants knowledge of the research topic in the proposed setting.

Participants included mainly administration teams/IT staff at school and board level and any educators who were interested in participating or had experience using technology or personal devices in their classrooms.

The study was vetted through a university REB process to ensure student assent and parent consent forms were approved however, those participants were not recruited as some school districts believed the level of psychological harm from reflecting on surveillance may cause harm to students and was not part of their practice.

Interview times were arranged according to the schedule and willingness of the participants, with the researcher bearing all costs associated with travel time, and location. Copies of the transcripts from the interview were provided to the participants for their review and/or modification along with an informed consent regarding the use of Google or work emails and the potential for loss of privacy for participants. In such cases, participants with concerns were allowed to use email addresses and account that did not personally identify their school district or name to communicate.

Data was analyzed based on the answers to the interview questions evident in the transcript and in some cases, the video footage provided. Video was used to help aid the researcher with transcription and to validate the context or emotion of the participant in the study and with informed consent that asked the participant to consent specifically to the use of video, the initial interview and follow up interview. Participants had the ability to select one, all or a combination of any.
The background survey used prior to the commencement of the interview collected demographic information related to the participants' gender, age, position and prior use of BYOD.

4. RESULTS

The background survey resulted in the collection of demographic information (Table 1) indicated most participants were between the ages of 30-40 had over 5 years experience in their roles (Figure 1).

The educators surveyed in the study were assumed to conduct the majority of surveillance from both an administrative and IT department perspective, on a day-to-day basis, as they circulated around the room, and without necessarily any technology guidance or ability to track beyond their use and knowledge of a specific tool or skill set while at school on a device. IT department participants felt this was at times an unrealistic expectation with the belief that texting is difficult to police.

Additionally, the educators were unaware of the potential consequences of reporting a student for inappropriate use, and did not have a voice in the technology agreement policies or the use of data collected or reported, therefore indicating at times a lack of engagement in the policy or the consequences of poorly written policies and black and white or literal interpretations. The potential for different educator reactions to policies, implementations of policies and tracking of student behaviour was confirmed.

In one case study, well-being in the form of suicide prevention was raised as a rationale for the current policy of monitoring cell phone use and inclusions in technology agreements for safety concerns addressed through the allowance of cell phones on school properties.

Most school districts had an awareness of parental challenges to the monitoring of communication on cell phones for students or the tracking or collection of their child on any technology owned by the school or by personal. Depending on the age of the child (elementary versus secondary) students in younger age brackets were more willing to give their phone to an educator or an administrator and were more forthright about their misuse of the personal device. While parents in specific professions such as law were more likely to challenge the collection and tracking of data.

Parental challenges to the collection and monitoring of data and insistence of anonymous accounts raised concerns for IT department staff participants in the study who considered the implications for assessment, however well-being and self-regulation were not specifically identified as the intent of the surveillance.

IT department participants considered the security of the network and hacking of network accounts, documents or ability to access confidential data to be their top priority for conducting surveillance and noted it was not feasible to conduct active monitoring of all users at all times.

5. DISCUSSION

For one school with a noted suicide attempt, the situational context and reflections led to the creation of a policy that they still followed five years later. Due to the collaborative effort of the policy making and shared experience of the incident, each staff member had a voice in the creation of the policy but for new staff members and new families the school ensures they continue to educate and promote their policy through weekly communications. Weekly communication allowed parents the opportunity to raise an issue with individual pieces as well, and it is the most promising point to relate to the potential use of data tracking for self-regulation and cognitive behaviour therapy in schools.

Moving towards a well-being intent for tracking of student behaviour, clear communication with parents about the intent for tracking, monitoring or storing information in addition to policies that are inclusive of all stakeholders voices may alleviate parental concerns for the use of devices in schools.
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7. DATA SOURCES, EVIDENCE, OBJECTS OR MATERIALS

Table 1. Demographic information collected from study participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study #</th>
<th>Case Study #</th>
<th>Case Study #</th>
<th>Case Study #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 10,2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Island, BC</td>
<td>Island, BC</td>
<td>Island, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>8,000 students</td>
<td>11,300 students</td>
<td>247,000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female: 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d</td>
<td>Male: 1a, 1b</td>
<td>Female: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Teacher: 1a, 1b, 1c, Administrator: 1d</td>
<td>Head of Department: 1a</td>
<td>Administrator (IT): 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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