Regulation of Teacher Professionalism and Social Media: An Analysis of Disciplinary Outcomes and Teacher Candidates' Self-Regulation in British Columbia

by

Kieran Forde

(B.A., National University of Ireland, Galway, 2000; MA, University of Limerick, 2005)

A GRADUATING PAPER SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Education

in

Media and Technology Studies Education

University of British Columbia (Vancouver)

Date: July 31, 2019

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

This graduating paper came together over the course of 18 months and was made possible through the support, guidance and counsel of quite number of people. I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Stephen Petrina, who was with me throughout the journey providing insight, suggestions, and encouragement. Thank you also to Dr. Jillianne Code for serving as the second reader as well as inspiring me and helping me to stay motivated throughout my M.Ed.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Tony Clarke, who was especially generous with his time, for providing a steadying influence as well as valuable counsel and guidance over the last two years.

Finally, I offer my thanks to my friends and family, both near and far, for their love and support, especially during the earlier months following my return to study. A special thanks to Roy, Carol, Joan, and Karlene; my Canadian mentors, friends, and family. Lastly, I offer my enduring gratitude to my wife, Nicholle, whose determination, grit, and goodness continues to inspire me to keep going and growing.

Dedication

To my wonderful wife, Nicholle: we did it!

Introduction

Teachers today face regulation and restrictions in their use of social media. Some regulations and restrictions are self-imposed, as they seek to keep a clear boundary between their professional and private lives, while others come from provincial guidelines and school district policies regulating the use of social media. Quite often, these guidelines and policies are unclear and leave it up to teachers' "best judgement" as to how to navigate this challenging area. In the absence of overarching policies, teachers are then open to the possibility of facing disciplinary action for using social media in a way that *they* may have considered acceptable while an authority deems the content or expression "inappropriate." Kimmons (2016) highlights this by observing, "within the current technology ecosystem, the opportunity for teachers to lead a personal life separate from their professional life has almost disappeared" and that the standards to which teachers are held "might mean different things to different people." This gives rise to self-regulation as teachers grow to understand the challenges around balancing their rights of thought, belief, opinion, and expression with their duty of care to their students and to the profession. This chilling effect is highlighted by Papandrea who notes that "any secondary teacher who places information into a social media site takes a chance that an unintended audience might see it" and, to avoid this, teachers may avoid using social media entirely or "engage in significant self-censorship to post only the most benign content" (p. 1607).

It is within this context that I examine the area around teacher professionalism and social media, looking at what misuse of social media is resulting in K-12 teachers in British Columbia being subject to disciplinary action and how teacher candidates are preparing to meet the challenges of becoming a "subject of interest" upon entering the teaching profession.

Defining Social Media

Given that this study analyses the "inappropriate use of social media", it is important to consider the terminology. Most definitions of social media include reference to "online" or "internet-based" communication including blogs, micro-blogs, and social networking sites (Social Media, n.d. -a; Social Media, 2016; Quintanilla, 2016, p. 12; Nations, 2017). Another important element defining the term is the *sharing of information* using "primarily internet or cellular phone based applications" (Social media, n.d. b) or, more broadly, "forms of electronic communication" (Social media, n.d. c) allowing this. Nations (2017) admits that "the term is so vague that it can basically be used to describe almost any website on the internet today", noting that even traditional media (TV, radio, and newspapers) can sometimes be considered social media as "the line drawn between the two is slowly thinning as each continues to evolve".

However, for teachers in BC, the definition of social media can be even broader. For example, the Vancouver School Board's draft social media policy, "aimed at providing employees with a clear understanding of the impact of using social media and its appropriate use" (VSB Board Reviews, 2013), defines social media as

> any form of online publication or presence that allows end users to engage in multi-directional conversations in or around the content of the website. Social media includes but is not restricted to, social networking, blogs, wikis, social bookmarking, podcasts, forums, content communities, email, and instant messaging, and texting (SMS or texting). (Draft Policy and Regulations, 2013, p. 2)

The inclusion of email and texting, and particularly SMS, in this definition is notable. In some school districts in BC, definitions of social media are so broad as to include almost all forms of modern communication. For example, Revelstoke Board of Education (2016) defines

social media as "the use of web-based and mobile technologies to turn communication into interactive dialogue" (p. 3). A similarly broad scope is seen in many BC districts' social media guidelines (Abbotsford School District, 2013; Delta School District 37, 2013; Langley School District, 2014) but this is somewhat problematic in that, by some definitions, neither email nor SMS should be considered social media. For example, Anthony Bradley, a group vice president of Gartner Research, views e-mail as a distribution mechanism in opposition to social media as a collective mechanism (Bradley, 2010), and Peter Kim, VP of Digital Consumer Engagement at The LEGO Group, states clearly that "email isn't social media. In fact it's a communications tool that users shouldn't employ for media consumption at all" (Kim, 2011). Similarly, while texting applications like Facebook Messenger, WeChat, and WhatsApp are considered to be social media as they are online platforms, SMS is somewhat separate to this, as this channel generally enables communication over a cellular network. Benbria (2017) highlights another important distinction between texting (SMS) and instant messaging (IM); using IM requires an application to be downloaded and there needs to be a connection between the users *before* they can send messages while, in contrast, with SMS, no additional software is needed, and users are free to contact anyone directly so long as they have access to their phone number. I feel that the distinction between these two means of communication is important; my technophobic father uses his "dumb phone" to send SMS messages to my mother. I find it difficult to accept that, because of this, my father is a regular user of social media.

This difficulty in defining clearly what social media actually is could pose challenges to teachers as it is currently unclear what the term encompasses. It is possible then, that the definitions in school board social media policy, perhaps, extend into areas that may not actually be social media. In addition, the lack of a clear definition of social media at the provincial level

is also evident. For example, the recently released British Columbia Public Service's *Social Media Guidelines for BC Public Service Employees* (2019) fail to provide any definition of the term and, instead, merely mention some of the more popular social media networks: "from Facebook to LinkedIn, Reddit to Ravelry, Instagram to Tinder, @Work to Glassdoor, social media use plays a role in the personal lives of many BC Public Service (BCPS) employees" (p. 3).

Uniquely, the Ontario College of Teachers' (OCT) *Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession* (OCT, 2016, p. 13) refer to the appropriate use of technology and supplements its standards with a professional advisory on social media. In *Maintaining Professionalism – Use of Electronic Communication and Social Media* (OCT, 2017), the OCT does not define social media. However, the advisory distinguishes between "electronic communication" and social media while noting that both can be problematic for teachers. On the other hand, the OCT makes little to no distinction between teachers' personal lives and professional communications: "Members must maintain a sense of professionalism at all times – in their personal and professional lives."

Given a lack of a clear definition and the fact that SMS / text messaging is included in various school district policies as well as evident in many of the DOs analyzed classified under the term "inappropriate use of social media", for the purposes of the study, both will be considered as a form of social media and referred to as "communication methods" to distinguish them from other platforms more commonly understood to constitute social media. This is consistent with the OCT's advisory.

Theory and Context: Literature review

This section explores three concepts related to the challenges outlined above. These concepts were chosen as they each represent a specific area of difficulty for teachers around how they manage their digital presence. Firstly, the issue of regulation, specifically the standards to which teachers are held to, is examined. Secondly, the issue of the chilling effect that vague or absent standards or policy might have on teachers is explored, as well as how this may affect them exercising their fundamental freedoms as citizens. Finally, the emerging concept of the right to be forgotten is outlined and discussed as it is an area that is likely to become increasingly important as it relates to the need for people to be able to have some degree of control over their online identity so that, should they transition to a new role, they are not inextricably linked to their previous (perhaps irrelevant) identities.

Regulation

In 2003, the BC College of Teachers (BCCT) introduced *Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct of Educators in British Columbia* ("Standards for Educators"). "It is expected that the Standards will continue to evolve over time and will require ongoing updating and modification," the College asserted in 2004 (BCCT, 2004, p. 3). In early January 2012, following the BC Ministry's introduction of the *Teachers Act*, the College was disbanded and the BC Teacher Regulation Branch (TRB) was created, albeit with a share of controversy. The TRB is an operational office in the regulatory structure for the teaching profession and oversees the *Professional Standards for BC Educators* ("*Professional Standards"*), which outline the requirements of the profession regarding conduct and competency. These nine standards, updated and renamed in June 2019, articulate the values and

characteristics that distinguish the work of teachers in BC (approx. 70,000). While there is no explicit mention of the appropriate use of social media, it is in the first two standards where the overarching descriptions of proper conduct are outlined. Within these, it is clearly stated that teachers have a responsibility to act in the best interests of their students, and to "act ethically and maintain the integrity, credibility and reputation of the profession" (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2019). These standards are, by necessity, quite broad and general but nevertheless cover the duty of care that teachers in BC have to their students and profession. However, standards specific to the appropriate use of social media are significantly less well articulated. TRB Commissioner Bruce Preston acknowledged the problem, explaining

> We see abuses of social media by teachers that run through a lot of our consent resolution agreements. And students, they've got the cellphone down under the desk during the class; they record what the teacher is saying and so on and so forth. It's a whole new world out there for teachers, and I think everybody's struggling with that, cellphone policies and so forth. (quoted in Naylor, 2017)

A review of the literature finds the repeatedly stated belief that the standards to which teachers are held are generally not clearly defined. Brake (2014) notes that "due to the rapid technological revolution, existing social media usage policy within school districts may be absent or ambiguous" (p. 2). The rapidity of the evolution of social media can make it difficult for administrators and policy makers to keep standards clear and up to date. Moreover, while guidelines are usually provided to teachers, by regulatory bodies and within each school or district, for the use of technology *within* the classroom there exists a grey area with regard to how teachers use social media in their *private* lives (Akiti, 2012, p. 132). On this, MacKenzie

(2016) states: "a standard delineating when discipline is appropriate for social media use unrelated to students and the school has yet to develop in Canada" (p. 54).

In their 2014 paper *Teacher Professionalization in the Age of Social Networking Sites*, the authors interviewed pre-service teachers in the US and found that "participants had difficulty articulating what professionalism in [social networking sites] means and what constitutes appropriate behavior" (Kimmons & Veletsianos, 2015, p. 486). They conclude by noting that "in general, the issue seemed like a fuzzy area, and they had no source that they could reference for clear, universalizable standards of appropriateness" (p. 488). This was echoed in Brake's (2014) study, where data analysis of interviews with 11 in-service teachers "indicated existing social media policies were ambiguous" and that "several participants noted elusive language was used in the policy, feeling the existing policy did not provide concrete expectations for use in the classroom" (p. 78).

It is this very lack of clear standards that make navigating social media so challenging for teachers. For K-12 teachers in British Columbia, the most recent articulation of these can be seen in the "Professional Conduct Advisory: Professional Boundaries and Social Media" in *Learn* magazine (Spring 2016) (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2016, p. 14). This magazine aims to "ensure that teachers, and other members of the education community, are informed about the Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct required for teaching in BC" (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2018). In this issue, the TRB Commissioner Preston (2016) begins by acknowledging that "the increasing use of social media presents both opportunities and dangers for the professional educator" and that it is "important for educators to protect their professional reputation at all times" (p. 14). In addition to this, the advisory cautions teachers in a general way about the hazards social media can present noting,

"communicating [with students, parents, and colleagues] through a personal email account or through Facebook posts or personal text messaging accounts should be avoided completely". However, apart from these types of warnings, the advisory doesn't explicitly state what might constitute "misuse" of social media or what actions would result in disciplinary actions being taken against teachers.

The ambiguity with regard to the standards for teachers in this area is extremely challenging. MacKenzie (2016) notes, "of course, it is not possible to draw a bright line indicating precisely what online conduct is inappropriate — each case will have to be considered on its facts to assess whether a teacher's posted comments or photos create a loss of confidence in the teacher and the school system as a whole" (p. 69). However, this means that teachers could well be unclear where the "line" is and may be held accountable only after they have inadvertently crossed it. O'Connor and Schmidt (2015) observe that "if a school district fails to clearly articulate a social media policy, teachers are left to use their personal judgment regarding appropriateness. Subjective standards can result in objectionable online interactions with students (p. 5). Similarly, Delgado (2013) makes note of the need for clear language in social media policy in her analysis of how regulation in the US needs to take care not to infringe on the First Amendment rights of teachers, calling for legislation to more narrowly define the limitations placed on teachers.

In their study of student teachers, Kimmons and Veletsianos (2015) comment, "as role models and semi-public figures, participants believed that teachers need to tread carefully in certain areas, because they will be expected to work with diverse people, representing various value systems" (p. 492). I argue that terms like "tread carefully" and advice to use social media "appropriately" are of little use to teachers in lieu of clearly stated overarching policies.

In *Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct of Educators in BC*, it is explained that "standards are not detailed descriptors of teaching competency or conduct. They are statements of principle upon which the detail can be built" (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2012). The challenge for teachers in BC is to get specific details about the appropriate use of social media both inside and outside the classroom. Granted, the discipline outcome documents issued for breaches of "appropriate" usage provide very clear examples of when teachers were found to be acting inappropriately, but it would arguably be better to have these examples presented in one comprehensive document, with supplementary discussion and more detailed guidelines, rather than dispersed across dozens of magazines. We are told that publication of these is "a means of ensuring accountability for the educators involved, as well as articulating the standards expected of all certificate holders" (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2016, p.15). While this is certainly helpful and serves as a warning to those in the profession where the lines are, it is beneficial to provide more specific language in guidelines *before* teachers are taken to task rather than articulating the standards *after* the fact with the transgression providing the detail absent in the guidelines.

In short, the standards for teachers can be absent or ambiguous resulting in teachers having to live in a "fuzzy area" around the standards to which they are held. The challenge is to "find the balance between maintaining public confidence in the education system and respecting a teacher's right to maintain a private life" (MacKenzie, 2016, p. 71) while providing teachers with more clearly worded and detailed descriptions of inappropriate behavior.

Fundamental Freedoms and Chilling Effect

Of further concern to teachers and teacher-educators alike is the possible chilling effect that might "deter people from exercising their freedoms or engaging in legal activities on the internet" (Penney, 2017, p. 1) by the imposition of unclear standards of "acceptable" usage of social media. This chilling effect occurs within a context of academic freedom for teachers and "professional autonomy" (Larson, 2009; Petrina, 2008, 2010; Popp, 2009). If teachers are unclear what use of social media may result in disciplinary action, the easiest choice for them is to avoid it entirely. However, with internet technology and social media being ubiquitous in schools, this can seriously curtail teachers from taking advantage of the benefits using social media can have in the professional context. Though teachers understand that "their role is intrinsically public" (Preston, 2016, p. 14), in *Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15* (2006), Supreme Court of Canada Justice La Forest cautioned that this doesn't mean that that they should be under "inordinate scrutiny" as "this could lead to a substantial invasion of the privacy rights and fundamental freedoms of teachers" (p. 45).

The perceived chilling effect on teachers with regard to their use of social media is evident throughout the literature, with Scarfo and Zuker (2017) noting that "teachers cannot fully participate in the use of websites, online social networking and the Internet because they have to censor their personal views and self-representation to avoid actual or perceived misconduct and its consequences" (p. 21). This position is made clear when scholars in the field suggest that "it is tempting to suggest that one should proceed with extreme caution, perhaps avoiding social media altogether" (Burtis, 2017, p. xi) or that "with such an ephemeral standard, the only safe choice may be to reduce online participation to practical non-existence" (Kimmons & Veletsianos, 2015, p. 496).

Delgado (2013) explains that vague or overbroad laws discourage teachers from expressing themselves online "because the individuals are unable to determine precisely what expression is permissible and what expression is proscribed" even as such expression is protected, for the most part, in the US under the First Amendment and in Canada under the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (p. 313). Akiti (2012) notes that teachers in the US have sought to combat the chilling effect by threatening legal action for violation of these First Amendment rights (pp. 120-21). In Canada, the Office of the Privacy Commissioner addresses this issue in their Draft Position on Online Reputation which named Reputation and Privacy as one of their strategic privacy priorities for 2015-2020. The Office set a goal to assist in creating "an environment where individuals may use the Internet to explore their interests and develop as persons without fear that their digital trace will lead to unfair treatment" noting that, though Canadian citizens "recognize the personal and professional benefits of participating in the online world, they are increasingly concerned about their online reputation" (Office of the Privacy Commissioner, 2018).

In her study with ten secondary teachers in the US, Quintanilla (2016) notes that they repeatedly expressed "concerns with oversharing when using social media and a fear of posting something that might be misconstrued or possibly warrant reprimand by their employers" with some opting out of the use of social media altogether (p. 79). However, Burtis (2017) says this "opting out" approach "is an abdication of our responsibilities as educators" and describes the myriad professional development opportunities for teachers through the use of social media (p. xi).

The existence of vague standards then can have a chilling effect on teachers and curtail their rights to express themselves as individuals or to use social media as part of their pedagogy

for fear of repercussions "divorcing them from vibrant, vital online communities of educators" (Burtis, 2017, p. xii). Cooke (2012) highlights that many teachers value Twitter, specifically because of the opportunity it provides to interact within their community of practice, breaking "the sense of professional isolation that many teachers feel within the walls of their own schools while reinvigorating their lesson plans by exposing them to a daily global idea exchange".

Furthermore, teachers are entitled to have a private life and the freedom to express themselves as individuals but, as Fornwald (2017) notes, "as citizens, we have the right to our online lives, but when we seek guidance regarding acceptable participation, we are often met with rules that are vague, incomplete, or unclear". Is it the case then that, because of these "higher" standards teachers are held to, they lose some of their basic fundamental freedoms in terms of opinion and expression?

The Right to Be Forgotten

Another concern for teachers is that their use of social media could be found inappropriate retroactively. These days, we know that potential employers check our social media as part of the recruitment and interview processes. A 2018 Harris Poll found that 70 percent of employers use social networking sites to vet potential hires and, of these, 57 percent have found content that caused them not to hire candidates, with the posting of "provocative or inappropriate photographs, videos or information", at 40 percent, being the primary disqualifying factor (More Than Half of Employers, 2018). Similarly, teachers today are under scrutiny for what they have posted, as well as what others have posted about them, on social media but, as

MacKenzie (2016) points out "how does this apply in the age of social media, when evidence of private off-duty conduct can be posted online for the world to see—indefinitely?" (p. 53).

Most teacher candidates today will have grown up with social media as part of their lives and may have, at one time, had inappropriate content on their social media. While it is possible for them to delete personal content that they deem might be problematic, that the content was in the public domain may mean that it could have been copied or recorded by a third party and so could appear online at any time in the future. In essence, the permanence of their digital footprint could, at a later date, cause "inappropriate" materials concerning them to be posted online. Ettighoffer cautions that "unfortunate or dishonest links become very easy on the Net. They can be used by whoever wants to put his/her fellow [hu]man in trouble" (as cited in Pereira, Vesnić-Alujević & Alessia, 2014, p. 13). Similarly, de Terwangne (2014) notes that "the power of Internet search engines to gather any data concerning a targeted individual at any time, from anywhere, without any administrative procedure, without revealing the searcher's own identity, and for free, raises serious concern" (p. 82). In addition, Lindsay (2014) observes that Google's page ranking algorithm determines that the most embarrassing or humiliating information about a person dominates returns (p. 295), thus bringing greater attention to elements of our lives that we might rather not have attention brought to.

In Europe, the 2014 "right to be forgotten", as part of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), gives some protection in this regard. It goes some way towards ensuring that something a person has done or posted online can be removed from search engine results or from specific websites. Mantelero (2013) explains:

> This conception of the right to be forgotten is based on the fundamental need of an
> individual to determine the development of her life in an autonomous way, without being

perpetually or periodically stigmatized as a consequence of a specific action performed in the past (p. 235).

In Canada, there is no right to be forgotten comparable to that which was introduced in Europe under the GDPR. Internet, technology, and privacy lawyer David Fraser doesn't believe such a law could be implemented in Canada because the Charter of Rights and Freedoms "has a guarantee of freedom of expression — we don't have a guarantee of your right to be forgotten" (quoted in Mayer, 2014). However, Geist (2017) noted that a federal court ruling in 2018 may have "pave[d] the way for a Canadian version of the right to be forgotten" though later concludes that steps in that direction from The Privacy Commissioner of Canada "creates more problems than it solves" (Geist, 2018). In contrast, Werro (2009) notes the primacy of the First Amendment constitutional right means that no such law will evolve in the US.

If a teacher's use of social media, before they even become qualified as a teacher, can potentially be held against them in perpetuity, this opens up another dangerous issue with regard to how they use it. Hoskins (2014) sees this as an "inexorable past made present" (p. 55), noting that the pervasiveness and searchability of information online enables "the projection backwards onto our past of the intensity, immediacy and messiness of a compulsive digital present" (p. 54). In his commentary on the right to be forgotten, Szekely (2012) notes that the pervasiveness of our digital footprint could bring about a "zero-tolerance-society" because "the possibility of storing information on everyone, of retrieving and using it at any time against anybody, is the perfect means to detect and sanction the slightest deviation from the ideologically, politically or commercially preferred behavior" (p. 353). That the permanence of elements of our digital past could, at any time, come back to cause sufficient reputational damage is of particular importance today as we see careers being destroyed by old social media posts being dug up and used as

ammunition against various public figures. Similarly, teachers may also have significant concerns about elements of their digital presence which could be used against them as parents, and concerned others, may choose to carry out investigations of their near and distant past.

In addition to this, other challenges arise when teachers are accused of misconduct on the social media of parents or concerned others. Fraser Valley music teacher Douglas Pritchard, who was falsely accused on Facebook of "pedophilic behavior" by a vindictive neighbor, is a shocking example of how a teacher's reputation can be tarnished as a form of vendetta, forcing teachers to start litigation to clear their name. Prichard notes that, in cases such as this, "as a teacher you have no choice. Your reputation as a teacher is everything, especially when those kind [*sic*] of allegations are attached to you" (BC court awards, 2016). Though Prichard was cleared of any wrongdoing, and awarded $67,000 in damages, a Google search of his name ties him to these allegations in perpetuity. The links make it clear that Prichard was falsely accused but the co-occurrence of his name and terms like "pedo," a "creep" and a "nutter" can serve a permanent reputational stigma. Prichard himself laments; "Those rumours will always persist" ('This is devastating', 2016).

MacKenzie (2016) warns that "We cannot expect to retain excellent educators if all aspects of teachers' personal lives are under a microscope" (p. 70). That a teacher's past use of social media could, at any time in the future, be deemed to be "inappropriate" or that reputational harm done to them can follow them seems forever is an issue that could be addressed through the application of some form of the right to be forgotten.

Inquiry project description

The project consisted of two strands of research. Firstly, interviews were conducted with seven UBC teacher education candidates (TCs) from the Bachelor of Education (BEd) program. Following this, the discipline outcomes (DOs) relating to the "inappropriate use of social media" in the Teacher Regulation Branch (TRB) section of the BC Ministry of Education website were analysed. Details of these two research areas are given below.

Inquiry Procedure

Firstly, between January 17-28, 2019, interviews were conducted with seven teacher education candidates in a metro Vancouver university. The interviews took place on the university's campus and each lasted for approximately 30 minutes. These TCs were asked questions around three areas in order to inquire into their concerns around transitioning from TC to certified teacher. These questions are provided in Appendix B.

The second area of research involved an analysis of the DOs on the TRB website. This took place between May and June, 2019. The researcher used a grounded theory approach to analyse the DOs in order to discover the salient common features within these and to get a clearer picture about what "inappropriate use of social media" teachers in BC were being held accountable for. The Constant Comparative Method (CCM), following Lincoln and Guba (1985), was used to analyze the data within the DOs. A further explanation of this process is given within the analysis and interpretation section of the discipline outcomes below.

Through this inquiry, the researcher was able to address the research question driving the inquiry, namely:

Are the teacher candidates' concerns reflected in the discipline outcomes and do the factors leading to the issuing of discipline outcomes reflect the concerns of the teacher candidates.

Inquiry Purpose

Fornwald (2017) understands that being a teacher means "placing certain limits and restrictions on my off-duty conduct, including how, when, and where I interacted digitally" but in terms of being accountable to vague standards, she asks*:* "what exactly are these 'higher standards?' Who decides? And where is the line between acceptable and unacceptable?"

The purpose of this study is to illuminate and assist in making clearer where the boundaries are regarding teachers' use of social media. This was achieved by looking at the discipline outcomes and examining what the common factors are that result in teachers being disciplined. In addition, through interviews with teacher candidates, I was able to explore their areas of concern regarding the transition from student teacher to certified teacher and see what, if any, consideration they had given to their online presence on social media in preparation for entering the teaching profession. This was done in order to explore their beliefs around what constitutes a "professional" online identity and concerns that they might have about managing that identity.

I believe that this is both a timely and important topic given that teachers are being held accountable to standards that are either absent or unclear. The American Psychological Association (2008) acknowledges that "although technology per se is not new to the education process of teaching and learning, education is one of the areas most heavily impacted by technology" (pp. 455-56). This being the case, and in particular with teachers (mis)use of social media, I believe that it is imperative to understand more fully how and why teachers in BC are

being held to task for their misuse of social media. This study will interest teacher candidates, teachers, and teacher educators alike as we learn how to navigate the increasingly complex issues concerning the regulation of teacher professionalism and social media.

Ethical Considerations

There were several ethical considerations to consider during this study. Firstly, for the interview component, the TCs were informed about the purposes of the study and how their interview would be used. Following this, the TCs signed a consent form to sign to indicate that they agreed to participate in the study (Appendix A). The interviews were recorded and transferred to an encrypted flash drive which was kept in a locked cabinet in the lab at all times. To maintain the privacy of the TCs involved, they were assigned a number according to the order in which the interviews were conducted. Throughout the paper, they are referred to only by this number.

As my second data source, the discipline outcomes, are publicly available, I did not need consent to work with them. However, as the purpose of the study is not to be an "exposé" of those involved, the names of the teachers (if given in the DOs) has been replaced by the bracketed phrase [the teacher].

It was of minor, though considered, concern that searching for the subjects online by name and viewing specific articles concerning the discipline outcomes may have a (negligible) impact on how search results related to those names may be displayed in the future.

Analysis and Interpretation

As mentioned above, the researcher conducted two separate strands of research. These will be discussed in turn before relating them both to the research question.

The Discipline Outcomes

The researcher analyzed the TRB Discipline Database within the field "inappropriate use of social media" (n=61). These discipline outcomes (DOs) date from 1996-2019. Table 1 shows the annual distribution.

Table 1**:** Distribution of DOs (by year) within the "inappropriate use of social media" field.

Year	Number
1996	1
2003	3
2004	0
2005	0
2006	1
2007	2
2008	3
2009	5
2010	6
2011	9
2012	3
2013	7
2014	2
2015	2
2016	8
2017	5
2018	2
2019	2
Total	61

Within this field, five sub-topics were provided: "Misuse of district/school internet service", "Nudity/sexualized content", "Pornography", "Via email/texting/phone, and "With students". The total number of results within the subtopics (106) reflects overlap where some DOs are filed under more than one sub-topic. Table 2 shows the distribution of the sub-topics.

Table 2: Breakdown by subtopic of the DOs within the "inappropriate use of social media" field.

Sub-topic	Number
Misuse of district/school internet service	18
Nudity/sexualized content	11
Pornography	17
Via email/texting/phone	33
With students	27
Total	106

For the purposes of the study, the DOs were assigned a number from most recent (DO#1: Feb 2019) to least recent (DO#61: Jan 1996). Appendix D provides full details for each of the DOs along with a hyperlink to each document.

Of the 61 DOs analyzed, 14 involve criminal conduct and were removed from the study. The nature and DO number of these are listed in table 3 for reference.

Table 3: Discipline outcomes involving criminal conduct

Nature of crime	DO#
Assault	27
Child pornography	25, 40, 43, 44, 51, 57, 59
Indecent assault	14
Sexual exploitation	1, 26, 37, 50,
Voyeurism	10

Of the remaining 47 DOs, there are two incidences where the DOs refers to the *same* respondent *and* incident; DO# 13/16 and DO# 28/29. In these cases, the DOs were analyzed as one unit though they remain as separate DOs in the chronological naming sequence for the purposes of the study. Two of the DOs refer to the *same* respondent (DO# 6/24) but to *different*

incidents. These were analyzed and treated as separate units. As a result of this, the study analyzed the circumstances of 45 discrete DOs.

Results

Following the CCM, the researcher first read through the discipline outcomes and began to identify "items". These were recurring details exhibited throughout the DOs that could linked through their "look-alike" characteristics as emergent categories as the analysis progressed. Examples of this include the citing of specific standards breached, terms such as "conduct unbecoming", and references to the area of "boundaries" or courses relating to maintaining appropriate boundaries that the teachers involved were required to complete. In the case of references to specific social media (SM) platforms, even though the number of items in some of these categories were as low as 1, the researcher kept these as separate categories in order to be better able to be able to compare the number of occurrences of these. At the end of this process, 233 individual items had been identified.

As analysis continued, categories were created and named by the researcher into which subsequent related items could be placed. The names of some of these categories changed as new items were discovered that could be added to and expand an existing category. In some cases, categories were collapsed when items were taken from these and added to newly expanded categories.

At the end of the process 24 categories were identified. The category with the least number of items, excluding the stand-alone social media platform categories, was the three items

contained in the "personal use" category. The largest category, 43 items, related to "professional misconduct".

At the end of the analysis, the researcher endeavored to combine some of these categories to create overarching themes and related sub-themes that best represented the categories. For example, the stand-alone social media platform categories were thematically merged, alongside, "phone calls", to create one theme named "communication". The rest of the categories were combined until, four overarching themes and 9 sub-themes were identified that encompassed all 24 categories. The themes are presented below with sections of the DOs and, occasionally, context provided by the researcher to illustrate these themes.

Overarching Theme #1: Communication

In this study, the DOs almost exclusively detail "inappropriate" communication, in some form, between teachers and students. The platforms and methods used for this communication are broken down into the two sub-themes below.

Sub-theme #1.1: Social media / text-based communication

The largest group of categories identified in the study related to the different SM platforms and text-based communication methods mentioned in the DOs. During the CCM process, the "items" in this category were *not* combined as the researcher wanted to keep separate the various social media platforms mentioned. One mention of YouTube and one of access to unspecified SM sites are also included here. In these cases, though there was no communication involved, the platforms themselves are included as they relate to SM. They are

presented here as one sub-theme in order to facilitate comparison between the number of each

communication method. A breakdown of these is given in table 4.

Table 4: The number of occurrences with the DOs of specific social media platforms and related communication methods.

Social media platform / communication method	Number of occurrences in DOs
Adult dating app	1
Email	14
Facebook	9
Instagram	2
MSN messages	4
Snapchat	1
Text messages (SMS)	10
Twitter	2
YouTube	1
Social media (unspecified)	1
Total	45

The prevalence of email and text messages, as opposed to popular SM networks, is evident.

Language that illustrates this sub-theme includes:

DO#46: "communications included sending the student emails and MSN messages in which he disclosed his phone number, that he was drunk at the time, and said words to the effect that the student had 'a nice body'."
DO#49: "[The teacher's] conduct included email communications that went beyond the normal student/teacher relationship, and which continued despite a directive from his employer not to interact with her."
DO#35: "[The teacher] began tutoring the student in English. Then they exchanged email addresses and other contact information. The relationship developed initially through electronic means, such as text messages, emails and Twitter."

Communication through Facebook, which was by far the most commonly used SM

network to contact students, is shown in the following:

DO#8: "[The teacher] sent Student A a private Facebook message, telling her that he had a crush on her friend, Student B."
DO#18: "[The teacher] posted comments on her Facebook page, which was accessible by students, in which she wrote disrespectful comments about students."

Sub-theme #1.2: Phone calls

Phone calls were also mentioned in DOs as another method by which teachers communicated with students. In all cases, this was in addition to one or more of the SM types mentioned above. Text from the DOs provide some examples.

DO#29: "[The teacher] called her [a student] at night for long telephone conversations."
DO#58: "[The teacher] admitted to meeting alone with the student for coffee and dinner, making personal telephone calls to her home, and sending her a birthday card and gift."

Overarching Theme #2: Relationship to professionalism

The DOs describe behaviors that relate to unprofessional conduct where those involved fell short with regard to standards of professional behavior. The following sub-themes, which represent separate "containers" used during the CCM process, explore the different expressions of this within the DOs.

Sub-theme #2.1: Specific standards

All but three of the 42 most recent DOs reference the specific standards that were breached by the teachers involved. In all but one of these 42 cases, the set of standards referred to are the third and fourth editions of the *Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct of Educators in BC*. The most commonly breached standards are #1 and #2:

Standard #1 Educators value and care for all students and act in their best interests.

Standard #2 Educators are role models who act ethically and honestly.

These overarching statements for these are provided below (see British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2012 for the full form of these standards). Illustrative examples of the nature of these breaches include:

DO#4 (breach of Standard#1): "[The teacher] posted one photograph of a student on his Facebook page where her face was not obscured, although she was wearing sunglasses. He posted another photograph of a student without her face being obscured on his Instagram."

DO#31 (breach of Standard#2): "[The teacher] improperly accessed the work email account of a colleague (Teacher A). By using group mailing lists, [the teacher] forwarded an email from Teacher B that was in Teacher A's inbox to 335 staff and teachers at three schools. The content of the email was personal, private and not intended for anyone other than Teacher A."

DO#17 (breach of Standards #1 & #2): "[The teacher] failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and inappropriately communicated through a series of text messages with a grade 11 student (the "Student") in her class." "The student was absent from class with [the teacher] on several occasions in December and January because he felt uncomfortable. [The teacher] did not mark him absent as required nor notify the school principal or his parents of his absences."

Do#36 is the only document that references the earlier, second edition (2004), standards. Though the discipline outcome was issued in September 2011, the actual incidents detailed occurred in 2005 when these standards were in force. The specific standards mentioned in this case are standards #5 and #13. The relevant sections are provided below (see Appendix C for full version) with language from the DO illustrating the nature of the breach of standards:

Standard #5 Professional educators are knowledgeable about BC's education system.
    Professional educators:
    5.1 understand the principal features of the BC education system
    5.2 have a working knowledge of the relevant legislation that governs the profession and its work
Standard #13 Professional educators have a responsibility to the profession.
    Professional educators:
    13.1 exemplify behaviours that maintain the dignity, credibility and integrity of the profession

DO#36: "[The teacher] failed to provide adequate supervision to students and that he used the district computer to conduct personal business during instructional time. Further, [the teacher] was found to have used physical intimidation towards the principal and refused to accept the request that he fulfill his professional responsibilities to his students."

Sub-theme #2.2: Professional Misconduct

The second largest category identified in the study represented occurrences where the

DOs detailed behaviors that were described as "professional misconduct". In almost all cases in

DOs #1-42, professional misconduct is mentioned alongside reference to the specific standards

breached. However, in DOs #45-61, only the term professional misconduct is used and there is

no mention of specific standards. Examples of these earlier DOs, with context, include:

DO#61: This is the oldest DO in this category of the database, with the hearing being held in
September 1995. In this case, the teacher involved "entered into an inappropriate
relationship with a student" and "published and distributed obscene/indecent and/or
pornographic material to a student both at and away from school. At this time, there were
no explicit standards to which teachers were held so 'professional misconduct' functions
as an overarching description of the breach.

DO#45: "[The teacher] had been suspended for 10 days, relating to his inappropriate use of the
school computer system, his use of inappropriate language in the classroom and allowing
students to use inappropriate language in the classroom. The school district investigation
found that [the teacher] had accessed his Hotmail and Facebook accounts during class
time. He also accessed the website Tumblr for classroom purposes and for a personal art
project. Some of the images [the teacher] accessed and "re-blogged" to his blog for the
latter purpose contained images of naked females and of people engaged in sexual acts."

Sub-theme #2.3 Conduct unbecoming

The term "conduct unbecoming" is included in far fewer of the DOs. In all but one case,

it occurs alongside the use of "professional misconduct" or where a specific behavioral standard

is given. The circumstances of the single instance where it does not are detailed below:

DO#39: "In July 2006, [the teacher] was employed at an independent school when he disclosed
to school authorities that he had viewed adult pornography on a school computer."
    "In January 2007, [the teacher] acknowledged to school authorities that he again viewed
adult pornography on a school computer."
    "In December 2009, a video from a school security camera revealed that [the teacher]
was accessing and viewing adult pornographic images on a school computer. During the
school's investigation, [the teacher] acknowledged that he accessed and viewed
pornographic images on the school computer and that over the previous 18 months he had
spent $8,000 on the services of prostitutes and escorts. In addition, [the teacher]
acknowledged that he had inappropriate sexual thoughts about students between the ages
of 12 and 18."

Sub-theme #2.4 Role / position at school

The researcher included this sub-theme here as there are five cases that involved

individuals other than full-time teachers.

DO#60: involves a school principal who "interacted with students via email and face to face in
an inappropriate manner", gave "inappropriate foot massages" to students, and used the
school computer during school hours to view pornography.

In addition, there are four DOs which involve teachers on call (TOC). Context and language

from this type of DO are provided below.

DO#12: Involves a TOC who played inappropriate music videos in his Grade 10 English class.
These videos included profanity and scenes "including urination and sexual acts."
DO#53: "[The teacher] viewed inappropriate images on a classroom computer that included
beach scenes with partially naked individuals. He further admitted that while viewing
these images during instructional time, one student accidentally observed the
inappropriate image."

Overarching Theme #3: "Inappropriate" behaviors

Given the DOs were compiled under the category, "inappropriate use of social media",

the term "inappropriate" is evident throughout most, though not all, of the DOs. One of the

challenges described in the literature review is around understanding what constitutes

"inappropriate" behavior with regard to SM usage. In this theme, the various forms of behavior

described as "inappropriate" are categorized.

Sub-theme #3.1 "Inappropriate"

The word "inappropriate" occurs in 34 of the 46 analyzed DOs. In 15 of DOs the word is

used to refer to actions that do not specifically involve the use of SM or communication

methods. These were kept in one "container" during the CCM. Of course, "inappropriate of

social media" is a factor in all these cases, but in these DOs the term is used to refer to other

behaviors. Table 5 details the corresponding behavior associated in each DO.

Table 5: Co-occurring term(s) described as "inappropriate"

DO#	Co-occurring term(s) described as "inappropriate"
13/16	websites with sexual content, use of laptop, sites, or obscene purposes, sexual
19	age-inappropriate (video)
20	pictures of inappropriate relationships between adults and children
30	files
33	language
35	relationships
39	sexual thoughts
42	material on the internet
49	relationship
53	languages, images on classroom computer
54	touching
55	relationship
56	relationship
58	comments
60	material,
61	relationship, counselling

The remaining 18 DOs refer specifically to the use of social media or communication

methods which was termed "inappropriate". Table 6 details in which DOs the term occurs.

Illustrative examples are provided afterwards.

Table 6: Uses of social media / communication methods described as "inappropriate".

Uses of social media / communication	DO#	TOTAL
Text messages	2, 4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 38, 48	10
Email	3, 22, 29/29, 60	14
Facebook	4, 7, 6, 24, 45, 47, 48	6
Social media (unspecified)	5	1
MSN messages	21, 24, 46	4
Phone calls	48	1
Twitter	15	1

DO#4: "The Teacher engaged in highly inappropriate communications with a Grade 11 student using Facebook messenger and text messaging. The conversations occurred late at night and were frequently intimate in nature."

DO#7: "the Teacher sent numerous inappropriate and personal Facebook and text messages to a 15-year old female student at the School."

DO#15: "Then over the course of approximately three weeks, [the teacher] sent Student A numerous inappropriate messages of a sexual nature, including references to having sex with Student A, using Twitter and text messaging."

DO#38: "[The teacher] had been sending her inappropriate text messages for a period of time. The district investigation determined that between February to May 2009, [the teacher] texted the student several times. The messages were innocuous at first, but became increasingly suggestive."

Sub-theme #3.2 Pornography on school computers

Included in this theme were the 12 DOs that are contained in the category referring to the viewing of pornography. In all these cases, the material was viewed on school computers or laptops. In over half of the cases, it is made clear that this behavior occurred during instructional time or working hours. Examples highlighting this sub-theme include:

DO#41: The only reasonable inference to be drawn from the evidence provided was that it was [the teacher] who accessed and viewed adult pornography websites on his school computer in his class during instructional time.

DO#52: a few of [the teacher's] students approached his desk and observed him viewing pornographic images of adult women on his classroom computer. It was later discovered that [the teacher] accessed and viewed adult pornographic material from the internet on his classroom computer during school hours on at least three other occasions between 2004 and 2005.

Overarching Theme #4: Boundaries

The final theme brings together the categories labeled "boundaries", "courses", "alcohol", and "personal use." Boundaries were specifically mentioned in five of the DOs. Language highlighting the more salient examples of this are:

DO#2: "[The teacher] used multiple contact points with students, including some outside the classroom, which were used to blur boundaries."

DO#5: "[The teacher] breached acceptable boundaries with her students by using numerous social media platforms to exchange emails and messages with them about non-school related activities."
Included in this theme, is the smallest container in the CCM, which was for that of where

teachers were found to be using school computers for "personal use". This occurred in three of

the DOs, an example of this is shown below:

DO#33: "The investigation determined that [the teacher] made extensive use of his school computer for personal use during class time, including visits to a variety of commercial, entertainment and non-educational websites."

Also included in this theme are references found in the DOs to alcohol usage. Some illustrative

examples include:

DO#3: "[The Teacher] sent Student A numerous inappropriate emails, and served her alcohol and bought her cigarettes even though she was underage."
DO#8: "[The teacher] knew that Student C was under the legal drinking age at the time and wrote: "I'm on the reserve side of the river, so no one enforces the drinking age.""
DO#22: [The teacher] explains his conduct on June 24, 2009 by maintaining that he was drunk at the time he sent the emails. He does not recall sending the emails in question.

Finally, nine of the DOs reference that, as a result of the issuing of the DO, the teachers

agreed to attend a workshop relating to "professional boundaries" and one instance (DO#24)

where the teacher appears to have done so by her or his own volition prior to the DO in question.

Examples illustrating this facet of the DOs include:

DO#5: "[The teacher] will successfully complete, at her expense, the following course offered at the Justice Institute of BC: Reinforcing Respectful Professional Boundaries."
DO#32: "[The teacher] agreed that the College would issue him a reprimand and that he would complete the workshop 'Understanding the Professional Relationship: Respecting the Boundaries.'"
DO#45: "[The teacher] accepted a reprimand and an undertaking to complete the College Boundary Violations workshop."

The Interviews

Responses to interviews with the seven TCs are presented below. The main questions, alongside the possible follow-up questions asked, are provided before each section.

1. **What do you consider to be examples of social media?**

    - Do you consider SMS and email to be social media?

      Of the seven TCs interviewed, none had any difficulty articulating their definition of what SM is. They all referred to the same general concepts of "online or digital platforms" [TC1, TC3, TC4], "digital social interaction" [TC2], "representing yourself online", and "platforms for interaction" [TC5, TC7], "websites or apps that connect you to other people" [TC6], and included examples such as Instagram, Facebook, Reddit, and "more professional" [TC3] sites like LinkedIn. However, when asked if SMS and email constituted SM, the answers were significantly less consistent.

      With regard to SMS, three of the TCs believe that SMS is not SM for the following reasons. TC1 believes that SMS involves "peer to peer" [TC1] communication with the "intention" that nobody other than the person they were communicating with would see it. Similarly, TC6 believes that SMS is "person to person: a direct contact" noting that, if SMS were considered to be SM, then why not phone calls? TC4 explained that SMS is more "informal", "usually individual", and about "communication" and "purpose" in contrast to SM where you are presenting an "image" of yourself.

The remaining four TCs referred to SMS being a "grey area" in this regard. TC7 initially stated that SMS was not SM, mentioning "the internet part is a criteria for me", but later concluded that it is a grey area. Similarly, TC2 believes that SMS is a grey area in contrast to Facebook and Twitter, which are "very clearly social media". TC5 believes that SMS "walks the line" of being SM, contrasting the explicitly public nature of Facebook and Twitter with the far greater expectation of "confidentiality" and "privacy" when using SMS. TC3 believes that SMS is not SM but that policy makers "have to put it in there to ensure that it is not being used inappropriately, because it's not the most confidential"

There was a similar ambivalence as to whether email is a form of SM. Only TC1 was sure that it is not, given that email is used to contact "one person in particular or a specific group of people". TC4 believes that it is "not quite" SM, as "it's not a profile of yourself; it's just a form of communication" while TC6 feels like it is "more like social media than SMS because of newsletters" explaining that "I email people I don't know more frequently than I text message them." Both TC3 and TC5 gave greater consideration to the intended audience of email with TC3 feeling "unsure" if email could be SM as "it might end up with a bigger audience" than intended while TC5, again, feels that email "walks the line" having a higher expectation of privacy. TC 2 and 7 both felt unsure, using the term, specifically using the term "grey area"

2. **What consideration have you given to your online presence on social media in preparation for entering the teaching profession?**
   - What, if any, changes have you made to your social media presence since joining the BEd program?
     - Why did you make these changes?
   - Do you have any concerns about your online presence on social media with regard to entering the teaching profession?

When asked about the changes the TCs made to their online presence around concerns for entering the teaching profession, five of the seven responded by saying they had made few, if any, changes.

TC2 has a minimal presence on SM but explains that this has less to do with concerns around professionalism and more to do with their "general dislike" of SM which they believe is "unhealthy", citing concerns around "addiction and narcissism" and noting that "people don't understand the ramifications of having those social media sites." As they explained more, TC2 noted their concern that contemporary "hypervigilance" creates pariahs of people for causing offense unintentionally and that "the internet has no shelf-life" meaning that mistakes made a dozen years before, even if these mistakes were apologised for at the time, are still costing people their jobs.

TC3 has "no concerns" around their SM profiles as, due to their previous work with children, their profiles have always been "private" and they use their first and middle names in order to make searching for their profiles far more difficult. They have taken these measures to guard their privacy online saying, "I want to be free to post what I want without students or parents seeing it" and "I don't want them coming to work and knowing what I did the night before."

TC4 has no concerns around their content on SM and doesn't foresee having any problem in the future. Though they use their real name in their profiles, they believe that their privacy settings on their Facebook and Instagram accounts will protect them from any unwanted scrutiny. They are also cautious about who they "friend" and the content they post is, largely, light-hearted. Upon becoming a certified teacher, TC4 "won't be making any major changes" but

notes that they would have to give further consideration in the future if they were to become "friends" with any of their students' parents with concerns around posting "vacation pictures" and tagging their location as it would feel "a little strange" if these parents had access to this content.

TC5 also doesn't foresee making any big changes to their digital presence explaining that "I was always careful about what I posted online", they use a pseudonym in their profiles, and that they "abstained" from posting content around concerns that "someone who doesn't directly know me being able to learn things about me." They find this "kind of creepy" and, though they "don't have anything to hide", they are concerned that an opinion or idea posted online, or even "liking" something might be seen by "a person who makes major decisions in your life" which could cause problems. TC5 has also used the settings on SM to protect their privacy explaining that "I don't like the idea that my students could search for me and learn things about my personal life." They have removed some content (pictures) relating to their previous membership of a "political punk rock band" which was not "grounds to get me in trouble" but in order to disassociate themselves from content related to "heavy drinking and partying." TC5 relates that "there's stuff out there" that they haven't seen posted but they don't believe that any "rational thinking person" would hold this against them if "by freak chance" this was found in the future but also acknowledges that this could be a problem for some employers.

TC7 initially explained that they have no concerns about their SM presence, noting that their Instagram and Facebook is "always private" and "I filter things" so they don't anticipate making any changes. Later, TC7 refers to political comments they had made on other people's posts that had removed out of concern that these, and tagged pictures, were "definitely a thought,

a worry, for sure". When asked about this, they explained that posts like this "make you vulnerable" and "if you haven't worded it perfectly" it could be problematic.

TC1 explained that, before entering the BEd program, they worked as an English language teacher and, as part of an effort to separate their professional and personal lives, had taken steps with their SM to maintain their privacy. They changed their name to a variation on FB and started to "curate" their IG posts. TC1 is also a member of a punk rock band and is aware that their SM attached to this part of their identity may be problematic, particularly "songs about drinking and encouraging drinking." Discussing pictures they had posted of themselves drinking beer on stage, they explain that they consider this "art, more than personal identity" and don't believe that this is necessarily a problem. They explain that there should be "a gradient on what is acceptable; I think there must be some nuanced consideration for things like that" and that "people having beers is just a part of life" regardless of their profession. They acknowledge other people may hold different opinions about this which could cause reputational harm but also that "if someone has a personal vendetta against you then they could really try to ruin your life but that can't really be on you." TC1 is also aware of how being associated, through SM posts, with smoking and the use of marijuana could be problematic when trying to "curate and cultivate [their] own online persona" and should be taken down, conscious that "preconceptions about certain activities" could prevent them from entering a new job with "a blank slate."

TC6 explained that they Googled their name to see what results came back. They noted that, because they have a unique name (searching under their given name alone leads immediately to information about them; their family name is quite unusual too so, used together, TC6 is eminently "searchable"), they have always been "very aware" their online presence and regularly searches for their name. They "cleaned up" some of the older information posted about

them online: asking that (unflattering) photos from a time when they had studied abroad, a decade before, be removed from a university website. They are also a small business owner and don't want their business to be connected to their professional (teacher) identity, even though they are aware that this could potentially benefit them, but this is particularly challenging given their unique name. TC6 remarks that, as they are older than most of the others in the BEd cohort, they have "more of a mature presence" on SM and points out that they are glad that SM was not so prevalent when they were younger as they "don't have that 'stuck on the internet forever'" issue, "thank goodness!" Because of this, the few changes they have made are enough to satisfy their need to "curate" their digital identity.

3. **Did anyone at the school where you had your short practicum speak to you about the school's social media usage policy?**

Of all the issues raised in the interviews, the questions around the SM policies in the schools in which the TCs did their short practicum were the most interesting. Asked if they had made themselves aware of their school's SM usage policy, only one of the seven TCs said that they had [TC5] and only one of them [TC7] was given information about their particular district's SM policy during their short practicum, though this was of a limited nature.

TC1 explains that they didn't make themselves aware of the SM policy as "it didn't really seem like a big deal" and "all the teachers are normal people and it didn't really seem like they cared that much" about the issue. They are aware of the constraints teachers are under and note that they would "refrain from posting anything political" out of fear of facing "backlash" from entering into political debate online. TC1 also believes that "because you are working for the

government it is kind of important to try to stay neutral" online and that, "as teachers, I don't know if there is the right to complete free expression."

TC2 remarks that their school's SM policy was not mentioned, but they believe that "it should be brought to people's attention" and "spelled out very clearly by administration if you are going to be held responsible for those things in the future", not because of the "obvious reasons" ("don't post inappropriate things") but because of "the more nuanced reasons" that TCs may be unaware of. Speaking about the area of political expression, TC2 speculates that their school's SM policy would have "lawyered wording to protect themselves ten times beyond what they should need" which would be "vague enough that they could use it to blanket defend themselves if anything happened", giving the example of wording such as "we expect you to act *professionally* but without defining that." TC2 believes that the "higher" expectation that teachers are held to is justified given the influential position they hold at a "formative time in kids' lives". When asked if they were comfortable living in the "grey area" around SM, TC2 explains "No! It's terrible, it's awful! You can never make a mistake. The mistakes you make will haunt you forever" and expresses the concern that "living in fear of making mistakes is not healthy."

TC3 explains that they hadn't seen the school SM policy and it wasn't mentioned by anyone at the school; they remark "didn't even know it was a thing; probably gonna look it up after this." Speaking of the "higher" standard teachers are held to, they explain that "when you choose this profession, that's something you have to be aware of" citing the "direct influence on a large number of youth" and, later, explaining "I don't think you can ever disassociate from your role as a teacher; even when you're in public, you're always connected to that."

TC4 recalls that there was no mention of her school's SM policy but that they are aware of a "general rule" which says "don't talk any pictures at all" of the practicum experience (especially "pictures that include faces"). They speculate that the SM policy might contain language around "keeping a professional image and might be a little vague." Asked about political expression, they felt that, so long as accounts are "set to private…it should be fine; it should be at the discretion of the teacher." Speaking of maintaining their private life, TC4 explains that "It's part of your identity, being a teacher, but I think you definitely have a private life and that you can keep it private." They go on to explain that this is possible absent "very serious digging" on the part of parents "which I don't think parents do very serious digging like that…hopefully!" Generally, they explain, "I am not too concerned about it…and I don't think I would run into those grey areas, at this moment."

TC6 told me that nobody at the school mentioned their SM policy — "don't think they even mentioned that they had one, but I assume that they have one" — and that they didn't seek it out themselves as they have "no concerns" about what it may contain. When asked about political expression, TC6 explains "I would feel a bit, censored, in a way but I would understand it" because this is "part of [my] identity" as a teacher, and "I am a teacher 24/7". Asked why this is the case for teachers, as opposed to those in other professions, TC6 explains that "I think teachers are just judged differently just because you are teaching impressionable minds."

TC5 related that nobody at his school mentioned the SM policy, though they themselves had looked briefly at it on the school district website before the short practicum and "felt that it was the same policies that they would have at a university or technical institute" and the content was, largely, "common sense." Nonetheless, they did acknowledge that, as a teacher, it is "frustrating to think how many ways your hands are tied and your rights are, somewhat,

removed", mentioning freedom of speech and freedom of expression in particular. Speaking of the responsibility that teachers have to their profession, liking this to police officers, TC5 explains "you are a public servant and I don't think that turns off… most of the time that's not turned off" and "so you have to be aware that what you throw online could affect somebody else."

TC7 explained that their school's SM policy document was not specifically mentioned, but they were told about restrictions on taking pictures of students and posting them online and they also referred to a recent email from their school district about updates to their policy. They also related that, due to their national background, they have experience of "self-censorship" but laments that "they keep telling us we're held to a higher standard, and yea we're teachers so in a way we should, but what are we talking about,…what does that mean?"

Discussion

The Interviews

The TCs concerns mainly relate to three areas. Firstly, the TCs expressed unease around the area related to their personal privacy. Many of them had taken steps to protect their privacy and were reasonably confident that their SM was not accessible by the general public.

On this issue, several of the TCs mentioned the *Digital Tattoo* workshop that they were required to attend as part of the BEd program. This workshop explored challenges around the digital identity of teachers by presenting case study scenarios whereby participants could

- build their confidence for decision-making about posting and sharing content online.
- practice using guidelines and resources to support decision-making.

- reflect on and discuss the multiple perspectives at play in each scenario and the implications for themselves as beginning teachers (*Digital Tattoo* Curriculum, 2018)

Three of the TCs explained during the interviews that there was "not much" (TC2) take away from the workshop, that "it was pretty standard" (TC3), and that "it was a reiteration for me" (TC4). Similarly, the one TC interviewed who looked at the SM policy at the school where they did their practicum (TC5) described it as simple "common sense." The researcher got the sense during the interviews that the TCs involved were extremely aware of the dangers that the material on their SM could pose in regard to their professional identities and their descriptions of the steps they had taken to "curate" their profiles as a result of this indicated that they took the issue seriously. It occurred that it was for this very reason that the TCs involved chose to join the research project as they had already considered the implications and consequences of "inappropriate" SM usage. However, it should be noted that TC3 observed, during the *Digital Tattoo* workshop "everyone around all had their Facebook open changing their settings as it was happening" so it may be the case that some of the more than seven hundred BEd students who attended may have given less consideration to their digital footprint than those involved in this study. Supporting this, the *Digital Tattoo Evaluation Report 2018* reveals that, having attended the workshop, 84% of the TCs involved felt "more confident making informed decisions about my digital identity as a teacher candidate" (Wright, 2018).

A second concern that the TCs expressed was that, upon becoming a certified teacher, it might well be difficult to separate their professional and private identities. A final concern was around some of their online content that the TCs had removed or planned to remove. This was largely done to "draw a line in the sand", as it were, as they transitioned to their new role as

professional educators. Below, I will relate these concerns to the key concepts underpinning the paper.

<u>Regulation</u>

All of the TCs demonstrated an understanding that, upon becoming certified teachers, they would be subject to "higher" standards regarding their use of social media. Though these were not explicitly stated, the TCs were aware that their use of SM had a relationship to standards of professionalism, though for the most part, they had little concern about maintaining a suitably professional presence online

In preparation to meet these standards, the TCs had reflected on their SM presence and taken what steps they could to "professionalize" their digital footprint in anticipation of the additional scrutiny their SM may face. Each spoke of the precautions they had taken, which included the use of pseudonyms or variations of their names as well as using the privacy settings within SM platforms to restrict access to their profiles. There seemed to be a consensus that this would give sufficient protection from unwanted scrutiny leading to problems with regard to professionalism. In spite of the general confidence in the level of privacy that SM settings could provide, several TCs made reference to removing content from their SM profiles, mostly photographs, that might reflect poorly on them should anyone "do some digging."

<u>Fundamental Freedoms and Chilling Effect</u>

Though the TCs understood that teachers are held to a higher standard, there was also some acknowledgement that this may lead the TC toward a more cautious approach as to how they express themselves online. There was an understanding that, as public servants, there was a responsibility to "stay neutral" regarding expressing opinions online, that being a teacher inextricably links their "public" and "private" identities. At the same time, two of the TCs clearly

explained that they would feel "a bit censored" (TC6) and frustration that "your hands are tied, and your rights are, somewhat, removed" (TC5) because of the need to moderate how they express themselves online.

<u>The Right to Be Forgotten</u>

Several of the TCs mentioned that they had removed content from their social media. TC6, for example, had asked that "unflattering" photos of her taken years before and posted on a university website be removed. The university complied with this request, but one might ask what could TC6 have done if the university had not been so cooperative.

Both TCs 1 & 5 had been members of punk rock bands. They had both made an effort to remove content related to this part of their identity as part of an effort to disassociate themselves from some of the behaviors connected with the sub-culture. Both were able to do this as the material they removed was in Facebook accounts, which they had control over. TC5 makes the interesting observation that if people are to be part of a Facebook, it might be prudent to keep administrator privileges of the account so that content can be removed without having to ask another user to do so.

Similarly, TC7 speaks of removing political comments they had made on other people's posts as well as a video they has posted that they had second thoughts about after learning that it was "not as it seemed" after learning more about the context of what it depicted. Again, the TC was only able to do this because they had control over the posts they had made.

The Discipline Outcomes

The factors leading to the issuing of the DOs analysed are included in the three themes identified through the CCM. Below, I will relate these factors to the key concepts of the paper.

<u>Regulation</u>

The majority of the DOs make specific reference to the standards breached in each case and, for the most part, these are Standards #1 and #2. Taken together, these refer to the duty of care teachers have to their students as well as the teacher acting as a role model, behaving honestly and ethically. Analysis of the DOs fond that the circumstances involved ranged from extremely serious, though not criminal (e.g. DO#6/24), to cases that could be considered more of a "lapse of judgement" (DO#12). The context of these cases is described below for comparison.

DO#6/24: These DOs involved the same teacher. The earlier DO was issued in August 2013 and describes where teacher had invited students to their house for movie nights and meals, had taken part in a camping trip with five students, as well as posting "inappropriate" comments on Facebook in discussions with students. For these actions, the teacher was suspended for 20 days. The DO also mentions that, subsequent to this, the teacher had attended a workshop that explored "grooming behaviors" and that the teacher "initially expressed astonishment that his behaviors could be perceived in that category" though he later came to understand that they could. This DO resulted in an additional 30-day suspension of their teaching certificate. The more recent document (DO#6), issued in October 2017, details how this same teacher was suspended without pay for five days in 2016, when he was told to "avoid any and all behavior that could be perceived as 'grooming' behavior" as well as to "not have any communications with students using any technology other than his district email account. This DO resulted in the

issuing of a reprimand and an undertaking from the teacher to attend the course *Creating a Positive Learning Environment*.

In contrast to the case above, DO#12 describes how the teacher (TOC), in "a lesson on the use of satire in music videos", played videos that included profanity, and scenes "including urination and sexual acts." Though not mentioned in the DO, it is presumed that this DO is included in the "inappropriate use of social media" field of the DO database because the teacher used YouTube to show these music videos. For this, the teacher was suspended without pay for five days. Subsequently, the DO issued a reprimand and included an agreement with the teacher that they attend the course "Reinforcing Professional Boundaries."

The two cases described above were provided to give some context of the scope of the severity of the breaches the standards. Having said that, it should be noted that the majority of the DOs involved teachers communicating with students in a way that clearly breaches their professional duty of care. Though the DO database sub-topic "With students" contains only 27 DOs, the researcher has identified 12 additional cases that should, arguably, be included here.

It appears that at least some of the cases not included were omitted because the breach of the standard involved *former* rather than *current* students of the associated schools (e.g. DO#3, #22). Another case (DO#32) may have been excluded because the student involved "was a neighbor and not a student at the school where [the teacher] taught". Other cases (e.g. DO#17, # 38, #49) very clearly state that the nature of the breach involved students and the researcher cannot explain these have been excluded from the "With students" sub-topic. The researchers' analysis indicated that, of the 45 discrete DOs analysed in the study, 35 involved students to some degree. Seven of the remaining cases centre around the viewing of pornography, and two

others detail teachers using school computers for personal use unrelated to school activities alongside additional unprofessional behavior.

In short, a vast majority of the DOs in the study were issued for breaches around the standards regarding the duty of care teachers have for their students and, in most of these cases, they involved teachers interacting with students using social media or "communication methods" to develop a "romantic" relationship.

Fundamental Freedoms and Chilling Effect

There are no instances within this study where the DOs were issued to teachers for using social media or "communication methods" in an "inappropriate" way where this was not directly linked to their role and responsibilities as teachers. Regulation should predictably create a chilling effect on teachers' freedom of expression, but researchers have yet to document how and to what degree.

The Right to Be Forgotten

In seven of the DOs analysed, the name of the teachers involved were not published. In the four most recent cases section 54(3)(a) of the Teachers Act is cited to explain that this is "to protect the identity of a student who was harmed, abused or exploited by the teacher." While this is understandable, it also means that the identities of the teachers involved are protected in parallel. This creates the situation where a teacher who is guilty of a far less serious breach of the *Professional Standards* being linked, by name, to the act, potentially forever, where the perpetrators of more serious infractions are not linked to their actions by name. For example, DO#35 describes an incident where a teacher played a YouTube video in class that "featured age-inappropriate and suggestive still photos of women in bikinis, and one photo of a nude

woman lying on a beach." The teacher was reprimanded as a result but he is linked to this incident forever.

This sentiment is noticeable in DO#13 which involved, among other issues, the teacher forging the school principal's signature on report cards as well as taking the District-issued laptop of a colleague and using it over the winter break to view "websites" with sexual content." In the "Penalty and Publication" section of the DO, the disciplinary panel note that

> The conduct was grave, but perhaps not the most egregious conduct seen in discipline cases. It would not have impacted the students, save and except for the forger signature of the School Principal on the report cards, which could be remedied. The Respondent suffered dire consequences for his misconduct in that he was fired from his position. He has, one must think, suffered humiliation due to the publication of the decision. (**DO#13**)

Nonetheless, the full name of the teacher involved was published with the DO. Entering their name into a Google search brings back news articles from several different publications (all dated from March 2016) relating the details of the case. Given the disciplinary panel's comments that, one might ask for how long this teacher is to be linked to his past actions.

Another case that stands out in this area is DO#30 which involves a teacher who used their work computer to access "graphic adult material" for which the teacher received a two-month suspension of his certificate of qualification. The teacher's name was published in the DO in June 2012. In October that year, a CBC news article titled "B.C. teacher disciplined for surfing porn" (2012) was published with details of the case including the teachers name. The researcher observed that the page details show that it was last updated in February 2016. When searching Google with this teacher's name, there are several reports dating back to when the DO was

published, but the first result is the updated 2016 news article. The researcher wonders if, in a sense, the teacher's conduct could be said to be "following" them through the years, inextricably linking them to mistakes of the past.

Pedagogical implications

Standards

While the *Professional Standards* provide an overarching description of the expected professional behavior for teachers in BC, there is no specific mention to social media usage. Similarly, the 2016 "Professional Conduct Advisory: Professional Boundaries and Social Media" in *Learn* magazine (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2016, p. 14) provides general tips for teachers without providing specific policy. There is a need for a "code of practice" for teachers in BC which makes clear to them both what *is* and what is *not* "appropriate use of social media." A useful starting point would be the provision of a clear definition of what the term SM constitutes. As the *Professional Standards* provide a list of numbered standards that can be referred to corresponding with the nature of the breach of professionalism by a teacher, there should be a similar list for "inappropriate use of social media" in order to bring clarity to describing where exactly teachers fall short of meeting their professional responsibilities. Examples are provided in the OCT's professional advisory, which could serve as a good template for BC. In addition, such a document should make specific reference to what constitutes appropriate use of SM in both the on-duty and off-duty contexts as it relates to students and the school, as well as off-duty conduct where this is unrelated and unconnected to students and the school. On this, Maxwell (2018) brings attention to the need for clarity in regard to the balance between teachers' rights to free expression and "the need to uphold public trust in teachers and teaching" (p. 161). While Maxwell discusses this specifically regarding art teachers, the need for

discussion and clarity around this issue is relevant to all teachers who wish to be able to freely express themselves on SM, in areas unrelated to schools and students, without fear of facing censure or professional repercussions. In closing, Maxwell sums up the need, noting

> If teachers associations and the teaching profession do nothing to claim their right to participate in setting the moral standards off-duty teacher conduct, the situation will remain as it is today—the task of sorting these matters out will be left to the whims of public opinion, the vagaries of school authorities' moral intuitions, and the sometimes questionable reasoning of judges. (p. 176)

In consultation with relevant stakeholders, plans for such a document could be made which would, at the very least, open a discussion around the issue of teacher professionalism and SM which would aid in bringing attention to the "grey area" teachers currently find themselves in. Rather than allowing the current situation where each school district has their own version of a "social media usage policy", having a single SM "code of practice" for all K-12 teachers in BC would be especially useful in order to ensure that all teachers in the province are held to uniform expectations. Creating such a document would be difficult, having to tease apart issues which are often in conflict, such as a teacher's right to free expression and their duties and responsibilities as a certified teacher. However, that such a process would be challenging is not an argument against doing so. In fact, it is likely that that the challenges of creating a "code of conduct" for K-12 teachers' use of SM will only become greater as SM usage among teachers and students becomes an increasing part of our lives as well as one of the means we express our identity.

Teacher training

        As mentioned above, many of the BEd cohort found the *Digital Tattoo* workshop to be beneficial in helping them make informed decisions about their digital identity as they transition into their role as a certified teacher. While the post-workshop survey (Wright, 2018) shows that the TCs understand the impact that their digital identity can have on them professionally (98%), less than three-quarters of the cohort expressed confidence in their ability to integrate their emerging professional identity into their existing digital identity (74%; though this was a 36% increase from the pre-workshop survey). In addition, 88% of the TCs affirmed that they would make changes (or more changes) in their use of technology, including SM, in order to meet the standard of professionalism for teachers. The latter statistic is quite telling in that, while the TCs are acutely aware of the challenges around the area of teacher professionalism and social media, the majority still believe that they still have changes to make to "curate" their digital identities.

        While the workshop was obviously beneficial to the TCs, some of the comments and questions raised by them afterwards indicate that there may need to be additional opportunities for the TCs to explore the area around teacher professionalism and social media given that it is clearly an area of concern for many of them. Some of the comments (Wright, 2018), collected anonymously from the TCs, that highlight this need include:

- "A lot of the discussions seem to have no clear line to anything and thus put me in a more confused situation... more discussions regarding *Digital Tattoo* will be helpful."
- "Many of these case studies and lack of statistics on how often these cases occur overall can result in feelings of fear over empowerment."
- "Was hoping to hear some examples of Canadian cases where teachers have been let go or gotten in trouble to get more context since "a higher standard" isn't defined at all."
- "I think that often times it is a very thin line between what is acceptable and unacceptable. I'm struggling with the idea of online dating presence while also maintaining privacy and professionalism. How do teacher candidates balance the private lives with work?"
- "Where do political standpoints fit into the question of 'higher moral standards'? Is it best to be apolitical online despite having strict privacy settings?"

This last point is particularly interesting as it is an issue that came up in the researcher's interviews with the TCs who were similarly concerned about where "the line" was for teachers with regard to expressing their political views on SM; TC7 specifically mentioned that political comments could "make you vulnerable if you haven't worded it perfectly."

In addition to the above, another concern that the TCs expressed in the interviews was that parents, or concerned members of the public, could engage in an extensive search of their digital presence in order to "dig" for information that could potentially be used against them. This was echoed in one of the TC comments subsequent to the *Digital Tattoo* workshop, which noted:

> I feel that the standards held for teachers can be overwhelming. There is a base line that is obvious (no swearing or engaging in destructive behaviour). However, parents can all have different interpretations of what a teacher should act like. Also, it is scary that people can ruin your reputation online just because they are disgruntled.

Similarly, TC4 was aware of the potential for parents to "do very serious digging" through SM to gain access into their "private life" while TC1 laments that "if someone has a personal vendetta against you then they could really try to ruin your life but that can't really be on you." In addition, when speaking about posting artwork online, TC2 explains that "there is no damage in sharing an artifact you have created…but then…later on people decide it's cultural appropriation and you get in trouble for it."

In this regard, it seems that there is a concern around teachers being subject to undue scrutiny from parents in particular. There is also the consideration that, during the practicum portion of the BEd program, the TCs are subject to the standards and responsibilities of certified teachers while they are afforded none of the protections that certified teachers enjoy, specifically that from the teachers' union. This point was raised in the *Digital Tattoo* workshop when it was

explained that TCs are "particularly vulnerable" at this time as they as they are not considered employees of the schools at which they teach and so the schools have no obligation to extend the same backing to them as they would to teachers employed at the school. The researcher believes that this point should be made especially clear to the TCs in the course of the BEd program so that, should parents engage in "serious digging" or, having simply taken a dislike to some facet of their identity, engage in a "vendetta" to discredit their professionalism before they even achieve certification and full-time employment at which stage their professional status would assume greater security.

In short, the researcher believes that TCs would benefit from the issue of teacher professionalism as it relates to SM being given more emphasis in the BEd program. In addition to the *Digital Tattoo* workshop, class discussions and perhaps a specific course related to "digital identity" would aid in bringing increased attention to an area which is likely to only become a greater concern to teachers and teacher educators alike.

Additional implications / observations

<u>Unique names</u>

TC6 explained that, due to having both an unusual given name as well as a less common family name, they are conscious that a simple Google search of their full name would bring back results about them. On this point, the researcher has considered if parents in the future may purposely give their children common (less popular) names in order to afford some degree of protection from being so easily "searchable" out of consideration to their children's privacy. Jenkins (2010) relates that, in an interview with the then CEO of Google, Eric Schmidt predicted "apparently seriously, that every young person one day will be entitled automatically to change his or her name on reaching adulthood in order to disown youthful hijinks stored on their friends'

social media sites." When asked about this the following month, Schmidt clarified that he had meant this as a joke (Hill, 2010), but perhaps this might well be something that people will have to consider in the future when they come of age as one of the methods of enabling "reputation bankruptcy" (Zittrain, 2008). The mitigation of searchability by giving children a less common name, or possibly a name which would like them with someone eminently more "searchable", e.g. a celebrity or public figure, could well be a useful gift to a child, possibly allowing for them to have a less visible digital identity in their future should they feel the need.

Conclusion

Relating the study back to the research question, it has been found that the TC's concerns *are not* reflected in the discipline outcomes. The TC's concerns centered around their personal privacy and on keeping separate their professional and private identities. There were no instances within the DOs analyzed in the study where the teachers involved were disciplined for behavior or use of SM unrelated to the school or their students. Put simply, there was no evidence in the DOs to suggest that either the private lives or off-duty use of SM of the teachers involved were contributing factors to the teachers involved being disciplined. Of course, this does not invalidate the TC's concerns, and could be a limitation of the DO database, as minor disciplinary measures are not included.

Similarly, the factors leading to the issuing of discipline outcomes *do not* reflect the concerns of the teacher candidates. The DOs, for the most part, detail "inappropriate communication" through SM between teachers and students in addition to "inappropriate use of

social media" involving the school or students. In short, the TC's concerns were around perceived transgressions of behavior of a far less serious degree than were evident in the DOs.

The only area where there was marginal overlap was about whether SMS and email could be considered SM. The researcher described how none of the TCs accepted that SMS was clearly a form of SM, referencing the "intention" or understanding that communication in this form would be considered, for the most part, between two people and so "less public" than mainstream SM (Facebook, Twitter etc.). This expectation of greater privacy and confidentiality through communicating through SMS is, perhaps, one of the reasons why this is so prevalent in the DOs. Where teachers communicated with students through text messaging, it could be argued that they too felt that SMS afforded more protection from the communication being made known to third parties. Of course, text messages can be forwarded to third parties, through screenshots for example, but that the "intention" of the teacher was that the communication would remain private possibly gives credence to this. Similarly, the TCs were largely unsure if email could be considered SM with the reasoning that the "intended audience" is generally known and often limited to a specific audience, while acknowledging that emails could reach a far larger, and unintended, audience. The prevalence of email communication between teachers and students in the DOs might support the idea that email, like SMS, was considered a more "private" method for teachers to communicate with students.

The study has found that there is a gap between the concerns that the TCs involved had around teacher professionalism and social media as they prepared to enter the profession and the reality of what certified teachers in BC are actually being disciplined for around the "inappropriate use of social media." The TCs found the *Digital Tattoo* workshop useful in focusing their attention around consideration of their digital identity. However, that the DOs

reflect that teachers are facing discipline for behaviors relating to schools and students that are, for the most part, objectively unprofessional and inappropriate. While it is necessary to discuss the challenges and pitfalls that TCs may face around their use of SM upon entering the profession, the DOs reflect that it is not necessary to cause TCs to be unduly concerned that their past or future use of SM, unrelated to school or students, will lead them towards facing formal discipline.

In conclusion, the study has taken one of many approaches to investigate the nexus of teacher professionalism and social media. Absent a provincial "code of conduct" for teachers' use of SM, both on and off-duty, the concerns teachers face living in the "grey area" will only increase. Further studies, perhaps focusing specifically on the legal basis for the limits teachers face on their fundamental freedoms, and consultation with policy makers in education should be made a priority to bring the needed attention to the challenges of balancing teachers' rights with their responsibilities.

References

Abbotsford School District. (2013, August). *AP 401 – Social media – Employees*. Retrieved from

http://www.sd34.bc.ca/sites/default/files/AP%20401%20-%20Social%20Media%20-%20Employees.pdf

Akiti, L. (2012). Facebook off limits? Protecting teachers' private speech on social networking sites. *Valparaiso University Law Review*, 47(1), 119-167. Retrieved from

http://scholar.valpo.edu/vulr/vol47/iss1/4

American Psychological Association. (2008). How technology changes everything (and nothing) in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 64(5), 454–463. Retrieved from

http://ccare.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/How-Tech-Changes-Everything-and-Nothing-in-Psychology.pdf

B.C. teacher disciplined for surfing porn. (2012, October 26). *CBC news*. Retrieved from

https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/b-c-teacher-disciplined-for-surfing-porn-1.1292130

BC court awards teacher $67,500 for neighbour's defamatory Facebook comments Social Sharing. (2016, April 25). *CBC Radio*. Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/radio/asithappens/as-it-happens-monday-edition-1.3551902/bc-court-awards-teacher-67-500-for-neighbour-s-defamatory-facebook-comments-1.3551903

Benbria. (2017, June 1). The difference between texting and messaging. Retrieved from

https://www.benbria.com/difference-between-texting-and-messaging/

Bradley, A. J. (2010, May 17). "Why isn't e-mail (and other channels) considered social media?" *Gartner Blog Network*. Retrieved from

https://blogs.gartner.com/anthony_bradley/2010/05/17/why-isnt-e-mail-and-other-channels-considered-social-media/

Brake, L. (2014). Teacher perceptions on ethical use of educational social media applications (Order

No. 3641965). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1629825734).

Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1629825734?ac

countid=14656

British Columbia College of Teachers (BCCT). (2004). *Standards for the education, competence*

and professional conduct of educators in British Columbia. Vancouver, BC: BCCT.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2012). *Standards for the education, competence and*

professional conduct of educators in BC. Retrieved from the BC Teacher Regulation website:

http://www.llbc.leg.bc.ca/public/pubdocs/bcdocs2016/515808/edu_stds.pdf

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2016). Standards of education, competence and

professional conduct of educators in British Columbia. *Learn* (13). Retrieved from the BC

Teacher Regulation website: https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/kindergarten-to-

grade-12/teach/ learn/ learnmagazine_spring_2016.pdf

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2018). *The magazine*. Retrieved from Internet Archive

website: https://web.archive.org/web/20181022194343/https://

www.bcteacherregulation.ca/Magazine/Magazine.aspx

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2019). *Professional standards for BC educators.* Retrieved

from the BC Teacher Regulation website:

https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/kindergarten-to-grade-12/teach/teacher-

regulation/standards-for-educators/edu_standards.pdf

British Columbia Public Service. (2019, July). Social media guidelines for BC public service

employees. Retrieved from https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/careers/about-the-bc-public-

service/ethics/social_media_guidelines_for_personal_use.pdf

Burtis, M. (2016). Foreword. J.S. Davis, *Building a professional teaching identity on social media: A digital constellation of selves* (p. xi-xiii). Dordrecht: Sense Publishers. doi:10.1007/978-94-6300-702-3

Cooke, M. (2012, March 12). Twitter and Canadian educators. *Canadian Education Association*. Retrieved from https://www.edcan.ca/articles/twitter-and-canadian-educators/

de Terwangne, C. (2014). The right to be forgotten and informational autonomy in the digital environment. In A. Ghezzi, A. G. Pereira, & L. Vesnić-Alujević (Eds.), *The ethics of memory in a digital age: Interrogating the right to be forgotten* (pp. 82-101). Houndmills, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Delgado, J. M. (2013). "Chill out" Mrs. Robinson: First Amendment implications of limiting private teacher-student electronic communication. *Arizona State Law Journal*, *45*(1), 299-327. Retrieved from https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/arzjl45&id=309&collection=journals&index

Delta School District 37. (2013, May). Social media. Retrieved from https://district.public.deltasd.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2017/07/1196__Procedure146.pdf

Digital Tattoo Curriculum/Case Studies for Student Teachers. (2018, August 8). *In UBC Wiki*. Retrieved June 10 from, 2019 from https://wiki.ubc.ca/Documentation:Digital_Tattoo_Curriculum/Case_Studies_for_Student_Teachers

Draft Policy and Regulations: Acceptable use of technology social media policy for employees. (2013, May 13). Vancouver school board: Interoffice memorandum. Retrieved from http://www.vsb.bc.ca/sites/default/files/13May28_op_commIII_item3.pdf

Fornwald, E. (2017, September 6). *From student to teacher: Becoming a professional*. Retrieved

from *Digital Tattoo* website: https://digitaltattoo.ubc.ca/2017/09/06/case-studies-for-student-

teachers/

Geist, M. (2017, March 24). Did a Canadian court just establish a new right to be forgotten online?

Globe and Mail. Retrieved from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/rob-

commentary/did-a-canadian-court-just-establish-a-new-right-to-be-forgotten-

online/article33915916/

Geist, M. (2018, January 26). Why a Canadian right to be forgotten creates more problems than it

solves. *Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-

business/rob-commentary/why-a-canadian-right-to-be-forgotten-creates-more-problems-

than-it-solves/article37757704/

Hill, K. (2010, September 22). Google CEO Eric Schmidt tells Stephen Colbert that *Wall Street

Journal* doesn't know how to take a joke. *Forbes*. Retrieved from

https://www.forbes.com/sites/kashmirhill/2010/09/22/google-ceo-eric-schmidt-tells-stephen-

colbert-that-wall-street-journal-doesnt-know-how-to-take-a-joke/#2c2511f03811

Hoskins, A. (2014). The right to be forgotten and informational autonomy in the digital environment.

In A. Ghezzi, A. G. Pereira, & L. Vesnić-Alujević (Eds.), *The ethics of memory in a digital

age: Interrogating the right to be forgotten* (pp. 50-64). Houndmills, Basingstoke, UK:

Palgrave Macmillan

Jenkins, H. W., Jr. (2010, August 14). Google and the search for the future. *Wall Street Journal*.

Retrieved from

https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704901104575423294099527212

Kim, P. (2011, April 27). Is email social media? [Web log post]. Retrieved from

https://www.beingpeterkim.com/2011/04/is-email-social-media-2.html

Kimmons, R. (2016, March 11). *Online professionalism for teachers* [Video file]. Retrieved from

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dz333YW9awg

Kimmons, R., & Veletsianos, G. (2015). Teacher professionalization in the age of social networking

sites. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 40(4), 480-501. doi: 10.1080/17439884.2014.933846

Langley School District. (2014, September). Technology - Acceptable use policy (AUP). Retrieved

from https://district.public.sd35.bc.ca/wp-

content/uploads/sites/2/2015/12/AUP_Acceptable_Use_Policy-2014-2015.pdf

Larson, J. (2011, October). Professional autonomy in teaching. *Teacher Newsmagazine,* 24(2)

Retrieved from https://bctf.ca/publications/NewsmagArticle.aspx?id=24164

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications.

Lindsay, D. (2014). The 'right to be forgotten' in European data protection law. In N. Witzleb, D.

Lindsay, M. Paterson, & S. Rodrick (Eds.), *Emerging Challenges in Privacy Law:*

Comparative Perspectives (Cambridge Intellectual Property and Information Law, pp. 290-

337). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107300491.019

MacKenzie, B. (2016). #Inappropriate: Ramifications of teachers' off-duty social media postings.

Education Law Journal, 26(1), 53-72. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-

com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/docview/1852735328?accountid=14656

Mantelero, A. (2013). Competitive value of data protection: The impact of data protection regulation

on online behaviour. *International Data Privacy Law*, *3*(4), 229-238.

https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipt016

Maxwell, B. (2018). When teachers' off-duty creative pursuits conflict with role model expectations:

A critical analysis of "Shewan". *Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education*, *49*(2), 161-

178. doi:10.1007/s10780-018-9320-y

Mayer, A. (2014, June 16). 'Right to be forgotten': How Canada could adopt similar law for online

   privacy. Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/right-to-be-forgotten-how-

   canada-could-adopt-similar-law-for-online-privacy-1.2676880

More than half of employers have found content on social media that caused them not to hire a

   candidate, according to recent Careerbuilder survey. (2018, August 9). *Career Builder*.

   Retrieved from http://press.careerbuilder.com/2018-08-09-More-Than-Half-of-Employers-

   Have-Found-Content-on-Social-Media-That-Caused-Them-NOT-to-Hire-a-Candidate-

   According-to-Recent-CareerBuilder-Survey

Nations, D. (2017, May 30). *What is social media? Explaining the big trend*. Retrieved from

   https://www.lifewire.com/what-is-social-media-explaining-the-big-trend-3486616

Naylor, C. (2017, November 17). Where do we send B.C. teachers when they blow it? *The New

   Westminster Record*. Retrieved from https://www.burnabynow.com/news/education/where-

   do-we-send-b-c-teachers-when-they-blow-it-1.23097861

O'Connor, K. W., & Schmidt, G. B. (2015). "Facebook fired": Legal standards for social media-

   based terminations of K-12 public school teachers. *SAGE Open*, *5*(1)

   doi:10.1177/2158244015575636

Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. (2018, January 26). *Draft OPC position on online

   reputation*. Retrieved from https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/about-the-opc/what-we-

   do/consultations/consultation-on-online-reputation/pos_or_201801/

Ontario College of Teachers (OCT). (2016, August). *Foundations of professional practice*.

   Retrieved from https://www.oct.ca/-

   /media/PDF/Foundations%20of%20Professional%20Practice/Foundation_e.pdf

Ontario College of Teachers (OCT). (2017, September 27). *Maintaining professionalism – Use of

   electronic communication and social media*. Retrieved from

   https://www.oct.ca/resources/advisories/use-of-electronic-communication-and-social-media

Papandrea, M.-R. (2012, June). Social media, public school teachers, and the First Amendment. *North Carolina Law Review*, *90*(5), 1597-1641. Retrieved from http://link.galegroup.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/apps/doc/A297135667/LT?u=ubcolumbia&sid=LT&xid=0c7c0b90

Penney, J. (2017). Internet surveillance, regulation, and chilling effects online: a comparative case study. *Internet Policy Review*, 6(2). doi: 10.14763/2017.2.692

Pereira, A.G., Vesnić-Alujević, L. & Ghezzi, A. (2014). The ethics of forgetting and remembering in the digital world through the eye of the media. In A. Ghezzi, A. G. Pereira, & L. Vesnić-Alujević (Eds.), *The ethics of memory in a digital age: Interrogating the right to be forgotten* (pp. 9-27). Houndmills, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan

Petrina, S. (2008). Academic freedom for K-12 teachers. In S. Mathison & W. Ross (Eds.), *Battleground Schools: An encyclopedia of conflict and controversy*, Volume 1 (pp. 1-11). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Petrina, S. (2010). Academic freedom. In C. Kridel, (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (pp. 1-2). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Popp, G. (2009, September). Teacher autonomy. *Teacher newsmagazine*, 22(1). Retrieved from https://bctf.ca/publications/NewsmagArticle.aspx?id=19526

Preston, B. (2016). Professional conduct advisory: Professional boundaries and social media. *Learn* (13), Retrieved from https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/kindergarten-to-grade-12/teach/learn/learnmagazine_spring_2016.pdf

Quintanilla, B. U. (2016). *The implications of social media use: Secondary teachers' use of social media for personal, professional, and instructional purposes* (Order No. 10307590). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1871546868). Retrieved from http://ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/docview/1871546868?accountid=14656

Quintanilla, B. U. (2016). *The implications of social media use: Secondary teachers' use of social media for personal, professional, and instructional purposes* (Order No. 10307590). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1871546868). Retrieved from http://ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/docview/1871546868?accountid=14656

Revelstoke Board of Education. (2016, February 24). Information technology and MyEducationBC usage and access. Retrieved from https://www.sd19.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2015/04/3.8-Information-Technology-MyEducationBC-Usage-and-Access.pdf

Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15, Supreme Court of Canada. (1996). Retrieved from the Supreme Court of Canada Judgments website: https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1367/index.do

Scarfo, N. J., & Zuker, M. A. (2017). *Inspiring the future: The new teacher's guide to the law* (Second ed.). Toronto, ON: Thomson Reuters.

Social Media. (2016, September). In *WhatIs.com*. Retrieved from http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/social-media

Social Media. (n.d. a). *In PC magazine encyclopedia online*. Retrieved from https://www.pcmag.com/encyclopedia/term/61162/social-media

Social Media. (n.d. b). In *Business dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/social-media.html

Social Media. (n.d. c). In *Merriam-Webster online*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/social%20media

Szekely, I. (2012). The right to forget, the right to be forgotten. In S. Gutwirth, P. De Hert, R. Leenes, & Y. Poullet, (Eds.), *European data protection: In good health?* (pp. 347-363). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-2903-2

'This is devastating': Teacher on Facebook posts suggesting he was a pedophile. (2016, April 22).

CTV News Vancouver. Retrieved from https://bc.ctvnews.ca/this-is-devastating-teacher-on-

facebook-posts-suggesting-he-was-a-pedophile-1.2871721

VSB Board Reviews Social Media Guidelines. (2013, May 30.). Vancouver school board. Retrieved

from https://www.vsb.bc.ca/News/archivednews/Pages/2012-2013_271.aspx

Werro, F. (May 8, 2009). The right to be forgotten in post-scarcity culture. In A. C. Ciacchi, C.

Godt, P. Rott, & L. J. Smith (Eds.), *Liability in the third millennium* (pp. 285-300).

Georgetown, MD: Georgetown Public Law Research Paper No. 2. Available at SSRN:

https://ssrn.com/abstract=1401357

Wright, L. (2018, October 25). *Digital tattoo evaluation report 2018*. Retrieved from

https://wiki.ubc.ca/images/0/0c/Digital_Tattoo_Evaluation_Report_Complete.pdf

Zittrain, J.L. (2008). *The future of the internet — And how to stop it*. Retrieved from

https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4455262/Zittrain_Future+of+the+Internet.pdf?se

quence=1

Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Consent Form

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA | VANCOUV

Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Consent Form
Teacher Professionalism and Social Media

Investigators: The principal investigator for this study is Dr. Stephen Petrina, Professor in the Faculty of Education and who may be reached at (604) 822-5325. This research will be used for the MEd graduating paper of Kieran Forde, MEd student, who may be reached at UBC (604) 779-8635.

Study Purpose and Procedures: The study investigates the nexus between teacher professionalism and teachers' use of social media. The total time necessary to participate in the study is approximately 45 minutes. Your participation will be through an audio-recorded interview.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept strictly confidential. All documents will be identified only by code. Physical hard copies will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Electronic copies will be encrypted and protected by password. This data will be kept in the research office in the Neville Scarfe building on the UBC campus and will be accessed only by research team members.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or desire further information with respect to this study, you may contact Dr. Stephen Petrina at (604) 822-5325 or Kieran Forde at (604) 779-8635. If you have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, contact the Research Participant Complaint Line in the UBC Office of Research Ethics at 604-822-8598 or if long distance e-mail RSIL@ors.ubc.ca or call toll free 1-877-822-8598.

Consent
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time.

_____   _____
Participant Signature   Date

_____
Printed Name of the Participant

Appendix B: Interview Questions

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA | VANCOUVER

Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Teacher Professionalism and Social Media

Interview

Thank you for participating in this research study; I am Kieran Forde working on Teacher Professionalism and Social Media. The purpose of this research is to explore pre-service teachers' attitudes to social media use in the professional context, illuminating their beliefs around what constitutes a "professional" online identity. The study also aims to explore what pre-service teachers consider social media to be, as well as what they consider to be areas of concern regarding their digital identity and what they have done, or plan to do, to mitigate the possible consequences or negative effects arising from their use of social media.

An audio device will be used to record this interview; this is to ensure that your responses are properly captured for later analysis. If during or at any point in the interview you feel uncomfortable with the recording, please notify me and the recording device will be switched off. Confidentiality of all responses is guaranteed and you are free to withdraw from the research study at any time.

The approximate length of this interview is 45 minutes. Please kindly sign the consent form indicating your consent to participate in this study.

Date _____
Time _____
Location _____
Interviewer _____
Interviewee _____   Consent form signed? _____

Interview Questions

4. What do you consider to be examples of social media?
    - Do you consider SMS and email to be social media?

5. What consideration have you given to your online presence on social media in preparation for entering the teaching profession?

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA | VANCOUVER

- What, if any, changes have you made to your social media presence since joining the BEd program?
  - o Why did you make these changes?
- Do you have any concerns about your online presence on social media with regard to entering the teaching profession?

6. Did anyone at the school where you had your short practicum speak to you about the school's social media usage policy?

Appendix C: Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct off Educators in British Columbia. (BCCT). Second Edition, May 2004, pp. 10-18.

Education and Competence

The Standards in this section define the education and skills necessary to be a professional educator in BC. They are presented in a sequence that builds from attitudes and attributes in the early standards to knowledge, skills and professional expertise in the latter Standards.

Foundation Statements: Standards for the Education and Competence of Educators
1. Professional educators value and care for all children, acting at all times in the best interests of children.
2. Professional educators demonstrate an understanding of the role of parents and the home in the life of students.
3. Professional educators have a broad knowledge base as well as an in-depth understanding about the subject areas they teach.
4. Professional educators are knowledgeable about Canada and the world.
5. Professional educators are knowledgeable about BC's education system.
6. Professional educators understand children's growth and development.
7. Professional educators implement effective teaching practices.
8. Professional educators apply principles of assessment, evaluation and reporting.
9. Professional educators act as ethical educational leaders.
10. Professional educators engage in life-long learning.

STANDARDS FOR THE EDUCATION AND COMPETENCE OF EDUCATORS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

1. **Professional educators value and care for all children, acting at all times in the best interests of children.**

Professional educators:

1.1 ensure the physical safety and intellectual and emotional security of all children

1.2 treat all children in ways that convey respect, warmth and freedom from domination

1.3 act within ethical and legal boundaries for the benefit and protection of all children

1.4 show commitment to principles of inclusion by treating all children equitably

1.5 intervene where possible if others fail to value and care for all children

> Valuing and caring for all children is an essential prerequisite in the development of a professional educator, and one that may not necessarily be learned within a professional program. With this important moral perspective, the society can have confidence about the motivation and practice of an educator. Standard #1 speaks to the basic values that are prerequisite to the knowledge and skill necessary to be an educator.

2. **Professional educators demonstrate an understanding of the role of parents and the home in the life of students.**

Professional educators:

2.1 recognize, in planning for instruction and interactions with students and parents, the importance of the home environment and differing family values

2.2 respect the role of parents as co-educators of children and work to provide an educational environment that is supportive of that role

2.3 communicate openly, effectively, sensitively and in a timely manner with parents

2.4 seek involvement and input from parents to support students

> Education in a democratic society is a shared responsibility of the family and the state. The school systems, whether public or independent, represent establishments that are built on the values of a particular body – either the society as a whole for public schools or a particular group within society that establishes an independent school. No matter in which context professional educators work, the fact that parents and society entrust their children to the care of professional educators must be recognized. Standard #2 speaks to the role of the professional educator within this partnership.

Education and Competence

3. **Professional educators have a broad knowledge base as well as an in-depth understanding about the subject areas they teach.**

Professional educators:

3.1   are literate, numerate and fluent in either English or French

3.2   understand the core concepts and structures of the subjects they teach

3.3   understand how knowledge in subject areas is created, organized and linked to other disciplines

3.4   command a depth of subject area knowledge that goes beyond the particular curriculum

3.5   access and communicate subject area knowledge and connect it to the curriculum and the world beyond the school

Professional educators require, as a prerequisite to the act of educating others, a level of subject knowledge that can support the demands of the curriculum and the curiosity and questions of students. Further, professional educators must be able to communicate effectively in English or French in order to carry out their duties. Standard #3 requires that professional educators are competent to teach subjects and be understood by students and parents.

4. **Professional educators are knowledgeable about Canada and the world**

Professional educators:

4.1   have a general knowledge of Canadian history, geography and culture

4.2   understand, encourage and uphold the rule of law

4.3   are knowledgeable about the theory and practice of our constitutional democracy

4.4   understand the contributions of diverse cultures to Canadian society

4.5   have a general knowledge of world history, geography and cultures

Students must develop their knowledge and understanding of the history, geography and cultures of the nation and the world if they are to be sensitive to the larger context in which life is lived. Standard #4 describes the need for professional educators to be translators of Canadian and world societal values, enabling children to become participatory citizens.

Education and Competence

5. Professional educators are knowledgeable about BC's education system.

Professional educators:

5.1 understand the principal features of the BC education system

5.2 have a working knowledge of the relevant legislation that governs the profession and its work

5.3 understand the differing views regarding the goals of education

5.4 understand the history and context of education in BC and Canada

5.5 are aware of the current debates in education

5.6 understand the role of education in developing informed citizens in a constitutional democracy

As professionals, educators make decisions about the welfare of students. Many of the decisions are informed by holding a working knowledge of the philosophies and history that have shaped the current education system in BC. Professional educators also need to understand the legal context within which they work and have responsibilities, whether it is the public system, the independent or the First Nations systems. Standard #5 speaks to the importance of professional educators having a working understanding of the larger context of their work from both legal and political perspectives.

6. Professional educators understand children's growth and development.

Professional educators:

6.1 understand and apply relevant theories of human development including demonstrating an understanding of individual learning differences and special needs

6.2 understand and apply relevant theories that explain children's behaviour

6.3 focus on developing children's potential and love of learning

6.4 respond to specific situations in ways that respect children's dignity

Professional educators require knowledge of how children develop as learners and as social beings. This knowledge is used to inform the decisions that educators make about curriculum design and establishing relationships with children. Standard #6 speaks to the need for all professional educators to have the basic knowledge that supports appropriate skill development in the education of students.

Education and Competence

7. **Professional educators implement effective teaching practices.**

Professional educators:

7.1 create an environment that supports learning for all students

7.2 design, implement and monitor learning experiences to benefit student achievement

7.3 provide learning experiences in which students understand and develop their own role and responsibility in the learning process and as life-long learners

7.4 work collaboratively with educators, support staff, professional support staff, parents and others to improve student achievement

7.5 recognize when additional support and expertise is required to meet the specific needs of students and work collaboratively within these contexts to benefit students

Professional educators must have the knowledge and skill to make the subject matter accessible to all students. The previous six standards are, in a way, prerequisite to the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth standards, which add the pedagogical knowledge and skill that transform an educated person into an educator. Standard #7 sets out the skills necessary for educating children.

8. **Professional educators apply principles of assessment, evaluation and reporting.**

Professional educators:

8.1 understand the strengths and limitations of specific assessment, evaluation and reporting tools

8.2 regularly assess and evaluate the intellectual achievement and social development of students

8.3 use assessment and evaluation to plan further teaching and learning experiences

8.4 work with colleagues to ensure a common interpretation of learning outcomes and evaluation results

8.5 maintain accurate and comprehensive records of student achievement

8.6 report regularly, accurately and informatively, to administration and parents, the intellectual achievement and social development of students

Understanding and implementing effective assessment and evaluation strategies, as well as recognizing what relevant information these strategies provide, is critical to student achievement. Assessment and evaluation practices have the potential to motivate students to greater success or to create barriers to their success. Standard #8 is intended to provide the appropriate benchmarks for professional educators as they determine the best methods of assessment and evaluation.

9. Professional educators act as ethical educational leaders.

Professional educators:

9.1   act within legal boundaries for the benefit of students, the education system, and society

9.2   establish and maintain constructive, professional relationships with students, colleagues, employers, parents, the profession and others

9.3   accept, and assign others to, teaching or administrative positions for which the professional educator has the relevant knowledge and skills

9.4   are accountable to students, parents, employers, the profession and the public

9.5   develop and refine personal philosophies of education, teaching and learning that are informed by theory and contribute to practice

9.6   work collaboratively with educators, support staff, professional support staff, parents and others to improve the effective functioning of the school and district

9.7   support collaborative partnerships with parents, community, universities, government, social and business agencies for the benefit of students

> The moral aspect of education requires that educators act ethically and with integrity. Education as a profession is based on the concept of public service and is concerned first and foremost with the welfare of the client, both individual students and society as a whole. Standard #9 is intended to provide appropriate professional expectations within a public-service context.

10. Professional educators engage in life-long learning.

Professional educators:

10.1   model their interest in, commitment to and enthusiasm for learning

10.2   keep current with subject area and pedagogical knowledge and skill

10.3   share their professional knowledge and expertise with the profession and others in the community

10.4   employ reflective practices that enhance their understanding and skills

> The practice of education is not stagnant. It is impacted by research, technology, creativity and interactions with others. A hallmark of professionalism is the concept of professional growth over time. Professionals are not finished learning when they graduate from university or receive a certificate. Instead, they are embarking on a journey of learning that must continue throughout a career. Standard #10 is intended to guide professionals as they continue to develop in their particular areas of expertise within education.

Professional Conduct

The Standards in this section define expectations of educators' behaviour. Whether on duty or off, professional educators are seen as role models and as such must exhibit the highest qualities of character, including honesty, integrity, trustworthiness and compassion. The *Standards for Professional Conduct* are presented as expanding sets of responsibilities from those closest to the daily work of a professional educator to those who are involved more globally.

Standards for the Professional Conduct of Educators
1. Professional educators have a responsibility to students.
2. Professional educators have a responsibility to parents and the public.
3. Professional educators have a responsibility to the profession.

STANDARDS FOR THE PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OF EDUCATORS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

11. Professional educators have a responsibility to students.

Professional educators:

11.1   respect the privileged position of authority, trust and influence that they hold with students

11.2   act in the best interests of children at all times

11.3   act with the understanding that they are role models for students

11.4   establish and maintain the boundaries of a professional relationship

11.5   do not engage in any sexually related behaviour with a child or student, with or without consent

11.6   provide students with an emotionally, intellectually and physically safe environment

11.7   treat all students with dignity and respect

> Professionals provide a public service – in the case of education, the primary clients of that service are students. Therefore, an educator's personal needs must not supersede the needs of students. Professional educators are responsible, first and foremost, to students. The "best interests of children" must be defined within the context of society. Standard #11 is intended to prescribe and proscribe in broad terms the relationships that must exist between educators and students.

12. Professional educators have a responsibility to parents and the public.

Professional educators:

12.1   act ethically and honestly at all times

12.2   understand that they are viewed as role models by parents and society

12.3   ensure that the interests of students and the public supersede any responsibility to another educator or institution

12.4   behave at all times in ways that reflect positively on the public's confidence and trust in the education system

12.5   understand that professional autonomy is balanced by professional responsibility and accountability to the public

> Parents and the larger society have a vested interest in the work of professional educators. The standards to which educators are held are not limited to when they are acting in their professional capacity. Rather, like all professionals, educators are expected to uphold the values of the profession and to act at all times in ways that maintain confidence in the education system. Standard #12 is intended to guide educators in their relationship with parents and the public to the benefit of individual students and the society as a whole.

13. Professional educators have a responsibility to the profession.

Professional educators:

13.1   exemplify behaviours that maintain the dignity, credibility and integrity of the profession

13.2   support the profession by providing mentorship or encouragement to other educators and those preparing to enter the profession

13.3   understand the difference between professional regulation and advocacy

13.4   ensure that all communications maintain a high standard of professionalism

13.5   cooperate in an investigation or inquiry conducted pursuant to the *Teaching Profession Act*

The Standards help to shape the individual and shared professional identity of educators. Each educator's actions reflect not only on that individual's reputation but on the integrity of the profession as a whole. Standard #13 is intended to provide guidelines with respect to the role an individual educator plays within the larger professional community.

Appendix D: Full details of the discipline outcomes in the "inappropriate use of social media" field.

DO#	Date	Name	Type of Report
1	Feb-19	T-BB-2019, Anonymous	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
2	Jan-19	Cederholm, Bryan Edmund	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
3	Feb-18	T-AB-2018, Anonymous	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
4	Jan-18	T-AL-2017, Anonymous	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
5	Oct-17	Vieira, Nicole Monique	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
6	Oct-17	Lettington, Matthew Norman	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
7	Sep-17	T-BI-2017, Anonymous	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
8	Aug-17	Ferguson, Ryan George	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
9	Mar-17	Stevenson, Robert William	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
10	Nov-16	T-AK-2016, Anonymous	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
11	Aug-16	Kwon, Jae Woo	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
12	Jun-16	Steeves, Cory Ray	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
13 /16	Jun-16	Hankey, Darren Lea	Hearing Decision (PDF)
14	Jun-16	Wait, Robin James	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
15	Mar-16	Drolet, Anthony Albert	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
*	Feb-16	Hankey, Darren Lea	Hearing Decision (PDF)
17	Jan-16	Neal, Daphne Anne	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
18	Dec-15	Crawford, Toby Annette	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
19	Oct-15	Winkler, Joe Edward	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
20	Jul-14	Buffel, Kevin James	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
21	Jan-14	TCR-AD-2014, Anonymous	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
22	Oct-13	Mclaughlin, Sean Vincent	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
23	Oct-13	Goddard, James Ellery	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
24	Aug-13	Lettington, Matthew Norman	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
25	Jul-13	Long, James David	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
26	Jul-13	Jefferson, Louis William	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
27	May-13	Fox, Clinton Heath	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
28/29	Jan-13	Mcgeough, James Martin	Hearing Decision (PDF)
*	Oct-12	Mcgeough, James Martin	Hearing Decision (PDF)
30	Jun-12	Mailhiot, Dale Andre Joseph	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
31	Mar-12	Gorris, Susan Alice	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
32	Dec-11	Carr, Scott Robert	Hearing Decision (PDF)
33	Dec-11	Schmid, Peter Henner	Hearing Decision (PDF)
34	Dec-11	Davidson, John Lindsay	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)

DO#	Date	Name	Type of Report
36	Sep-11	Grant, Douglas Angus	Hearing Decision (PDF)
37	Jun-11	Sunter, Daniel Anderson	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
38	Mar-11	Riedstra, Roland Melchior	Hearing Decision (PDF)
39	Mar-11	Williamson, Carl James	Conduct Review Sub-Committee Agreement (PDF)
40	Feb-11	Gardiner, Michael Raymond	Conduct Review Sub-Committee Agreement (PDF)
41	Dec-10	Sutherland, James Seymour	Hearing Decision (PDF)
42	Nov-10	Luscher, Johnathan Lamont	Hearing Decision (PDF)
43	Nov-10	Mcneice, Kelly Glenn	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
44	Jun-10	Van Ieperen, Samuel James	Hearing Decision (PDF)
45	May-10	Morgan, Justin Robert	Hearing Decision (PDF)
46	Mar-10	Richards, Gary Christopher	Hearing Decision (PDF)
47	Dec-09	Soong, Tommy Po Yew	Hearing Decision (PDF)
48	Dec-09	Member, CR-A12-09	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
49	Nov-09	Member, CR-A11-09	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
50	Oct-09	Belec, Gordon Frederick Joseph	Conduct Review Sub-Committee Agreement (PDF)
51	Feb-09	Gies, Gregory Mckeand	Hearing Decision (PDF)
52	Jun-08	Van Vloten, John Willem Van Bommel	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
53	Jun-08	Lee, Thomas James	Consent Resolution Agreement (PDF)
54	Jan-08	Schippers, Mark Anthony	Hearing Decision (PDF)
55	Sep-07	Lee, Howard Wallace	Hearing Decision (PDF)
56	Jul-07	Dyck, Mark Edward	Hearing Decision (PDF)
57	Apr-06	Stamps, William Edward	Hearing Decision (PDF)
58	May-03	Kushner, Gregory Michael	Hearing Decision (PDF)
59	Mar-03	Thomson, Todd Francis	Hearing Decision (PDF)
60	Jan-03	Van Der Molen, Henry John	Hearing Decision (PDF)
61	Jan-96	Respondent, (95-C)	Hearing Decision (PDF)