

# Center for the Advancement of Teaching Xavier University of Louisiana

## Newsletter Fall 2001

### *Table of Contents*

A Report on the Center's Grant Writing Activities .....	2
Upcoming Workshops .....	3
School News .....	5
New and Improved: Facilities Upgrades .....	6
Wanted: Brave Souls with an Interest in Advanced Web Publishing .....	7
Survey Results:	
Botstein Visit .....	8
SEF Technology .....	14
Teaching and Learning with Web Course Management Systems:	
A Case Study at Xavier University of Louisiana .....	27
Course Portfolio Working Group: Request for Proposals .....	28

Note: This newsletter is also available on-line at  
<http://www.xula.edu/Administrative/cat/news/>

# Grant Writing

## ***Bush***

In late August 2001, Xavier, through its Center for the Advancement of Teaching, will resubmit a proposal to The Bush and The William and Flora Hewlett foundations requesting their support our faculty development program. If you're reading this before the end of August 2001, please know that the proposal is still, as some might say, under construction. If, after reading the summary of the proposal, you have suggestions or comments, please do not hesitate in contacting us via e-mail at [cat@xula.edu](mailto:cat@xula.edu).

Thank you for taking the time to read the summary of this proposal.

## ***Mellon***

In August we submitted a proposal to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation requesting the Foundation's support of the Center's *Teaching, Learning, and Technology Initiatives* program. You can read a summary of the proposal here. If you'd like to plow through all 32 pages of the proposal, we certainly would be happy to make it available to you. Just give a [shout](#). We hope to hear whether the proposal is funded sometime in the fall semester, at which point we'll post the full proposal on the Center's website.

Xavier University of Louisiana respectfully requests \$350,000 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to support the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Initiatives of its Center for the Advancement of Teaching. These initiatives will be implemented over a 27-month period that begins September 1, 2001 and ends December 31, 2003. Specific faculty development and technology initiatives that would be supported by this grant are:

1. Thirty-five faculty technology projects, including faculty use of such information technologies as Web-based course management and conferencing systems, course websites, videoconferencing, JSTOR and other on-line databases, and discipline-specific courseware such as simulations, CD-ROMs, *etc.*
2. Hands-on technology training workshops, and symposia and brown-bag discussions about the pedagogical and professional impact of information technology on teaching, learning, and scholarship
3. The *Rich Media Projects Initiative*—an initiative that will guide 12 faculty members interested in rich media projects through three distinct phases of planning, implementation, and evaluation.

In addition, the grant will enable Xavier University to explore the feasibility and possible structure of a Technology Training Center and a Program of Student Certification in Information Technology. Grant funds will support a 7-month research and planning phase that will begin January 1, 2002 and end July 31, 2002.

## Upcoming Workshops

### ***Writing to Learn***

Whether your classes are large or small, lecture or discussion-based, writing exercises can improve student learning. This workshop will explore "painless" ways to use writing to generate better discussions, and improve students' critical thinking and engagement of course content. This is a hands-on workshop, so bring paper and a pen!

**Workshop leader:** Dr. David Lanoue, Professor of English  
**Date and time:** Wednesday, September 19, 2001  
3:00-4:30 p.m.  
**Location:** Library Room 501  
**To register:** Please contact Arriana at ext. 7512  
or via e-mail at [cat@xula.edu](mailto:cat@xula.edu).

### ***E-Moderating: Developing and Managing On-line Discussions***

How can on-line discussions using e-mail, chat, or a whiteboard tool positively affect student learning? What constitutes a "good" on-line discussion? Just what is an "on-line discussion?"

If these or other similar questions concerning teaching and learning via on-line discussions linger in your mind, then this workshop may be of interest to you.

This is a three-part workshop:

Part I: Pre-workshop readings	<i>Tuesday &amp; Wednesday</i>
Part II: Traditional face-to-face workshop	<i>November 27 &amp; 28</i>
Part III: On-line discussion	<i>4:30 - 6:00 PM</i>
	<i>Location TBA</i>

#### **Workshop leaders:**

- Ms. Elizabeth Rhodes, Center for the Advancement of Teaching School/University Liaison, who has used on-line discussion extensively while a doctoral student
- Dr. Deborah Bordelon, Division of Education faculty member, who has used on-line discussions in her classes at Xavier

This workshop will provide you with an opportunity to examine, think through, and discuss the potential uses and impact of on-line discussions in the teaching and learning process.

You may register by sending an e-mail to [cat@xula.edu](mailto:cat@xula.edu) or calling Arriana at ext. 7512.

## ***Electronic Classroom Orientation***

Please see the article titled "New and Improved" to learn about some exciting new upgrades to our electronic classrooms.

There are two electronic classroom orientation sessions scheduled:

- Thursday, August 23, 2001, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.
- Friday, August 24, 2001, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m.

Both sessions will be held in room 501.

An optional 30 minute workshop on teaching with the SmartBoard will be held immediately after each electronic classroom orientation sessions.

To register, please call Arriana at ext. 7512 or send e-mail to [cat@xula.edu](mailto:cat@xula.edu).

Faculty who have attended electronic classroom orientation before are not required to attend additional training. However, this would be a perfect opportunity for you to see the changes that were made in the classrooms.

We routinely schedule electronic classroom orientation sessions. You can check our [website](#) or call the Center to find out about future orientation sessions.

## School News

Towana Pierre, a recent graduate of McDonogh 35, and a freshman at Howard University, spent some time this summer in the Center working on the New Orleans Unmasked website. The design of the website (see <http://www.xula.edu/Administrative/cat/facdev/rich/>) was completed last summer in a collaborative process with other Students at the Center. Towana has created the shell website, so that others, Gabrielle and Erika, can continue the work while she is away at college. Towana is pictured here deep in thought , as she plans her next moves using BBEdit HTML editing software.

St.. Monica's Elementary school faculty came to Xavier University as part a Back-to-School staff development activity. This small school, which has a historical affiliation with the Blessed Sacrament Sisters, has a Principal who is a recent B.A. and M.A. graduate of Xavier, Mrs. Ross (see picture) and her staff of twelve teachers learned basics in Hyperstudio, multimedia authoring software, and searched the web for lesson plans to use when the school year begins.

## New and Improved: Facilities Upgrades

Over the summer upgrades were made to the electronic classrooms on the fifth floor of the Library. New additions in room 501 include a wireless control panel and SmartBoard (an electronic interactive whiteboard).

The wireless control panel allows you to remotely control devices in the classroom.

The electronic whiteboard captures notes and diagrams as you create them, so they can be viewed, saved, edited, shared, or printed. With the SmartBoard, you can have a complete record of ideas, notes and drawings you created during class time to review or distribute to your students.

For more information about SmartBoard, visit the SmartBoard website at:

<http://www.smarttech.com/products/smartboard/index.asp>

Wireless mice were also installed on the computers in rooms 501 and 502.

And finally, the Center's Production Room (Room 534) is now equipped with a scanner with an automatic document feeder. This scanner can also scan 35mm slides and transparencies.

More information about our facilities is available on our website:

<http://www.xula.edu/Administrative/cat/facilities>

The Center's Teaching Laboratory (Library room 532A) and its electronic classrooms (Library rooms 501 and 502) are reserved for faculty who make regular use of multimedia or the network in their courses. There are also limited times that the rooms are available for *ad hoc* usage.

All faculty members are encouraged to use the Teaching Laboratory and electronic classrooms. We require that you attend at least one classroom orientation so that we can offer some training on how to use the equipment. See the article titled "Electronic Classroom Orientation" for dates and times.

## **Wanted: Brave Souls with an Interest in Advanced Web Publishing**

Are you interested in creating a website which features significant interactivity and the persistent storage of data? Up to now, this has not been possible at Xavier because we didn't have a server which supported scripting and databasing. But the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and the Information Technology Center are pleased to announce a new era in Web publishing at the University.

The Center now has a server running the Linux operating system and the Apache Web server. Special thanks to ITC for supplying the server and setting it up. Installed on this new machine are MySQL (a relational database management system) and PHP (an HTML-embedded scripting language with built-in functions for database connectivity). Incidentally, this is all open-source software. You can take a look at the new server, on campus only, at <http://cateach.xula.edu/>.

Simply put, this server will allow the Center to assist faculty interested in advanced Web publishing by hosting sites that feature interactivity and databases. We're hoping to announce a formal request for proposals at some time in the future. But you don't have to wait for that!

Creating and using Web databases isn't exactly easy; then again, it's not rocket science either. So we're looking for a few brave souls who have some familiarity with scripting and databases or are motivated to learn by doing. Let us know if you're interested; we'll set you up with an account. If need be, we can point you to some truly excellent resources for learning about PHP and MySQL. You don't have to submit a formal proposal, and you don't even have to have a clear goal in mind. If you just want to play around and experiment, that's fine.

Just send an e-mail to [cat@xula.edu](mailto:cat@xula.edu) and say "I want an account."

## Survey Results of Botstein Visit

At the spring 2001 Faculty Institute, Dr. Leon Botstein, president of Bard College, gave a keynote address. Following Dr. Botstein's presentation, faculty joined small breakout sessions to consider a variety of questions such as (the complete list of questions is on-line):

- How do we convey the notion that liberal arts education is more of a beginning than an ending of an individual's education?
- How do we balance the frequently competing interests of a professional or even pre-professional education with those of a liberal arts and science education?
- If courses are bricks in building an education, what are essential campus activities outside the courses that form the mortar, especially those that involve faculty and students informally?

Later in the spring semester, the Coordinating Committee of the University Academic Assembly administered a survey to gather data from faculty regarding University Academic Assembly in general and Dr. Botstein's presentation in particular. The results of the survey are presented here:



## Breakout Questions

### *Spring 2001 Faculty Institute, Xavier University of Louisiana*

#### ***An afternoon with Dr. Leon Botstein, President of Bard College***

Following Dr. Botstein's presentation, faculty will break into small groups to discuss one of the questions below. Faculty members are to select the question that interests them most.

- How do we convey the notion that liberal arts education is more of a beginning than an ending of an individual's education?
- How do we balance the frequently competing interests of a professional or even pre-professional education with those of a liberal arts and science education?
- If courses are bricks in building an education, what are essential campus activities outside the courses that form the mortar, especially those that involve faculty and students informally?
- Keeping in mind that the Greek word for leisure is *scholē*, what is the role of leisure in the process of education and how does this element relate to administrator, faculty, and student workloads?
- What is the role of the campus environment in furthering the ideals of a liberal education?
- How do we initiate a conversation across the curriculum on ideals and virtues?
- How can the university create a climate in which the proclamation and discussion of unpopular or disturbing issues can be encouraged in an atmosphere of civility?
- How can the university create a more campus-centered learning, social, recreational, and athletic experience for its students?
- How can the university lessen the grade-consciousness of the students while increasing their actual learning and intellectual interests?
- How does a university liberal arts education differ from that experienced in secondary and primary school and how does this call for a different kind of teacher in different kinds of roles?
- What kind of marks should the Roman Catholic and African-American character of Xavier leave on its students—black, non black, Catholic, and non Catholic and what processes should the university use to accomplish these aspects of its work?
- How should a Catholic university that is historically black use its intercultural, interreligious, and interdisciplinary context as a way of enhancing an understanding of the broader religious, cultural, and social dimensions of society?
- What kind of core curriculum would enhance the goals of Xavier's liberal arts education?
- What skills should a well-constructed liberal arts education impart to the student? How do these skills satisfy the needs of the modern marketplace?

## Faculty Survey Results, March 2001 (47 completed surveys)

### *Spring 2001 Faculty Institute, Xavier University of Louisiana*

#### *An afternoon with Dr. Leon Botstein, President of Bard College*

**Rate the relevance of Dr. Botstein's presentation to issues and opportunities that exist at Xavier University?**

Response	Number
Very relevant	22
Somewhat relevant	19
Irrelevant	3

**Which of the following topics addressed by Dr. Botstein have most relevance to Xavier? (Choose all that apply.)**

Response	Number
Value or importance of a liberal arts education	31
Core curriculum	31
Interdisciplinary courses	8
Team teaching	7
Other: -Importance of writing a critical study -Importance of writing to critical thinking -Mandatory chemistry minor drains pool of humanities students and narrows focus of undergrad education	3
None of the topics were relevant to Xavier	2

**What topic(s) presented by Dr. Botstein call(s) for more discussion? (Choose all that apply.)**

Response	Number
Value or importance of a liberal arts education	20

Comments (assume *sic*):

- *It seems to me that the University's emphasis has lately been on training students to get into medical school, not on how to think independently & develop high-level analytical skills. These areas are important not only to enable our students to become valuable members of society, but so they can practice medicine (or other scientific career) effectively & holistically. What good is a doctor if she/he cannot write a paragraph?*
- *Because it's so central for our graduates to pursue leadership positions.*
- *Issue of pre-profession education vs. liberal arts education needs more discussion. This could impact the core. Also, validity or required minors should be reviewed.*

Response	Number
Core curriculum	25

Comments (assume sic):

- *Core curriculum needs revision.*
- *Stimulated thinking about a foundation preparation for life skills for an educated person, which also allows adequate development of specialty area.*
- *We seem to be over-stressing pre-professional training, so students don't see value in core courses.*
- *The core at Xavier is not suited for all majors. Perhaps we need less hours for some majors, or a greater variety of choices. The core should have more meaning than just be a hoop students need to jump through.*
- *We need desperately to look into the core curriculum to see if it is too unwieldy and ready for revision.*

Response	Number
Interdisciplinary courses	14

Comments (assume sic):

- *If XU means what it says about internationalizing the curriculum, it is important to investigate how disciplines can contribute collectively to this process. More generally, the benefits of an interdisciplinary learning environment are invaluable.*
- *As a university, we do not understand fully what interdisciplinary courses are, or how to meaningful conduct them.*

Response	Number
Team teaching	4

Comments (assume sic):

- *Cooperative learning allows students to have a chance to work together for a common goal. This is how many organizations function. Students can see faculty working together this provides a good model for learning.*
- *I liked the idea that the same constructs can be taught using different courses (e.g., the teaching of critical thinking skills).*

Response	Number
Other	1

Comments (assume sic):

- *Interdisciplinary learning. Never identified a systematic way to implement interdisciplinary teaching/learning.*
- *Dr. Botstein's students are white (mostly) and prosperous (mostly). He was clever and amusing, but much of what he said was not relevant to XU. It was a waste of time.*
- *These would offer a way to implement the way in which he considers liberal arts education to be valuable.*
- *His point about the humanities as critical to the potential for students to achieve. That is, that people need practical training to succeed, but that in order to achieve the highest degree of success, a person requires and must have grounding in the humanities. The truth is, we do not emphasize enough that organic side of skills our students need to realize their full potential.*
- *The importance seems under-emphasized currently.*
- *The faculty seem to remain interested and engaged for just that one day. There is rarely an on-going dialog, follow-up, or conclusion.*
- *My 3 choices are somewhat related. By developing a handful of powerful, creative, and sound interdisciplinary courses, we may be able to improve or enrich the core curriculum and increase students' understanding of a liberal arts education.*

- *I disagreed with Dr. Botstein.*

**Was the format followed (i.e., Dr. Botstein's presentation, breakout sessions, reports from breakout sessions, summary comments by Dr. Botstein) effective?**

Response (and comments)	Number
Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Some reports were overdone.</i></li> <li>• <i>Except reports &amp; summary comments were too monological.</i></li> <li>• <i>Reports after sessions tended NOT to be summaries.</i></li> </ul>	29
No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Only his presentation was effective.</i></li> <li>• <i>How can anything truly meaningful come out of breakout sessions that are so incredibly short?</i></li> <li>• <i>The summaries of breakout sessions was a huge waste of time-we lost a valuable opportunity to have Dr. Botstein field questions and develop his points.</i></li> <li>• <i>Afternoon was not best time. Not enough time for discussion of ideas.</i></li> </ul>	9
Somewhat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>This program opened discussion on an important question, but we seem to have no clear idea of where to go next.</i></li> </ul>	1

**Which format do you prefer for University Academic Assemblies?**

Response (and comments)	Number
Speaker with breakout sessions (Botstein model)	14
Topic with breakout sessions (January 2000 governance model)	10
Speaker with full faculty open discussion	15
Topic with full faculty open discussion	6
Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reports from committees should be sent via email; use meeting times for acceptance of reports/discussion.</i></li> <li>• <i>Never have them unless there is business to discuss.</i></li> <li>• <i>Speaker/breakout sessions/open discussion the Botstein model kind of stifled discussion among all the faculty.</i></li> <li>• <i>No opinion.</i></li> <li>• <i>Alternate speaker and topic format for UAA.</i></li> </ul>	4

**Please state your likes and dislikes pertaining to University Academic Assembly programs, formats, use of faculty time, etc.**

Comments (assume sic):

Likes

- *So far that variety of approaches has been good, particularly for letting us get to know faculty in other disciplines of the university.*
- *Opportunities for intellectual interaction.*
- *The breakout sessions that are provided with or without a speaker allow faculty from various areas to work together. These experiences have been very positive at Xavier.*
- *The Assembly meets infrequently and keeps it to an hour each time. This is good. Less often is better.*
- *I like getting together as a faculty, but dislike the fact this we seldom get to know each other.*

- *I would like a variety of the above approaches with a guest speaker every year or two, a panel discussion of XU and area faculty, and a theme-driven discussion either via breakout sessions or open discussions. Acad. Assembly should minimize committee reports and maximize the discussion of committee work and results.*
- *I prefer sessions that are directly related to improvements in teaching. A group in Minneapolis – 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Systems – teaches accelerative learning methods. A second use of time is problem solving: something specific with a direct relationship to students’ interest and/or faculty.*
- *I would like a preview of relevant points of the UAA program before the meeting via electronic media.*

#### Dislikes

- *Do not open a topic unless speaker knows all of the background.*
- *Content frequency of such programs (without comparable results).*
- *In this age of active learning, why are most meetings & programs the typical “lecture”? There is an abundance of research that shows that people retain very little from sitting and listening to a lecture format. Do we have to sit and listen to some of these presentations? Can’t some of the information be sent via email and other technology?*
- *Too long. Too often.*
- *Dislike the fact that we don’t use a mike, many times important items are missed due to not being able to hear.*
- *Some items could be taken care of via email.*
- *Eliminate reports, send them by email and let faculty discuss issues that interest them.*
- *Too big. The university has gotten too large for the VPAA to govern. This responsibility ought to be delegated to smaller working committees that publish the agendas so that interested faculty can attend as non-voting members.*
- *Committee reports could be distributed via email instead of presented at UAA. It’s disheartening to see so many empty seats at UAA: full faculty attendance seems to be a thing of the past. Perhaps the coordinating committee (if it doesn’t do so already) could focus on 1 or 2 issues, themes, challenges, etc. that face Xavier and could be considered in various ways (e.g., speakers, breakout sessions, etc.) throughout the academic year (naturally, some end-product or goal would be important to have before the UAA).*
- *While I am grateful for the efficient manner in which these meetings have been on recently, I question why we all need to be in the same room to hear reports from committees, etc. These informational items can be effectively communicated by other means. Academic Assembly should be for the discussion of issues relevant to the entire faculty so that we can make decisions on them.*
- *“Informational-only” reports are a waste of time and energy and cut into time that could be spent discussing issues.*
- *Far too many “reports” are given- much of this information could be provided via email. UAA meetings should be for the purpose of conducting business.*
- *90% of what transpires in academic assemblies could be transacted via email. Bringing faculty together to discuss an important issue has some value; bringing them together for informational presentation has little value, and can be very trying at 5 pm.*
- *I’m not interested in philosophical naval contemplation or listening to elitist blathering.*
- *There are always too many agenda items. As a consequence, not enough time is available to discuss important issues. Additionally, too much “verbiage” rambling. Speakers need to get to the point via a direct route.*
- *At least 90% of Assemblies’ agendas are informational, therefore can be transmitted by email or mail. We do not need to have meetings to hear information; only issues/discussions require meetings. We do not need a speaker at every Faculty Institute.*
- *Too long. Most of agenda could be discussed/distributed/complied by e-mail only.*

## SEF Technology Survey

This technology survey was first administered to all faculty members in fall 1998, as part of the Southern Educational Foundation, Inc.'s *Gateway 21 Project*, in which Xavier participated. The results of the survey then proved especially helpful to the Center for the Advancement of Teaching as indicators of faculty and institutional technology needs and interests.

Since 1998, the University has made many changes to its technology infrastructure and new initiatives have been launched to support faculty and student use of technology. The Center administered the survey again in March 2001.

The results of the survey have helped the University in general and the Center in particular measure the extent to which the changes and initiatives have impacted the institution. The survey results have also provided the Center with a better sense of current faculty technology needs and interests. We should add that the survey results were particularly helpful in preparing the faculty development and technology proposal we submitted to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation in mid-August.

The Center for the Advancement of Teaching would like to extend its gratitude to Dr. Michael Labranche, Mathematics Department, for his assistance in analyzing the survey data.

### Survey Results

**I am just beginning to learn how to use basic applications such as word processors and drill and practice software.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Agree	12.1% (11)	8.2% (6)
Disagree	87.9% (80)	91.7% (67)

Table 1. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 1. (*t* test,  $p=0.4193$ )

**I am familiar with a variety of applications and often require students to use technology to complete assignments.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Agree	62.2% (56)	69.9% (51)
Disagree	37.8% (34)	30.1% (22)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 2. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 2. (*t* test,  $p=0.307$ )

**I regularly use technology for collaboration, communication, and research and integrate these processes into classroom instruction.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Agree	60.7% (54)	75.3% (55)
Disagree	39.3% (35)	24.7% (18)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 3. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 3. (*t* test,  $p=0.0477$ )\*

**I use technology as a tool to craft curriculum and new teaching and learning techniques.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Agree	65.5% (59)	69.8% (51)
Disagree	34.4% (31)	30.1% (22)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 4. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 4. (*t* test,  $p=0.5594$ )

**To what extent do you currently incorporate computer technology into classroom instruction?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Frequently	24.4% (22)	34.7% (25)
Occasionally	38.9% (35)	38.8% (28)
Seldom	25.6% (23)	13.8% (10)
Never	11.1% (10)	12.5% (9)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 5. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 5. (Chi-square, p=0.2412)

**Insufficient technical equipment infrastructure (i.e., cables, routers, wiring) is a barrier to my incorporating computer technology into my classroom instruction (excluding Web-Based Instruction).**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	35.6% (32)	28.7% (21)
Agree	31.1% (28)	26.0% (19)
Disagree	21.1% (19)	21.9% (16)
Strongly Disagree	4.4% (4)	10.9% (8)
No Opinion	7.8% (7)	12.3% (9)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 6. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 6. (Chi-square, p=0.3902)

**Insufficient equipment (i.e., computers, servers) is a barrier to my incorporating computer technology into my classroom instruction (excluding Web-Based Instruction).**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	43.3% (39)	21.9% (16)
Agree	27.8% (25)	28.7% (21)
Disagree	21.1% (19)	26.0% (19)
Strongly Disagree	3.3% (3)	12.3% (9)
No Opinion	4.4% (4)	10.9% (8)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 7. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 7. (Chi-square, p=0.013)\*



**Insufficient technical support (i.e., technology administrators, etc.) is a barrier to my incorporating computer technology into my classroom instruction (excluding Web-Based Instruction).**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	35.6% (32)	7.0% (5)
Agree	34.4% (31)	27.3% (20)
Disagree	24.4% (22)	43.8% (32)
Strongly Disagree	1.1% (1)	8.2% (6)
No Opinion	4.4% (4)	10.9% (8)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 8. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 8. (Chi-square,  $p=0.00$ )\*\*

**Insufficient personal training on computer technology (excluding Web-Based Instruction) is a barrier to my incorporating computer technology into my classroom.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	12.2% (11)	9.5% (7)
Agree	34.4% (31)	17.8% (13)
Disagree	34.4% (31)	46.5% (34)
Strongly Disagree	14.4% (13)	16.4% (12)
No Opinion	4.4% (4)	8.2% (6)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 9. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 9. (Chi-square,  $p=0.1404$ )

**Do you currently incorporate Web-Based Instruction into your course work?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Frequently	6.7% (6)	20.5% (15)
Occasionally	21.1% (19)	28.7% (21)
Seldom	26.7% (24)	21.9% (16)
Never	45.6% (41)	28.7% (21)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 10. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 10. (Chi-square,  $p=0.035$ )\*

**Insufficient technical equipment infrastructure (i.e., cables, routers, wiring) is a barrier to my incorporating Web-Based Instruction into my classroom.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	36.0% (32)	21.7% (15)
Agree	25.8% (23)	24.6% (17)
Disagree	20.2% (18)	31.8% (22)
Strongly Disagree	3.4% (3)	7.2% (5)
No Opinion	13.5% (12)	14.4% (10)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 11. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 11. (Chi-square,  $p=0.2053$ )

**Insufficient equipment (i.e., computers, modems, servers) is a barrier to my incorporating Web-Based Instruction into my classroom.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	37.5% (33)	20.5% (16)
Agree	30.7% (27)	19.2% (15)
Disagree	18.2% (16)	28.2% (22)
Strongly Disagree	2.3% (2)	19.2% (15)
No Opinion	11.4% (10)	12.8% (10)
Missing	3 (-)	-

Table 12. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 12. (Chi-square,  $p=0.0006$ )\*\*

**Insufficient technical support (i.e., technology administrators, webmasters, etc.) is a barrier to my incorporating Web-Based Instruction into my classroom.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	34.1% (30)	10.0% (7)
Agree	30.7% (27)	28.5% (20)
Disagree	21.6% (19)	40.0% (28)
Strongly Disagree	1.1% (1)	7.1% (5)
No Opinion	12.5% (11)	14.2% (10)
Missing	3 (-)	-

Table 13. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 13. (Chi-square,  $p=0.0013$ )\*\*

**Insufficient personal training on Web-Based Instruction is a barrier to my incorporating Web-Based Instruction into my classroom.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Strongly Agree	20.5% (18)	15.7% (11)
Agree	38.6% (34)	22.8% (16)
Disagree	21.6% (19)	40.0% (28)
Strongly Disagree	9.1% (8)	8.5% (6)
No Opinion	10.2% (9)	12.8% (9)
Missing	3 (-)	-

Table 14. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 14. (Chi-square,  $p=0.0833$ )

**To what extent do you use word processors?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	96.7% (88)	95.7% (68)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	1.1% (1)	1.4% (1)
Less than once a year	1.1% (1)	-
Never	1.1% (1)	2.8% (2)

Table 15. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 15. ( $p=0.6938$ )

**To what extent do you use spreadsheets?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	49.5% (45)	57.5% (42)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	8.8% (8)	4.1% (3)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	8.8% (8)	8.2% (6)
Less than once a year	7.7% (7)	9.5% (7)
Never	25.3% (23)	20.5% (15)

Table 16. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 16. (Chi-square,  $p=0.6627$ )

### To what extent do you use presentation software?

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	31.9% (29)	40.9% (27)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	17.6% (16)	13.6% (9)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	13.2% (12)	9.0% (6)
Less than once a year	8.8% (8)	9.0% (6)
Never	28.6% (26)	27.2% (18)

Table 17. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 17. (Chi-square,  $p=0.7656$ )

### To what extent do you use Web publishing software?

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	25.3% (23)	31.9% (23)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	4.4% (4)	11.1% (8)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	16.5% (15)	12.5% (9)
Less than once a year	12.1% (11)	5.5% (4)
Never	41.8% (38)	38.8% (28)

Table 18. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 18. (Chi-square,  $p=0.242$ )

### To what extent do you use software for collaborative work (NetMeeting, C-U-See Me, Lotus Notes, etc.)?

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	12.1% (11)	11.2% (8)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	3.3% (3)	4.2% (3)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	3.3% (3)	4.2% (3)
Less than once a year	2.2% (2)	12.6% (9)
Never	79.1% (72)	67.6% (48)

Table 19. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 19. (Chi-square,  $p=0.1175$ )

**To what extent do you use research resources (CD-ROM or on-line resources)?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	68.9% (62)	75.3% (55)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	12.2% (11)	9.5% (7)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	7.8% (7)	2.7% (2)
Less than once a year	1.1% (1)	4.1% (3)
Never	10.0% (9)	8.2% (6)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 20. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 20. (Chi-square, p=0.4121)

**To what extent do you require your students to use word processors?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	53.3% (48)	57.5% (42)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	24.4% (22)	19.1% (14)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	5.6% (5)	9.5% (7)
Less than once a year	1.1% (1)	-
Never	15.6% (14)	13.6% (10)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 21. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 21. (Chi-square, p=0.657)

**To what extent do you require your students to use spreadsheets?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	5.6% (5)	9.7% (7)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	6.7% (6)	9.7% (7)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	7.8% (7)	2.7% (2)
Less than once a year	8.9% (8)	6.9% (5)
Never	71.1% (64)	70.8% (51)

Table 22. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 22. (Chi-square, p=0.4945)

**To what extent do you require your students to use presentation software?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	14.4% (13)	15.0% (11)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	10.0% (96)	6.8% (5)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	12.2% (11)	10.9% (8)
Less than once a year	3.3% (3)	5.4% (4)
Never	60.0% (54)	61.6% (45)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 23. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 23. (Chi-square, p=0.9125)

**To what extent do you require your students to use Web publishing software?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	3.4% (3)	1.3% (1)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	5.6% (5)	2.7% (2)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	2.2% (2)	4.1% (3)
Less than once a year	2.2% (2)	2.7% (2)
Never	86.5% (77)	89.0% (65)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 24. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 24. (Chi-square, p=0.7471)

**To what extent do you require your students to use software for collaborative work (NetMeeting, C-U-See Me, Lotus Notes, etc.)?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	6.7% (6)	8.2% (6)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	1.1% (1)	5.4% (4)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	7.9% (7)	1.3% (1)
Less than once a year	1.1% (1)	2.7% (2)
Never	83.1% (74)	82.1% (60)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 25. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 25. (Chi-square, p=0.1598)

**To what extent do you require your students to use research resources (CD-ROM or On-line resources)?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
At least once a month	37.1% (33)	41.0% (30)
Less than once a month but at least in three months	15.7% (14)	21.9% (16)
Less than once in three months but at least once a year	14.6% (13)	16.4% (12)
Less than once a year	4.5% (4)	2.7% (2)
Never	28.1% (25)	17.8% (13)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 26. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 26. (Chi-square, p=0.5211)

**I \_\_\_\_\_ use e-mail as a part of classroom instruction.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Frequently	24.7% (22)	31.5% (23)
Occasionally	20.2% (18)	24.6% (18)
Seldom	15.7% (14)	20.5% (15)
Never	38.2% (34)	23.2% (17)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 27. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 27. (Chi-square, p=0.2248)

**I \_\_\_\_\_ use bulletin boards as a part of classroom instruction.**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Frequently	5.6% (5)	12.1% (9)
Occasionally	7.9% (7)	12.1% (9)
Seldom	10.1% (9)	14.8% (11)
Never	75.3% (67)	60.8% (45)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 28. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 28. (Chi-square, p=0.1919)

I \_\_\_\_\_ use list servers as a part of classroom instruction.

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Frequently	5.7% (5)	4.1% (3)
Occasionally	10.2% (9)	13.8% (10)
Seldom	78.4% (69)	5.5% (4)
Never	5.7% (5)	76.3% (55)
Missing	3 (-)	-

Table 29. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 29. (Chi-square, p=0.000)\*\*

I \_\_\_\_\_ use chat lines as a part of classroom instruction.

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Frequently	1.1% (1)	5.4% (4)
Occasionally	5.7% (5)	6.7% (5)
Seldom	87.5% (77)	6.7% (5)
Never	5.7% (5)	81.0% (60)
Missing	3 (-)	-

Table 30. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 30. (Chi-square, p=0.000)\*\*

**What is your first preference for receiving training in the use of computer technology?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Workshops provided by designated faculty/professional trainer	53.3% (48)	56.5% (39)
Self-paced tutorial	20.0% (18)	18.8% (13)
One-on-one instruction	26.7% (24)	24.6% (17)
Missing	1 (-)	-

Table 31. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 31. (Chi-square, p= 0.92)



**To what extent are you interested in incorporating computer technology in your classes?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Very much	64.8% (57)	56.5% (39)
Somewhat	23.9% (21)	24.6% (17)
A little	9.1% (8)	14.4% (10)
Not at all	2.3% (2)	4.3% (3)
Missing	3 (-)	-

Table 32. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 32. (Chi-square, p=0.5834)

**Do you receive encouragement from your institution to integrate computer technology into classroom instruction?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Yes	89.8% (79)	83.5% (60)
No	10.2% (9)	16.6% (12)
Missing	3 (-)	-

Table 33. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 33. (*t* test, p=0.23)

**My gender is**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Male	51.7% (46)	45.7% (32)
Female	48.3% (43)	54.2% (38)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 34. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 34. (*t* test, p=0.4546)

**The number of years I have been in college teaching is**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
0	5.6% (6)	2.6% (2)
1-5	31.5% (28)	20.0% (15)
6-10	22.5% (20)	26.6% (20)
11-15	11.2% (10)	28.0% (21)
16-20	12.4% (11)	9.3% (7)
21-25	7.9% (7)	2.6% (2)
Over 25	9.0% (8)	10.6% (8)
Missing	2 (-)	-

Table 35. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 35. (Chi-square, p= 0.0696)\*

**My primary teaching area is**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Social & Behavioral Sciences	7.0% (6)	10.7% (7)
Humanities	25.8% (22)	33.8% (22)
Science/Mathematics	48.8% (42)	40.0% (26)
Business	2.3% (2)	4.6% (3)
Education	4.7% (4)	3.0% (2)
Not listed above	11.6% (10)	7.6% (5)
Missing	5 (-)	-

Table 36. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 36. (Chi-square, p= 0.62)

**What area, if any, is your secondary teaching area?**

<i>Response</i>	<i>1998 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>	<i>2001 Frequency (Number of responses)</i>
Social & Behavioral Sciences	2.3% (2)	2.8% (2)
Humanities	9.3% (8)	1.4% (1)
Science/Mathematics	4.7% (4)	10.1% (7)
Business	3.5% (3)	1.4% (1)
Education	7.0% (6)	5.7% (4)
Not listed above	16.3% (14)	4.3% (3)
I do not have a secondary teaching area.	57.0% (49)	73.9% (51)
Missing	5 (-)	-

Table 37. 1998 and 2001 technology survey data, question 37. (Chi-square, p= 0.0413)\*

# Teaching and Learning with Web Course Management Systems:

## *A Case Study at Xavier University of Louisiana*



### Executive Summary

In March 2000, Xavier University's Center for the Advancement of Teaching invited proposals from all faculty members to participate in a case study aimed at the two questions concerning Web course management systems (WCMS):

1. As regards teaching and learning, what are the advantages and disadvantages of WCMS?
2. How do WCMS change, if in fact they do, the teaching and learning process?

The case study also provided the University community an opportunity to examine Web course management systems in order that it might determine "best practices" of WCMS and the type of institutional support that is needed to integrate WCMS into the teaching and learning process. Furthermore, the case study offered an opportunity to examine related policy issues that may affect the University and its faculty and students.

In summer 2000, six faculty members participated in the case study and developed on-line components of their courses using WCMS such as WebCT, eCollege, Anlon, and Blackboard. The Center hosted a summer-long seminar for the faculty members to assist them in course design and development. The faculty members participated in face-to-face meetings and on-line activities using the on-line seminar resources, which were delivered using an eCollege seminar website. The courses taught by these faculty members were offered during the 2000-2001 academic year.

A report was written for the entire University community, with particular attention given to faculty and administration. In it, we address three primary results of the case study:

1. The "lessons learned"
2. A short list of recommendations
3. Brief consideration of possible issues of policy of particular relevance to faculty and administrators.

Individual faculty members contributed narratives that provide a sense of their experiences using the WCMS. We've also included an analysis of data that we gleaned from surveys of students and faculty.

And finally, we have a RealVideo tour that offers you a visual walk-through of the eCollege website we developed for the faculty involved in the project. This website served as the focal point during for helping faculty think through issues of technology and pedagogy, and plan the on-line components of their courses.

Materials are on-line at <http://www.xula.edu/Adminstrative/cat/facdev/xuwcms/>

# Course Portfolio Working Group

## ***Request for Proposals***

All university faculty members are invited to participate during the 2001-2002 academic year in a course portfolio working group (CPWG). Since 1997, more than 45 Xavier faculty members have developed course portfolios with grant support from the Center for the Advancement of Teaching. A \$500 stipend per semester is available to CPWG participants.

A course portfolio is a coherent set of materials related to a particular course. It is not simply a collection of teaching materials, but a scholarly project reflecting the choices an instructor makes in designing, implementing, and evaluating a course. As noted by one faculty member, “The purpose of the course portfolio is to provide a vehicle for inquiry and reflection into the teaching and learning process.” The portfolio may be Web-based.

Dr. David Lanoue, Professor of English and a member of the first course portfolio working group, will coordinate the efforts of the CPWG during the 2001-2002 academic year.

If you are interested in participating in this project, please submit a letter of interest to the Center by Friday, September 7, 2001. Please send a copy of this letter to your department chair. You may drop the letter off at the Center (Library Room 534) or send it via campus mail (P.O. Box 73A) or e-mail at [cat@xula.edu](mailto:cat@xula.edu).

Only the first 5 faculty members who submit letters of interest will be funded—we encourage you to submit your letter as soon as possible!

Funded faculty must submit progress and final reports, portions of which will be posted on the Center’s website. If you have questions, contact the Center at [cat@xula.edu](mailto:cat@xula.edu) or Todd Stanislav at ext. 7512 or [tstanisl@xula.edu](mailto:tstanisl@xula.edu).