

## President's Letter

### Nancy Thibeault, President

The 2002 ASCUE Conference, "Exploring the Impact of Technology on Teaching and Learning," in Myrtle Beach last June 9-13, was a great success! A wide variety of attendee presentations, pre-conference workshops, roundtable discussions, and a thought-provoking keynote speaker provided stimulation for continued discussion, sharing, and learning among all the conferees. The beautiful environs of Ocean Creek Resort and Myrtle Beach enhanced everyone's stay. If you were unable to join us last June, we trust that you will make every effort to be there for ASCUE's 36<sup>th</sup> annual meeting, June 8-12, 2003 at Ocean Creek Resort and Conference Center. Mark your calendars now!

The ASCUE Board met in late September to work and to begin planning next year's conference. Your ASCUE Board is a dedicated, hard working group. I have fully enjoyed working with them

over the past five years. Using the feedback received in the conference evaluations, the Board is making every effort to integrate a number of valuable ideas and suggestions into the next conference.

ASCUE has maintained the same, reasonable conference fees for next year. The registration fee (which includes annual membership) will still be \$200, all-day pre-conference workshops will be \$100, and half-day pre-conference workshops will be \$50. We are working on the details of the workshop topics, as we consider the feedback obtained from the evaluations. Ocean Creek Resort pricing is holding steady as well, with minimal changes in the cost of lodging. Ocean Creek representatives assure us that our conference rates will be 10% less than regular prices.

As you visit the ASCUE organization web site, you will soon notice that it has a new look and feel. The overall layout and presentation of the site is being redesigned.

Email addresses on the site ([www.ascue.org](http://www.ascue.org)) that will be of help to you are:

[conference@ascue.org](mailto:conference@ascue.org) Program  
Chair Barry Smith  
[newsletter@ascue.org](mailto:newsletter@ascue.org) Newsletter  
Editor Peter Smith  
[memberatlarge@ascue.org](mailto:memberatlarge@ascue.org) Board  
Members at Large, David  
Frace and George Pyo  
[president@ascue.org](mailto:president@ascue.org) President  
Nancy Thibeault  
[websitecoordinator@ascue.org](mailto:websitecoordinator@ascue.org)  
Web Site Coordinator  
Carol Smith

The ASCUE Board would like to encourage the membership to make greater use of our listserv, ASCUE-L. It provides a great vehicle for asking questions, sharing solutions, and staying in touch with conference attendees. To subscribe, send a message to [listserv@gettysburg.edu](mailto:listserv@gettysburg.edu) with *SUBSCRIBE ASCUE-L yourname* in the body of the message.

**Letter – continued on page 2**

### ASCUE 2003

June 8 - 12, 2003  
Ocean Creek Resort  
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina  
Dress is Resort Casual

### Highlights

President's Letter	1
Technology Workshop	2
ASCUE '02 Roundtable	4
ASCUE '03 Call for Papers	7

## Letter (continued from page 1)

Again, I hope you are planning to join us at the 36<sup>th</sup> Annual ASCUE Conference, June 8-12, 2003. The 2003 conference program chair is Barry Smith from Baptist Bible College, and the call for papers will be announced soon. I encourage you to consider presenting a paper or participating in a panel discussion. As you think of ideas for topics please feel free to contact Barry at [conference@ascue.org](mailto:conference@ascue.org) or [bcsmith@bbc.edu](mailto:bcsmith@bbc.edu).

Have a great year! I'm looking forward to seeing all of you in Myrtle Beach in June!!

...Nancy.

## Exploring the Impact of Technology on Teaching and Learning

**Workshop facilitated by David Brown. Notes taken by Peter Smith and Mary Connolly, Saint Mary's College**

This workshop focused on using the Five C strategy which was formulated by Dr. Brown from the results of a survey he organized involving the provosts of the 31 most wired colleges in the country. Each provost nominated their 3 most active faculty members to respond to the survey, for a total of 93 respondents. The five C's are Communication-Interaction, Collaboration-Teams, Controversy-Debate, Customization-Diversity, and Consultants-Adjuncts.

The survey revealed that 91 of the 93 respondents said that interaction between students and faculty, students and students, faculty and faculty was the most critical issue facing college teaching today. Wake Forest has changed the emphasis in its faculty development workshops from teaching elementary software (which faculty could learn on their own) to exploring educational philosophy (which was too varied, controversial, and high level) to examining strategies for improving teaching and learning. All of these strategies refer to individualization, customization, or interaction.

**Workshop – Continued on Page 3**

## ASCUE Board Members

**President Nancy Thibeault**  
Sinclair Community College  
444 West Third St.  
Dayton, OH 45402  
937-512-2926  
[nthibeau@sinclair.edu](mailto:nthibeau@sinclair.edu)

**Past President Fred Jenny**  
Grove City College  
100 Campus Drive  
Grove City, PA 16127-2104  
724-458-2071  
[fjjenny@gcc.edu](mailto:fjjenny@gcc.edu)

**Program Chair Barry Smith**  
Baptist Bible College  
538 Venard Rd.  
Clarks Summit, PA 18411  
570-586-2400  
[bcsmith@bbc.edu](mailto:bcsmith@bbc.edu)

**Treasurer Thomas Pollack**  
Duquesne University  
706 Rockwell Hall  
Pittsburgh, PA 15282  
412-396-1639  
[pollack@duq.edu](mailto:pollack@duq.edu)

**Secretary Kim Breighner**  
Gettysburg College  
Gettysburg, PA 17325  
717-337-6932  
[kbreighn@gettysburg.edu](mailto:kbreighn@gettysburg.edu)

**Newsletter Editor Peter Smith**  
Saint Mary's College  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
574-289-2126  
[psmith@saintmarys.edu](mailto:psmith@saintmarys.edu)

**Historian/Local Arrangements Jack Cundiff**  
Horry-Georgetown Technical College  
Box 1966, Conway, SC 29526  
803-347-3186  
[cundiffj@sccoast.net](mailto:cundiffj@sccoast.net)

### Board Members At Large

**David E. Frace**  
Community College of Baltimore County  
7201 Rossville Blvd D-11  
Baltimore, MD 21237  
[dfrace@ccebcmd.edu](mailto:dfrace@ccebcmd.edu)

**George Pyo**  
Saint Francis College  
Loretto, PA 15940  
814-472-3241  
[gpvo@sfcpa.edu](mailto:gpvo@sfcpa.edu)

**Equipment Coordinator Hollis Townsend**  
Young Harris College  
P.O. Box 160  
Young Harris, GA 30582  
706-379-3111 x 5210  
[hollist@yhc.edu](mailto:hollist@yhc.edu)

**Web Site Coordinator Carol Smith**  
DePauw University  
Greencastle, IN 46135  
768-658-4287  
[clsmith@depauw.edu](mailto:clsmith@depauw.edu)

## **Workshop – Continued from Page 2**

The communication issues mentioned included the use of email rather than web announcements via Blackboard to inform students about changed assignments, etc., or to solicit feedback about what students thought were the muddiest points in the lecture. Dr. Brown made frequent use of the one-minute quiz in a Blackboard chat session to which all students respond, testing their understanding of what was just presented. He keeps a chat session going all during each class so that students can send comments on the lecture or activity to each other and he can monitor the discussion.

Dr. Brown also makes student work available via the web to everyone in the class, including his comments on the work. If students are not comfortable with this, he recommends that they drop the course. Most students soon find this collaboration helpful and get some good suggestions from their peers to improve the work. In fact, all papers must be reviewed by two other class members and an alumnus volunteer before being submitted for grading. To encourage conscientious review, 50% of the grade on the assignment is based on the quality of the paper and the other 50% on the quality of the reviews that students have done for their peers. Each reviewer uses a different color so their comments can be tracked. When Dr. Brown did a survey asking each student to name the three most helpful students, he failed to discern a pattern until he turned the data over to the students to examine. They hypothesized that each student had chosen the three others whose rooms were closest to the room of the student being surveyed as the most helpful. It appeared that they did not use the computer to ask for help.

When the participants in the workshop were asked for ways to increase communication that were not available before widespread use of the computer, the following suggestions were made:

- Have each student partner with another student and exchange information early in the course.
- Use learning journals and share the entries with everyone in the class.
- Create class website using information from each student but set up by a class webmaster.
- Start a discussion thread using a student autobiography.

- In a CS course, have one team act out the programming solution created by another team.
- Have each student give a 10 minute portfolio presentation. It is useful to create a template for a student portfolio if one requires them.
- Sit in a circle.
- Get student images using an inexpensive video camera directly hooked to a classroom computer, print the images, have students go around and get the name and interesting facts about each student, and then a week later give them the pictures in the form of a quiz to write the name and information connected to each picture.
- Put the pictures of each student in the syllabus. The drawback of this plan is the download time. Also, students did not check the syllabus for changes like they should have.

Dr. Brown mentioned that when he visits other colleges he likes to ask students at random to identify themselves. These identifiers usually change over the course of their college career. Some students use their residence hall or fraternity/sorority as an identifier. Others used the organizations or volunteer activities in which they were engaged. As they approached graduation they used their major or future job as the primary identifier.

In response to a question about how to get students to get more involved in discussion boards, one faculty member mentioned the success she is having with the latest version of Dragon Naturally Speaking. She is able to get the software to handle spoken text at 180 words per minute with 99% accuracy. Thus, students would not have to type to respond to discussions. In larger classes, students can be separated into permanent teams and each team is responsible for responding to the discussion question. This cuts down on the amount of work the students and faculty member have to read. It is important to put yourself in each group if you use Blackboard's discussion board so you will have access to the group's interaction.

The second "C" was Collaboration. Peer to peer collaboration is becoming more common. In one discipline, a group of 13 faculty attending a conference **Workshop—Continued on page 4**

### **Workshop—Continued from page 3**

found that they were all teaching essentially the same course. Each prepared sophisticated web-based lessons for one week of the course and shared them with the others.

Student collaboration is greatly enhanced if the school requires or encourages the use of laptops. Students bring their laptops to class and group meetings, thus helping them to work together. Some departments are putting the lectures and academic resources of all faculty members in a common database.

In response to a question about ways in which faculty are encouraging students to collaborate and improve learning as a consequence of widespread use of computers, the following ideas were suggested:

- Have two or three students read ahead in the textbook and prepare a summary and answers to questions for the rest of the class and rotate this assignment over all class members.
- Bring the department together to affirm that collaboration is a value and have the faculty members model this collaboration to students.
- Bring support staff into this departmental collaboration – i.e. avoid one-on-one help sessions if several members have the same problems.
- Overcome the anonymity of online courses by using groups who get together either online or face-to-face.
- Have students read and comment on each other's work online.
- Give students their own workspace in proximity with other students in the department so they will work next to each other.
- Create a science-like model with students helping senior researchers with their experiments. This can be done via a group-owned web site.
- Provide shared space on the server for students and faculty. This may not be possible in this age of heightened security.

The third “C” – Controversy and Debate -- can be accomplished using cross-cultural projects (e.g. show the film “3 Men and a Baby” in French to a U.S. class

and in English to a French class and have them exchange reactions. Cultural divisions will come to the fore very quickly.) Other ideas are to cut out lectures, making them available on the web and expecting students to view them before class, and using class time for debate and discussion; engage students in threaded discussion; keep a running chat session going in class (students minds are wandering – let them wander on topic); using a double jeopardy quiz – i.e., an online quiz to which the responses to each question challenge both right and wrong answers. Then let the students take the quiz again.

The fourth “C” – Customization and Diversity -- can be facilitated by the use of cybershows (PowerPoint slides from the class online where they can be viewed over and over if desired); sending a personal note to each student once a week; utilizing a hierarchy of help process where all questions are funneled to a student assistant who answers what he can and forwards the rest to a grad student who repeats the process until only the hardest questions reach the professor; gather feedback on the “muddiest” points to allow for just-in-time teaching; contact students before the first class by email and keep in touch with them after the course ends; survey students at start of class about why they are there and work to achieve buy-in; use mid-course assessment instruments several times to discover what is working for them and what can be improved and how to make the improvement; elect three representatives to meet with the teacher every two weeks.

The final “C” – Consultants/Adjuncts – involves using experts or colleagues in remote locations to interact with the class online; ask students from previous semesters to act as consultants.

### **Roundtable Discussion: Campus Information Technologies**

**John Anderson, Loras College and  
Kathy Decker, Clarke College**

ABSTRACT: (Technology Center management issues including but not limited to: collaborative ventures, partnerships, IP telephony, wireless technologies, PDAs, document sharing and management, resource  
**Roundtable – Continued on page 5**

## **Roundtable – Continued from page 4**

scheduling, administrative web applications, enterprise systems, software maintenance costs, financial aid changes, security and privacy, storage systems, disaster planning, personnel management, project management, support services, distance education, and funding IT. We will entertain other topics from the audience as requested. We want to discuss what others are doing and what concerns there are that we may not have noticed yet.)

We began the roundtable with a list from Casey Green's "The Campus Computing Project" top issues and began discussion on the top eight ending with the topic of wireless and security.

### **Administrative Systems and Student Access –**

Interfacing the web with your administrative software system led to a discussion on issues of "buy or build," costs associated with each method, time commitment of webmaster/web development team, and benefits especially in the area of Enrollment Management. It seemed that most colleges have bought an administrative web solution rather than build their own.

Some institutions are working on the web interface process through a consortium of institutions to share expenses. Enrollment management benefits were cited as the major issue in winning institutional support. Everyone is using the web interface differently, but most try to keep things as simple as possible. Products should be sized properly and based on the needs of the institution. You don't want to get in the situation of the "tail wagging the dog" where the product dictates how it is to be used. One institution had a consulting group investigate what "real" student needs are... probably with surprising results. Anything you do with the web will change the way you do business... as much as changing administrative software systems.

**IT Funding –** Funding issues included budget "surprises:" vendors dropping support for products, equipment such as servers becoming cheaper (but not personnel). Technology fees were discussed: who charges, how fees are set, and then used within the institutions. A poll of technology fees showed 6 at \$50 or less, 4 between \$50 and \$100, 6 between \$100 and \$250, and 2 between \$250 and \$500 per semester. Some schools talked about state-sponsored programs

providing technology grants (Maryland schools). Planning and providing that plan to funding sources is crucial to receive grants or special funding. Many colleges lease most of their equipment because it is easier to manage and refreshes technology on a regular basis. Some pointed out that technology is not a capital expense, but an operating one, and is usually the first thing that gets cut when budgets are trimmed. It is good if you can cut deals with vendors to buy equipment in bulk and obtain special financial deals to smooth out the budgeting process. Some of the laptop schools detailed some of the special issues involved in having so many institution-provided computers on campus. There was some talk about special selling plans for computers on individual college campuses.

### **Faculty Development –**

Training needs seem to hit all at once and then drop off quickly. It always seems to be a "just in time" issue making resource planning very difficult, both financially and when committing personnel time. Usually it takes about 2 years to saturate the user base with Microsoft training. Faculty training fellow faculty helps them understand from an academic point of view how the use of the software integrates into their particular coursework. Technology should be used to help faculty refresh their knowledge, even in subject areas. We discussed strategies on how to encourage faculty to learn and use course management tools. About  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the institutions represented were Blackboard and about  $\frac{1}{4}$  were WebCT. There was talk about TLC (Teachers Learning Centers).

### **IT Staffing –**

Issues discussed were which area does the web master report to, compromises necessary to be able to afford staff and staff training, and the role tech departments play in customer service and leadership on campus. The Webmaster reporting structure and how the position has evolved in recent years consumed the biggest part of the discussion. Polling the group gave the following results; about half work in IT, about  $\frac{1}{4}$  in public relations, and the rest are shared. Only a few colleges represented have multiple web people, but it appears the trend is for multiple web personnel. Some suggested involving students in web design projects. On the issue of staff and staff training most everyone agreed on placing a higher priority on training especially when hiring from within the institution. In order to hire

**Roundtable – Continued on page 6**

### **Roundtable – Continued from page 5**

and retain tech staff, it was felt that we need to stress quality of life over money. Time off appears to be cheaper than many other benefits. Advice given on outsourcing indicates it can be good if kept on a specific level, but you must be careful not to outsource control over your operation. A few schools are downsizing and this may be coming for more, as budgets get tight.

**Distance Education** – Issues included discussion of collaboration, bandwidth, improved uses and products, and access. There appears to be some collaboration between similar institutions such as seminaries using each other’s personnel for on-line courses. Problems can occur when you do not utilize the same calendar and policies. Typically less-compressed video is being used today as bandwidth has increased. Things seem to be used much more properly than initially in distance education. This issue was very hot five years ago, but has cooled down drastically today. Most course management products set everything up, reducing the need for as much specialized training. Some institutions charge more and some charge less for on-line classes and usually fees are dropped. Many use distance education for summer courses only. Some limit access to distance education courses by age.

**Teaching/Learning Strategies** – There are still a number of available grants for innovative use of technology in the classroom. Teaching Learning Technology Roundtables (TLTR) focus on teacher workshops. Many techniques were mentioned, some of which are:

- audio/visual computer training
- faculty development labs/lounge
- specialized faculty servers
- get people to participate by baiting with food, stipends, and peer pressure
- target interest groups
- one-to-one personal assistance sessions
- have faculty teach technology classes/seminars
- faculty laptops (few)

**IT Strategic Plan** – Some time was spent talking about faculty representation in this planning process. Many feel that faculty are not concerned about strategic planning, but become alarmed when there is a problem. Some were concerned about the use or non-use of an IT Strategic Plan. It is not always obvious that the strategic plan is actually used in planning the budget, read after the initial release, and then updated on a regular basis.

**Online Student Services** – Make it available and the students will love it! It usually results in great communication for faculty and staff as well. Many institutions truly believe that you can lose enrollment when not providing a “forward-looking” image to current and potential students. Someone mentioned that every college administrator should look at the EDUCAUSE pamphlet available on what parents and students should ask about a potential college. Few schools have apparently purchased portals, mainly because of concerns about single authentication and procedures for distribution. Who maintains logins, passwords, PINs, etc.? Do you reset the login information to the original? Do you allow students to change their own information? How do you verify accuracy? Can this be useful and valuable in keeping in touch with students? Student advising is a major issue on most campuses and how technology fits into the picture is not the same in any two institutions. Do you replace personal advising for on-line advising? Some have set up an automated check list for students in advising and degree audit. Some have “see your advisor” week and some have advisors actually entering registration with the advisee. Others indicate a release flag so students can enter their own registration. Most schools use the faculty advisor model.

**Wireless and Security** – In this area we talked about wireless access, technology centers, need for network security personnel, and virus handling and prevention. This led to further discussion about security in general, until we once again ran out of time with too many issues and too little time.

# CALL FOR PAPERS, TUTORIALS AND PANEL PRESENTATIONS

## 2003 Annual ASCUE Summer conference

Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

June 8 – 12, 2003

*“Collaborating, Communicating and Connecting Using Technology in Education”*

The Association of Small Computer Users in Education, ASCUE, is seeking proposals from faculty and staff for presentations at its 36<sup>th</sup> Annual Summer Conference. Proposals should focus on issues in information technology that are of general interest to educational institutions. Proposals on any relevant topic are acceptable, but those that support the conference theme, **“Collaborating, Communicating, and Connecting Using Technology in Education,”** are particularly welcome.

### Session Format

Session presentations are limited to 45 minutes, including time set aside for audience questions and engagement. They can be in traditional paper, panel, demonstration, or tutorial format. Presentations will be printed in the Conference Proceedings that are distributed at the conference and submitted to the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) for inclusion in the ERIC database.

### Pre-Conference Workshops and Seminars

In addition to presenters for the main conference program, we are seeking individuals to lead full-day (six hour) or half-day (three hour) workshops or seminars for the pre-conference program on Sunday, June 8. The workshops, held in computer labs at Horry-Georgetown Technical College, provide hands-on learning with specific technologies such as the Web or multimedia. Seminars are classroom-style presentations, held at Ocean Creek, that explore important topics in the application of educational technologies. These workshops and seminars have been very successful at past conferences and help set the tone for the conference.

### Suggested Topics include . . .

**Teaching & Learning:** Collaborative and Web course hosting software, distance learning, impact of technology on faculty and students, increasing student engagement via technology, building and sustaining learning communities, assessment of student learning in technology-enhanced and distance learning classes, standards compliant course designs, technology-integration models, open source courses, technology and tenure, information technology and the library, ownership of materials, technology classrooms and labs, department labs, copyrights, lessons learned, and faculty recruitment.

**Institutional Infrastructure & Services:** Portals, strategies for information integration, corporate competition, IT-24-7, residential network support, security issues, virus protection, Web impact, faculty and student access, IT and admissions, wireless access, laptop initiatives, IT organization/reorganization, IT and strategic planning, information systems, upgrade strategies and timing, and tools of the trade.

**Support and Training:** Faculty-staff-student training, staff turnover, IT staff professional development, help desk issues, outsourcing, student assistants/employees/interns, public labs, tools

**Campus Communication:** Intranets, email, homepages, video-conferencing, changes to traditional processes (alumni, admissions, PR), policy issues, standards, application of new technologies, tools (e.g., push technologies, calendars).

**Operating Systems:** Windows XP, Linux and open systems architecture.

**Formats:** Papers Panel Discussions Software Demonstrations Tutorials Workshops

### Submitting a Proposal

We invite you to become a part of this dynamic conference. Submit a proposal for a session presentation, demonstration, or workshop by completing the online form at [www.ascue.org](http://www.ascue.org) before **January 18, 2003**.