



## **Faculty Instruction, Development, and Technology Survey Report**

Spring 2007

Prepared by

Lisa Rodriguez, Ph.D.,

Director and Assistant Professor  
Center for Teaching and Learning  
University of La Verne

With assistance from Aghop Der-Karabetian, Ph.D.,  
Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
and  
Laura Bava and Kristen Masters, Psy.D. Candidates &  
Heidi Saad, MBA Student

## **Executive Summary**

**Purpose:** The intent of the survey was to gauge faculty attitudes, needs, and experiences with instructional technologies, classroom equipment, professional development services, and the course management system, Blackboard.

**Design:** The 15 question survey addressed general computing, instructional practices, and satisfaction with campus technology. It was distributed via email only to the full-time faculty in the Fall of 2005 with a 44% response rate and to the part-time faculty in the Spring of 2006 with a 29% response rate.

## **Key Findings**

Positive areas:

- Faculty members, both full and part time, intend to seek training and continue using instructional technologies in teaching despite personal or institutional barriers of level of expertise, time, funding, prestige, or credit towards tenure and promotion.
- Part time faculty members are enthusiastic about Blackboard training offered at the regional campuses.

Needs areas:

- Faculty have expressed interest in, and might benefit from, further professional development and best practices for producing and incorporating web-page development, online discussion forums, research with technology, and multimedia in their curricula.
- The CTL is challenged with offering workshops for professional development which meet both the time and level of instructional need for faculty.
- Encouragement from academic departments to incorporate technology into teaching & time to develop new methods.
- A move away from PowerPoint replacing lecture, e.g. more meaningful use of the software.
- Individualized training is needed, namely for discipline specific academic technologies with varying expertise levels offered by the CTL.

## **Action Recommendations**

- Part-time faculty expressed concern over lack of smart carts at the regional campuses. However, as of the completion of this report, the RCA has addressed the need by providing one smart cart for every classroom at the regional campus sites.
- Continue installation of smart classrooms by the CTL and OIT until 100% of learning spaces are finished. This goal is estimated to be accomplished by Fall 2007. Continue to standardize and/or simplify equipment in response to faculty feedback and ADA compliance.
- The CTL will work closely and collaboratively with the Provost's Office, Office of Information Technology and Faculty Technology Committee with input from the Library,

Copyright, and Assessment committees respectively, to devise a strategic plan for instructional technology at ULV for the period of 2006-2010.

- Prepare commensurate student survey to align academic technology plans with student learning needs. Continue more specific self-study of technology infusion across the ULV learning community.

## Purpose

The intent of the survey was to gauge faculty attitudes, needs, and experiences with instructional technologies, classroom equipment, professional development services, and the course management system, Blackboard.

## Methodology

The 15 questions of the survey were selected and modified from existing publicly available measures. The survey was distributed via email only to the full-time faculty in the Fall of 2005 and to the part-time faculty in the Spring of 2006. Respondents:

- 84 full-time faculty responded; (44%) of 189 total identified
- 189 part-time faculty responded; (29%) of 646 total identified
- The majority of full-time faculty respondents were full and Associate Professors
- The majority of part-time respondents were adjunct Professors and Instructors

See appendix A for the full instrument. Qualitative theme tables follow quantitative tables and address open response questions where applicable.

## Findings

### Question 1) Role at the University

Table 1: Position of full and part-time faculty at ULV

	FT (n=82) skipped question = 2 %	PT (n= 189) skipped question = 0 %
Professor	46	0
Associate Professor	36	0
Assistant Professor	17	0
Lecturer	2	0
Senior Adjunct Professor	0	13
Adjunct Professor	0	28
Adjunct Instructor	0	51
Other	0	9

### Question 2) College Affiliation

Table 2 : College and program affiliation with ULV

	FT (n=82) (skipped question = 2) %	PT (n=187) (skipped question = 2) %
Arts and Sciences	52	20
Business and Public Management	23	27
Education and Organizational [Management] [Sic] <i>Leadership</i>	23	32
Law	5	.5
Continuing Education (Now RCA)	0	26

Numbers for part-time faculty don't equal N for that group because some chose to identify with more than one college.

### Frequency of and Type of Use – *Now and Future*

(Questions 3 & 5)

Question 3) Frequency of use this semester: (Scale = not at all, at least once this semester, once this month, a few times per month, once per week, a few times a week, once per day, more than once per day)

Table 3: Frequency of use of technology in the current semester by full and part-time Faculty

Uses	FT (n= 79) (skipped question = 5) <b>Frequently</b> (A few times/week, once/day, more than once/day) %	PT (n= 182) (skipped question = 7) <b>Frequently</b> (A few times/week, once/day, more than once/day) %
	Email	98
WWW	99	77
Word processing	99	83
PowerPoint presentations	54	29
Research with technology	62	44
Webpage development and self-maintenance	12	10
Blackboard	40	19
Online discussion forums	29	11
Digital audio/video	25	18
VHS video	20	10
Smart classroom technologies	53	13

For full-time faculty, Email, the Web, and Word processing are the most frequently used technologies followed by researching using technology, PowerPoint and researching using technology. Web pages, online discussion forums, digital audio/video, and VHS are the least

used methods of instruction and preparation. Part-time faculty members seem to keep pace with the full-time counterparts with regard to instructional technology, except in the areas of smart classroom technologies, PowerPoint, and Blackboard use.

Question 5) Intended use of technology for future (check all that apply):

Table 4 : Intended use of technology by faculty

	FT (n=78) (skipped question = 6) %	PT (n=183) (skipped question = 6) %
Email	100	97
WWW	96	92
Word processing	99	96
PowerPoint presentations	94	85
Research with technology	92	79
Webpage development and self-maintenance	68	36
Blackboard	77	57
Online discussion forums	72	46
Digital audio/video	86	66
VHS video	76	68
Smart classroom technologies	92	55
Other (please specify)	28	9

Table 5: Total qualitative themes on full-time faculty evaluations of intended future use of technology.

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Various types of packaged software	10	30.3
2. WebCT	2	6.1
3. Distance Learning/Online Classes	2	6.1
4. Teleconferencing	2	6.1
5. Webinars	2	6.1
6. Other	15	45.4
Total	33	100

- Responses varied greatly throughout faculty with regard to various types of technologies: SPSS software, science modeling programs, video conferencing, digital clickers, Flash, PDA's, video streaming, RSS feeds, Voice Recognition Software, Podcasting, etc.
- Adding online classes, distant learning, teleconferencing, the use of webinars and the inclusion of WebCT were also equally preferred possible uses of technology in the future.

Table 6: Total qualitative themes on part-time faculty evaluations of intended future use of technology.

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Various types of packaged software	2	10.0
2. Blackboard	4	20.0
3. Smart Classrooms	2	10.0
4. Teleconferencing	2	10.0
5. Podcasting	2	10.0
6. Did not address question	4	20.0
7. Other	4	20.0
Total	20	100

- Adding various types of packages software, using smart classrooms, teleconferencing and Podcasting were all equally preferred possible uses of technology in the future.

The use of email, as indicated in table 4, brings to light a question about faculty email practices. The survey did not differentiate between administrative and instructional uses, (internal and external correspondence with colleagues, managing course correspondence and assignment submission, as well as calendaring). The University Learning Management System, Blackboard, has internal messaging (non-email), the digital drop-box is a secure means of holding all student submissions, and each course can act as a “folder” for the 1 year FERPA requirement to keep data, hence freeing up the email account for non-course related communication. Anecdotally, many faculty members are still skeptical over the level of performance of Blackboard to keep such critical documents as student assignments, hence, the need for further assistance with email use to avoid the common annoyance of over-quota accounts.

It is evident that faculty recognize the utility of many of the online tools available for their teaching as noted by the marked increase in percentage from current use to future intentions to use.

Though smart classrooms aren’t a low-use category for full-time faculty, they are for part-time faculty as shown in Table 3, with some 77% stating that they never or seldom use smart classroom technologies but with 55% stating that they intend to use them in the future. With the recent efforts on the part of Regional Campus Administration to equip the off-campus locations, the faculty’s desire to vary their presentation techniques will soon come to fruition.

### **Level of Expertise with Technology**

Question 4) Level of expertise with the following technologies.

(Scale: Never used, Beginner, Fairly Knowledgeable, Skilled, Highly Proficient)

Table 7: Faculty level of expertise with technology

	FT (n= 78) (skipped question = 6) <b>Proficient</b> (skilled & highly proficient) %	PT(n=183) (skipped question = 6) <b>Proficient</b> (skilled & highly proficient) %
Email	93	88
WWW	90	83
Word processing	92	89
PowerPoint presentations	59	53
Research with technology	54	55
Webpage development and self-maintenance	15	14
Blackboard	29	23
Online discussion forums	29	23
Digital audio/video	33	38
VHS video	56	63
Smart classroom technologies	52	22

Full time faculty rate themselves slightly higher in proficiency levels than part-time faculty with the notable exception of smart classroom technologies where the gap is much wider. Also significant is the amount of full time faculty who currently use Bb (40%) and who intend to use it in the future (77%), but only feel marginally proficient in current skill level (29%)

## Blackboard

This category contained questions which omitted the other University supported course/learning management system, WebCT; however, with the merger between Blackboard and WebCT which was announced in early 2006, we hope to see the “best of both worlds” in these platforms coming soon.

Though at the time of this report, data on purely online, hybrid, and web-enhanced use was unavailable, future surveys will yield a better portrait of how faculty and students are utilizing the Learning Management System. Also, not addressed in the survey, but in need of discussion, are the challenges with supporting community sites within Blackboard without a true community system version of Blackboard. The University made the decision to only purchase a University Learning Management System, but there is much non-academic use of Blackboard to date. This issue is being addressed through creative programming by the Office of Information Technology department and the implementation of a portal system, Luminus, by the CIO coming in late summer of 2007.

Web-enhanced, Hybrid, and Online are the three uses of Blackboard at ULV. We do not presently have statistics available to track the exact number of Hybrid and fully Online courses taught, leaving the non-designated courses as the default web-enhanced courses, because faculty have previously had the ability to change the name of their courses. Now that our Blackboard system is linked to our Banner system, course designations cannot be changed and we will have statistics for the use of the system for teaching.

Question 7) Frequency and location of Blackboard access

(Scale: At least once/semester, once/month, a few times/month, a few times/week, once/day, more than once/day)

Table 8: Faculty use of Blackboard

	FT (n= 76) (skipped question = 8) <b>Frequently</b> (A few times/week, once/day, more than once/day) %	PT (n= 175) (skipped question = 14) <b>Frequently</b> (A few times/week, once/day, more than once/day) %
Location		
From home?	32	17
From your office?	34	12
From other off campus locations?	17	5

From this data it is clear that faculty members are using Blackboard equally between home and office locations.

Question 8) Importance of Blackboard Features

(Scale: Did not use, not at all important, not very important, somewhat important, important, very important)

Table 9: Ranking of importance of Blackboard features by ULV faculty

	FT (n= 76) (skipped question = 8) <b>Important</b> (important & very important) %	PT (n= 171) (skipped question = 18) <b>Important</b> (important & very important) %
Features		
Content Areas/Course Documents	48	28
Grade book	29	26
Announcements	39	19
Quiz/Assessment Tools	17	10
External Links	22	13
Digital Drop box	19	12
Virtual Classroom	15	3
Discussion Board	36	16
Group Pages	18	10
Calendar	12	8

Content areas which house course documents, assignments, and lecture notes, as well as the grade-book, are the highest rated for importance by both full and part-time faculty with the exception of the discussion board and the announcement areas of Blackboard. The disparity in perceived importance can be accounted for by the higher number of full-time faculty who teach fully online courses than their part-time counterparts, and therefore must rely more heavily on these features of the learning management system.



Table 10: Comparison of Blackboard use and proficiency

	FT %	PT %
Frequently use Blackboard	40	19
Intend to use Blackboard in future	77	57
Proficient with Blackboard	29	23

Full-time faculty use of Blackboard outpaces part-time faculty use with 56% of all full-time faculty using the system at least once per semester and 40% using it frequently whereas 39% of the part-time faculty indicate that they use Blackboard at least once per semester and only 19% use the system frequently. Much higher percentages from both groups indicate intent to either continue using, or learn to use the system in the future. Proficiency levels for those who do use the system are similar at 29% full-time and 23% part-time faculty identifying as proficient with Blackboard.

### Support and Faculty Development Needs (Questions 9 through 12)

Question 9) Need for faculty assistance/support/training in the use of technology for instruction at ULV: (scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree)

Table 11: Perceived need for training in technology for instruction by ULV faculty

	FT (n=74) (skipped question = 10) <b>Agree</b> (agree & strongly agree) %	PT (n=171) (skipped question = 8) <b>Agree</b> (agree & strongly agree) %
Technology		
Email	49	39
WWW	51	39
Word processing	47	32
PowerPoint presentations	82	67
Research	82	64
Webpage development	73	67
Blackboard	84	81
Online discussion forums	71	70
Digital video/audio	76	59
Smart classroom technology	82	81

Full and part-time faculty members regard most of the instructional technologies as valid training needs, however, they are in strong agreement over the need for professional development in the areas of online discussions, Blackboard in general, smart classroom technology, and webpage development. There is a slightly stronger feeling on the part of the full-time faculty for the Internet and Email. The most marked differences in their perceptions of need for development are in digital audio and video, research (with technology), and PowerPoint.

Question 10) Attended a technology workshop within last year:

Table 12: Technology workshop attendance, impetus, and evaluation

	FT (n=72) (skipped question = 12) %	PT (n=164) (skipped question = 25) %
No: please indicate why not	63	83
If yes please describe the workshop/courses in which you have participated	38	18
Who facilitated the session? *qualitative responses not included	32	15
Did you find the workshop(s) valuable?	36	18
Could anything have been done to improve the session?	32	15

Table 13: Total qualitative themes on full-time faculty about ever taken faculty workshops at ULV involving teaching with technology: “No” responses

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Offered at wrong time/scheduling conflict	13	26.0
2. Not enough time	10	20.0
3. Not needed	8	16.0
4. Inappropriate application for profession	4	8.0
5. Did not address the question	5	10.0
6. Did not address question	4	20.0
7. Other (6)	10	20.0
Total	50	100

Table 14: Total qualitative themes on part-time faculty evaluations about ever taken faculty workshops at ULV involving teaching with technology: “No” responses

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Did not know was available	41	29.0
2. Other conflicts/location limitations (far away from campus)	28	20.4
3. Offered at wrong time/scheduling conflict	23	16.8
4. Not invited/not offered to them	13	9.5
5. Not needed	8	5.8
6. Other (7)	24	17.5
Total	137	99.9

Those full-time faculty members who responded in the negative stated various reasons for not availing themselves of the training workshops or brown-bag teaching with technology sessions. Time constraints and scheduling conflicts rated among the highest reasons for not attending, followed in frequency by preference for one-on-one approach to learning new skills, perception of workshop as below level of need, problems with the design or topic of the workshops, and not needing any training.

Most part-time faculty respondents referenced lack of time, awareness of offerings or invitation extended beyond main campus, and proximity or distance to workshops as the primary reasons for not attending. The CTL has recently addressed these barriers by traveling to six of the Regional Campus Centers. Combined with the Main Campus training week in the Fall of 2006, 107 faculty members, the large majority of whom were part-time/adjunct, attended Blackboard

and Email focused workshops. Communication and variety of offerings remain a key approach to faculty development with technology, especially among the part-time faculty.

Table 15: Qualitative themes on full-time faculty evaluations about type of workshop taken involving teaching with technology

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Blackboard	12	35.3
2. PowerPoint	5	14.7
3. New web mail	2	5.9
4. Adjunct faculty workshop	2	5.9
5. Did not address the question	5	14.7
6. Other (8)	8	23.5
Total	34	100

Blackboard was the most common theme followed by PowerPoint, not addressing the question, and mentioning non-offered workshops such as online registration, Microsoft Word, WebCT, Digital media, etc.

Table 16: Total qualitative themes on part-time faculty evaluations about type of workshop taken involving teaching with technology

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Adjunct faculty workshop	10	31.3
2. Fall/November meeting	7	21.9
3. Blackboard	5	15.6
4. PowerPoint	2	6.3
5. Did not address the question	5	14.7
6. Other (6)	8	25.0
Total	32	100

Part-time faculty mentioned many other workshops but they did not create a consensus. Among them were: Microsoft Word, CAPA training, smart classroom training, etc.

Table 17: Total qualitative themes on full-time faculty evaluations about the value of taken workshops involving teaching with technology

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Yes	20	76.9
2. No	2	7.7
3. Absolutely	2	7.7
4. Very	1	3.8
5. Somewhat	1	3.8
6. Other (6)	8	25.0
Total	26	99.9

Table 18: Qualitative themes on part-time faculty evaluations about the value of taken workshops involving teaching with technology

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Yes	10	76.9
2. No	0	0

3. Absolutely	0	0
4. Very	2	15.4
5. Somewhat	1	7.7
6. Other (6)	8	25.0
Total	13	100

Table 19: Qualitative themes on full-time faculty evaluations about areas of improvement for workshops involving teaching with technology

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. More time on the topic	6	22.2
2. Nothing	4	14.8
3. Increase frequency of class/follow up	3	11.1
4. Greater depth in presentation	3	11.1
5. Somewhat	1	7.7
6. Other (10)	11	40.7
Total	27	99.9

Other topics were mentioned but in isolation, such as: having hands on classes, workshops offered at slower pace, and workshops needing to be less detailed, among others.

Table 20: Themes on full-time faculty evaluations about areas of improvement for workshops involving teaching with technology

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Nothing	8	28.6
2. "Hands on"	5	17.9
3. More time on topic	4	14.3
4. Offer extra assistance after class	2	7.1
5 Other (6)	9	32.1
Total	28	100

Other topics were mentioned but did not create a consensus such as: in isolation, such as: increasing frequency of classes, including follow up sessions, having more questions time, etc.

Question 11) Most useful approaches to training:

(scale: Not at all useful, not very useful, somewhat useful, useful, very useful)

Table 21: Perceived usefulness of approaches to technology training by ULV faculty

	FT (n=73) (skipped question 11) <b>Useful</b> (useful & very useful) %	PT (n=158) (skipped question 31) <b>Useful</b> (useful & very useful) %
Campus-wide technology workshops/seminars	47	49
Faculty lab with drop-in assistance available	68	57
Workshops/seminars within my college/school	70	69
Individual assistance from my college/school	87	76
Assistance from peers	73	63
Self-directed training	68	66

Regional meetings or conferences	21	42
----------------------------------	----	----

Most results align between the full and part-time faculty body, however, part-time faculty appear to have a preference over regional meetings and conferences over that of the full-time faculty. Both full-time and part-time faculty strongly favor individual assistance from their colleges or schools which presents the CTL with the opportunity to work to find instructional technology mentors in or instructional coordinators to provide one-on-one assistance in curricular design and computer use in research and teaching.

Question 12) Preferred type(s) of faculty support/training to promote the integration of technology into instruction

Table 22: Total qualitative themes from full-time faculty evaluations

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Personalized support	8	12.1
2. Did not address the question	11	16.7
3. Small group sessions	5	7.6
4. Blackboard improvement	4	6.1
5 Online courses	4	6.1
6. Other (21)	34	51.5
Total	66	100

A significant number of specific items were mentioned by full time faculty but did not reach consensus. Among those were: learning how to effectively use smart carts, having “hands on” practice, learning/improving about how using PowerPoint, having access to a faculty technology mentoring list, and receiving encouragement by deans and department chairpersons to integrate technology into teaching.

Table 23: Total qualitative themes on part-time faculty evaluations about type of support/training professors would like to see involving teaching with technology

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Blackboard improvement	22	12.4
2. Off-campus support/training	18	10.1
3. More courses available	15	8.5
4. Personalized support	14	7.9
5 Online courses	14	7.9
6. Other (22)	94	53.1
Total	177	99.9

Where online courses were a theme, these courses were referred as resources people could access at their own pace at any time. Most people that mentioned this option also mentioned liking to have some “manual” to follow along.

### Factors Affecting Use of Technology at ULV (6, 13, & 14)

Question 6) Student-driven inclusion of technology into curriculum/course content

Table 24: Student-driven inclusion of technology into curriculum/course content

	FT (n = 77) (skipped question = 7) %	PT (n= 181) (skipped question = 8) %
Students have <i>not</i> requested	64	77
Students have requested	38	25

PowerPoint, Blackboard, and video use are the most requested instructional technologies desired by students. Several interesting themes arose from this question in response to the affirmative of the question.

Table 25: Qualitative themes from full-time faculty evaluations of student's request for technology/course content.

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. PowerPoint	10	24.4
2. Web-link/Internet Resources/Blackboard	8	19.5
3. Videos/Video-streaming	5	12.1
4. Email communication	2	4.8
5 Did not addressed the question	9	21.9
6. Other (7)	7	17.1
Total	41	99.8

Other responses included text book CD's.

Table 26: Qualitative themes from part-time faculty evaluations of student's request for technology/course content.

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. PowerPoint	12	20.3
2. Weblink/Internet Resources/Blackboard	14	23.7
3. Videos/Videostreaming	4	6.8
4. Computer Research	5	8.5
5 Email communication	3	5.1
6. Did not addressed the question	15	25.4
7. Other (5)	6	10.2
Total	59	100

The CTL, in conjunction with the CIO and Assessment Committee, will conduct a student instructional and technology needs assessment in 2007 in order to begin to bring into alignment the campus support for technology with the efforts to assist faculty in teaching and research with technology. The last full assessment, done in 2001, did not specifically address online learning, wireless and hand-held technologies. Tracking student and faculty use patterns will assist the CTL and OIT in strategic planning for large technology initiatives.

Question 13) Factors affecting faculty use of academic technologies (Scale: Very Discouraging and Discouraging, Neither Encouraging Nor Discouraging, Encouraging, and Very Encouraging)

Table 27: Factors affecting faculty use of academic technologies

	FT (n=71)	PT (n=166)
	<b>Encouraging</b> (Encouraging, Very Encouraging)	<b>Encouraging</b> (Encouraging, Very Encouraging)
	%	%
Ability to apply innovative teaching techniques	81	83
Personal motivation to use technology	85	83
Opportunity to develop new ideas	76	89
Opportunity for scholarly pursuit	78	75
Opportunity for professional development	76	86
Fear of being left behind	44	41
Support and encouragement from dean or chair	64	50
Support and encouragement from ULV administrators	55	54
Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	66	57
Campus-wide training/support provided	70	68
Training/support provided by the Instructional Technologist within your school/college	74	77
Ability to convert teaching material that uses technology	73	83
Release time	64	49
Grants for development of course material that uses technology	60	56
Professional prestige or status	41	35
Credit towards promotion and tenure	50	49
Smart classroom design and workability of smart classroom technology (includes smart cart)	77	78
(skipped this question)	13	23

The faculty responded similarly, within 10% or less variance between full and part time faculty in most categories of use, with the exceptions of opportunity to develop new ideas, support and encouragement from dean or chair, and release time. In these categories, full-time faculty found support and encouragement from dean or chair as well as release time, to be more encouraging than the part-time faculty did whereas part-time faculty felt more strongly that the opportunity to develop new ideas was an encouraging factor in the use of academic technologies.

Comparative data from the EDUCAUSE core data survey (2005),<sup>1</sup> of which ULV is one of the 995 participating institutions, indicates that ULV is matching the mean for other institutions in support for faculty use of technology in teaching with a few exceptions noted in the right column. Table 28: ULV comparison to other higher education institutions supporting faculty teaching with technology (All represents types of institutions of higher learning (DR, MA, BA, AA))

<b>Support Type</b>	<b>Total Percentage (%)</b>	<b>ULV</b>
Designated instructional technology center	69.7	Yes; CTL is the intended entity for faculty development for academic technology.
Faculty teaching excellence center that works with IT	53.9	CTL is developing teaching-based support resources in our Blackboard online academy for faculty for integrating best practices in standard teaching to augment our teaching with technology resources. CTL works well with OIT (IT).
Instructional designers who work with technologists	56.7	Yes but developing further to expand course design at inception of offerings.
Instructional technologists who are discipline specialists	22.6	Only 2 on staff: Education/Diversity & Biology/Sports Medicine
Student technology assistants who help faculty use technology	27.7	CTL averages 8 students per semester, OIT/CLS averages 12 students per semester.
Intensive support for faculty using technology	55.8	Yes, but limited to staff availability and workload. Cross-training could be beneficial. The new ULV online certification policy will increase the demand on CTL staff.
Faculty training through scheduled seminars	89.2	Yes
Faculty training upon request	94.6	Yes
Activities for faculty to share innovative ideas	74.7	Yes: brown bag lunches, symposia, faculty research day, faculty retreat, and Blackboard Week.

#### Question 14) Factors preventing the integration of technology instruction

Table 29: Themes from full-time faculty evaluations about factors keeping them from integrating technology to instruction

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Lack of time	12	13.3
2. Equipment in classrooms do not	10	11.1



work well		
3. Technology is not available in all classrooms	10	11.1
4. Needs to learn the use of technology	8	8.8
5 No factors are impeding	7	7.8
6. Other (14)	43	47.8
Total	90	99.9

Many other themes were indicated, some with consensus, some without it. Among the factors mentioned were: smart carts being delivered late or not at all to classrooms, workload interference, discouragement because there is no tech support available, etc.

Table 30: Qualitative themes on part-time faculty evaluations about factors keeping them from integrating technology to instruction

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Technology is not available in all classrooms	27	20.5
2. Lack of time	16	12.1
3. Needs to learn the use of technology	15	11.4
4. No factors are impeding	14	10.6
5 Lacks knowledge how to use it	13	9.8
6. Other (15)	47	35.6
Total	132	100

Other themes included, but not reaching consensus, were lack of access to technology in general, lack of confidence, and training availability and flexibility.

**General Comments about Instruction and Technology**

Question 15) Final thoughts regarding use of technology at ULV

Table 31: Themes for full-time faculty evaluations about comments on use of technology at ULV

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Computers need to be updated/maintenance	9	18.8
2. CLT (OIT & DLC) is/are doing a great job	7	14.6
3. Need more technology available at classrooms	7	14.6
4. Nothing	4	8.3
5 Building difficulties	3	6.3
6. Other (13)	18	37.5
Total	48	100

With regard to building difficulties mentioned by the full-time faculty, was the perception of impediments to the use of technology (i.e. The Miller Hall building was specifically mentioned). Other comments focused on the notion that technology should be part of student course

evaluations, Mac and PC software should be interchangeable and available, and the focus should be on teaching, not technology as proof of good teaching.

Table 32: Themes for part-time faculty evaluations about comments on use of technology at ULV

Themes	Total Responses (n)	%
1. Nothing	16	18.8
2. Need more technology available in classrooms	14	16.5
3. Happy with current support/training	9	10.6
4. More support/training	8	9.4
5 Better access for satellite centers	8	9.4
6. Other (15)	30	35.3
Total	85	100

Other common themes were mentioned with less regularity such as: computers needing to be updated, feeling technologically intimidated, wanting more compensation for use of technology, etc.

**Further Research and Recommendations Summary**

In keeping with the national 2006 core data from EDUCAUSE<sup>2</sup>, ULV moves towards addressing several of the top ten issues in Information and Educational Technology (see table below). Items #5 and #9 are under the direct purview of the Center for Teaching and Learning. Others are addressed through the Chief Information Officer, while many are jointly addressed through collaboration with the Faculty Technology Committee and other relevant campus entities. Continued collaboration as well as strategic planning for all areas of technology is a valuable tool for the University to achieve its highest potential where planning, adoption, funding, maintenance, and delivery of technology are concerned.

1. Security and Identity Management	2. Funding IT	3. Administrative/ERP/Information Systems
4. Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity	6. Infrastructure	7. Strategic Planning
8. Governance, Organization, and Leadership	10. Web Systems and Services	<b>#5 &amp; #9 Outlined below</b>

1. **5. Faculty Development, Support, and Training.** Selected critical questions include the following:
  - How might the institution use newer delivery methods, such as *Podcasts* and *Wikis*, to provide faculty with information that has historically been delivered in more traditional ways?
  - Can the institution provide a “digital asset repository” that can be contributed to and shared by faculty?

- Can the institution manage its IT organizational units in a way that creates a culture of flexibility in services so that IT can respond effectively and quickly to new opportunities?
- What is the role of the IT organization regarding the integration of new technologies into teaching: driver, supporter, or somewhere in between?
- How does the institution identify the academic programs that are most likely to benefit from particular new technologies?

9. **E-Learning/Distributed Teaching and Learning.** Selected critical questions include the following:

- How will the changing demographics of college and university students affect the delivery of education? How will e-learning respond to the integration of higher education, training, and work? Where will e-learning fit in the institution's attempt to expand its outreach to new populations?
- How does the e-learning environment influence learning? What changes in the delivery of e-learning must be made to address science lab courses? How can the institution ensure that students learn through e-learning simulations the same material they have traditionally learned in laboratories?
- How can the institution ensure that online courses integrate accessible technology into their designs?
- How can e-learning be used to improve the quality of student learning, and how can the institution measure the effectiveness of e-learning? How can the institution build an assessment model for a variety of e-learning experiences, including on and off campus, fully online, and blended courses? How can it ensure that students remain engaged in an e-learning environment?
- What is the impact on attendance in hybrid courses when faculty post downloadable course materials on the Internet?
- What support services are needed to assist faculty in identifying or developing high-quality materials for an e-learning environment? How can the institution help faculty determine when and how to integrate new technologies into the educational experience? How should it reward faculty for the additional time and effort needed to develop e-learning experiences? Should faculty be required to change their teaching styles based on how students want to learn? How should the institution address the diverse technical competencies of faculty?
- What impact does e-learning have on the cost of education to both the institution and the individual, and how can institutions leverage e-learning to reduce the rising cost of education in spite of the rising cost of technology? How does the institution promote and coordinate e-learning environments?

Several of these key areas of teaching and learning with technology are research goals for the Center for Teaching and Learning to begin to address for the upcoming four years and beyond. With reference to the current ULV survey:

- Part-time faculty expressed concern over lack of smart carts at the regional campuses. However, this has been addressed by the RCA as of the survey completion with an

increase in smart carts, upgrades of labs, and Plasma displays increasing for faculty use at the centers.

- Continue installation of smart classrooms on the main campus until 100% outfit target is reached. Continue to standardize equipment in response to faculty feedback and involvement with design and re-design projects. Overhead projectors and slide projectors are becoming obsolete equipment, often crowding a classroom with unnecessary clutter. Therefore, the CTL will work diligently to inform and assist faculty in scanning slide transparencies which can easily be saved to CD-ROMS and projected onto white boards for notes. This will also give the faculty an opportunity to save their transparencies to their Blackboard websites whereby students can print them ahead of class time and focus on the substance of the lecture. Likewise, 35mm slides can now be scanned in the faculty multimedia lab in the CTL for archival and presentation purposes.
- The CTL will work closely and collaboratively with the Provost's Office, Office of Information Technology and Faculty Technology Committee with input from the Library, Copyright, and Assessment committees respectively, to devise a strategic plan for instructional technology at ULV for the period of 2006-2010.
- The CTL will stress outreach to part-time faculty through continued presentations at the annual part-time faculty workshops, regular visits to the regional campus centers, website augmentation for "just-in-time" tutorials and help, as well as distribution of instructional media and campus technology assistance CD-ROMS.
- Based on much of the quantitative data from this survey, the next version of this survey instrument will focus more on Mac users, post-survey new features of Blackboard such as the social environment of wikis, blogs, podcasts, and journal features, and draw data about the desire for wireless connectivity in the classrooms. The CTL recommends a separate survey for online and hybrid teaching and learning.
- Increase student support through cross-training of the Help Desk staff and Reference Librarians with regard to guiding students to technology resources and increased Blackboard information and assistance beyond the CTL's hours of operation.
- Blackboard education, data gathering, and staff support issues should be addressed by the CTL and OIT departments to find efficient and meaningful uses for incorporating web-supported, hybrid, and online teaching. Best practices and discipline specific workshops will be key to creating a culture of creativity and excellence in teaching with technology at ULV.
- Full qualitative results and filtered results by college are available upon request from the Center for Teaching and Learning.

---

Notes

- 1) “*EDUCAUSE Core Data Service Fiscal Year 2005 Summary Report*” Educause Core Data Service Online, < <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/pub8003e.pdf>> (17 January 2007).
- 2) Barbara I. Dewey, Peter B. DeBlois, and the 2006 EDUCAUSE Current Issues Committee. “*Top-Ten IT Issues, 2006* EDUCAUSE Review,” vol. 41, no. 3 (May/June 2006): 58–79, <<http://www.educause.edu/apps/er/erm06/erm0633.asp>> (16 January 2007).

## Appendix A

### Master CTL Faculty Technology Survey Questions – Full time (FT) and Part time (PT)

Introduction: To better support ULV faculty efforts to integrate technology into their instruction, the Center for Teaching and Learning would like to know a little about how you currently use technology. We hope to use your responses to improve our faculty support and training.

1. (FT) My role at the University is: (please select one)

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Lecturer
- Senior Adjunct Faculty
- Adjunct Faculty

1. (PT) My role at the University is: (please select one)

- Senior Adjunct Professor
- Adjunct Professor
- Adjunct Instructor
- Other

2. Please indicate which college you are a member of

- College of Arts & Sciences
- College of Business and Public Management
- College of Education and Organizational Management [sic]
- College of Law
- School of Continuing Education

3. Please indicate how frequently you will use the following technologies this semester.

Use the following responses: (8) More than once a day; (7) once a day, (6) a few times a week, (5) once a week, (4) a few times a month, (3) once a month, (2) at least once a semester, (1) not at all

- a. Email
- b. WWW
- c. Word processing
- d. PowerPoint presentations
- e. Research with technology
- f. Webpage development
- g. Blackboard
- h. Online discussion forums
- i. Digital audio/video
- j. Smart Classroom technologies

4. Please rate your level of expertise with the following technologies.

Use the following responses: (5) Highly proficient, (4) Skilled, (3) Fairly knowledgeable, (2) Beginner, (1) Never used

- a. Email
- b. WWW
- c. Word processing

- d. PowerPoint presentations
- e. Research with technology
- f. Webpage development
- g. Blackboard
- h. Online discussion forums
- i. Digital audio/video
- j. Smart Classroom technologies

5. Please indicate which of the following technologies you intend to use in the future.  
(Check all that apply)

- a. Email
- b. WWW
- c. Word processing
- d. PowerPoint presentations
- e. Research with technology
- f. Webpage development
- g. Blackboard
- h. Online discussion forums
- i. Digital audio/video
- j. Smart Classroom technologies
- k. Other → describe \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do your students ever ask you to include technology into your curriculum/course content?

- No

Yes → describe

7. How frequently will you access your Blackboard course sites this semester?

Use the following responses: (8) More than once a day; (7) Once a day, (6) A few times a week, (5) Once a week, (4) A few times a month, (3) At least once a month, (2) At least once a semester, (1) Not at all

- a. From home?
- b. From your office?
- c. From other off campus locations?

8. How important have you found the following Blackboard features?

Use the following responses: (5) Very important; (4) Important, (3) Somewhat important, (2) Not very important, (1) Not at all important, (9) Did not use

- a. Content Areas/Course Documents
- b. Gradebook
- c. Announcements
- d. Quiz/Assignments
- e. External Links
- f. Digital Drop Box
- g. Virtual Classroom
- h. Discussion Board
- i. Group Pages
- j. Calendar

9. How strongly do you agree or disagree that there is a need for faculty assistance/support/training in the use of technology for instruction at ULV in the following areas?

Use the following responses: (5) Strongly agree, (4) Agree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (2) Disagree, (1) Strongly disagree

- a. Email
- b. WWW
- c. Word processing
- d. PowerPoint presentations
- e. Research
- f. Webpage development
- g. Blackboard
- h. Online discussion forums
- I. Digital audio/video
- j. Smart Classroom technologies

10. Have you taken a faculty development workshop at ULV involving teaching with technology within the last year?

- No → why not? \_\_\_\_\_
- Yes →
  - a. Please describe the workshops/courses you have participated in?
  - b. Who facilitated the session(s)?
  - c. Did you find the workshop(s) valuable?
  - d. Could anything have been done to improve the session?

11. Which of the following approaches to training in instructional technology do you perceive to be most useful?

Use the following responses: (5) Very useful, (4) Useful, (3) Somewhat useful, (2) Not very useful, (1) Not at all useful

- a. Campus-wide technology workshops/seminars
- b. Faculty Lab with drop in assistance available
- c. Workshops/seminars within my College/School
- d. Individual assistance from my College/School Instructional Technologist
- e. Assistance from peers
- f. Self training
- g. Regional meetings or conferences

12. Please describe the type(s) of faculty support/training you'd like to see developed at ULV to promote the integration of technology into instruction?

13.

As things currently stand, how much would each of the following factors be seen as encouraging or discouraging you to use academic technologies?

Use the following response categories: (5) Very encouraging, (4) Encouraging, (3) Neither encouraging nor discouraging, (2) Discouraging, (1) Very discouraging

- a. Ability to apply innovative teaching techniques
- b. Personal motivation to use technology
- c. Opportunity to develop new ideas
- d. Opportunity for scholarly pursuit
- e. Opportunity for professional development
- f. Fear of being left behind
- g. Support and encouragement from dean or chair
- h. Support and encouragement from ULV administrators



- i. Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues
- j. Campus-wide training/support provided
- k. Training/support provided by the Instructional Technologist within your school/college
- l. Ability to convert teaching materials so that they integrate technology
- m. Release time
- n. Grants for development of course material that uses technology
- o. Professional prestige or status
- p. Credit toward promotion and tenure
- q. Smart classroom design and workability of smart classroom technology (includes smart cart)

14. Are there any factors that are currently keeping you from integrating technology into your instruction? If you list and describe more than one, please put them in order of importance, most important being first.

15. Is there anything else you would like to share with us regarding academic technology at ULV?