

# 2002 FORMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT

---

**University of Minnesota at Morris**  
**New Teachers New Technology Grant Project**

**Prepared by the**  
**Action Consulting and Evaluation Team**  
Stella SiWan Cheung  
Jason Butler

6312 Ashcroft Lane  
Edina, MN 55424  
Phone: (952) 922-1811  
(952) 922-0005  
Fax: (952) 922-1911  
Email: acetinc@mn.rr.com

## Introduction

In July of 2001, the University of Minnesota at Morris (UMM) was awarded a \$363,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) Program to implement their New Teachers New Technology (NTNT) project from June 2001 to June 2002. The goal of PT3 is to "improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in improved teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs." The PT3 grant aims to support the UMM NTNT project for three years, from June 2001 to June 2004.

To evaluate the NTNT grant project, UMM contracted with the Action Consulting and Evaluation Team (ACET, Inc.). ACET has worked with UMM in designing an evaluation plan for the PT3 Capacity Building Grant received in June of 1999. During the development of the evaluation plan, five main outcomes, with specific indicators for success, were identified by UMM staff:

- *Increase prospective teachers and educators' knowledge of instructional technology (IT);*
- *Improve prospective teachers and PK-16 educators' ability to integrate IT into their instruction;*
- *Improve PK-12 student performance;*
- *Continue relationships with partnering institutions and organizations; and*
- *Implement an integrated evaluation feedback system to continuously improve the project.*

Several data sources and evaluation procedures were used to address the five outcomes, both qualitative and quantitative, to include surveys, site visits, focus group sessions, interviews, and project records. Surveys were administered to the following groups in fall 2001 and again in spring 2002: (1) UMM faculty<sup>1</sup>; (2) UMM student teachers; (3) a sample of PK-12 consortium teachers; and (4) a sample of PK-12 consortium students. Two ACET consultants (Stella SiWan Cheung and Jason Butler) conducted the site visits to a sample of five consortium schools and the UMM Division of Education to observe instructional practices and to moderate focus group sessions with teachers/faculty and students in spring of 2002. The site visits and focus group sessions served two purposes: (1) to check the validity of the data collected by the surveys and (2) to collect qualitative information about the uses of IT. A sample of four business partners was interviewed in spring of 2002 to gather feedback about their involvement. In addition, records were collected from the NTNT Grant Coordinator to describe project activities.

This report represents evaluation activities collected for year one. The data gathered will serve as a baseline for future analysis. Key findings from the data collected are summarized first, followed by a table outlining the progress UMM made in the first year of the NTNT project, and then concluding with individual summaries of the surveys, site visits, and business partner interviews.

## KEY FINDINGS

- Overall, the different stakeholders were very enthusiastic about the NTNT project and the potential of preparing student teachers to be more equipped to integrate IT practices into their instruction.
- The NTNT sponsored events introduced the various stakeholders to a variety of IT software packages and technology ideas/uses.

---

<sup>1</sup> UMM faculty surveys were only administered in spring 2002.

- Generally, stakeholders had a very positive attitude towards IT and wanted training to integrate IT into their instructional practices.
- Stakeholders reported having the most experience with basic IT applications (e.g. Internet, MS Office, email) and the least with using web development/management software packages, hardware devices, and IT to assess student performance.
- Time and limited knowledge of certain applications appeared to be the two primary barriers for the stakeholders. They wanted training sessions that would provide them with hands-on experience to apply IT.
- Stakeholders expressed an interest to be more involved and offered the following recommendations to enhance participation:
  - Redesign student teacher coursework to incorporate IT as soon as possible. Educators will need to be trained to teach these courses effectively.
  - Offer concrete examples of proven uses of IT in contexts that stakeholders can readily use in their classrooms.
  - Provide follow-up support and training on the use and incorporation of IT.
  - Redefine the role and responsibilities of stakeholders in the NTNT project and communicate this directly to them.

### PROGRESS FOR YEAR 1

The table below outlines the progress UMM made in the first year of the NTNT grant project.

Outcomes	Indicators of Change (Over the next 3 years)	Progress
<i>Increase prospective teachers and educators' knowledge of IT</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK-16 students and educators will demonstrate improved IT literacy.</li> <li>• Number/percentage of prospective and PK-16 educators requesting and receiving IT training by type of training will increase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administered surveys (2002 as baseline); Some improvements mentioned during focus groups.</li> <li>• 24 NTNT IT trainings, with topics ranging from PowerPoint to the integration of IT with handheld devices/laptops (see Appendix A). The primary methods of communicating with stakeholders included bi-monthly e-mails, monthly mailings, and phone contacts. The IT Fair Committee distributed a satisfaction survey at the IT Fair to gather feedback.</li> </ul>
<i>Improve prospective teachers and PK-16 educators' ability to integrate IT into their instruction</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 90% of prospective and PK-16 educators will effectively utilize current IT tools in their instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administered surveys (2002 as baseline) – First year, IT was used weekly and partially integrated into their instruction. Focus group participants cited limited use of IT.</li> </ul>
<i>Improve PK-16 student performance</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK-16 students and educators will report improved student performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators and student focus groups – New project, no direct improvements reported yet.</li> </ul>

Outcomes	Indicators of Change	Progress
<i>Continue relationships with partnering institutions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain or increase the number of partnering institutions that participate in project meetings/events.</li> <li>• Partnering institutions will report satisfaction with the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar number of partnership institutions – started with 25, ended with 26; 3 partners became inactive, 4 were added (see Appendix B).</li> <li>• Interviews with partners – Active partners reported satisfaction and contributed by participating in the IT fair and conducting workshops and training sessions.</li> </ul>
<i>Implement an integrated evaluation feedback system to continuously improve the project</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eight member IT task force will meet at least bi-monthly to guide NTNT activities.</li> <li>• At least 90% of beginning PK-16 educators paired w/mentor.</li> <li>• Number of courses redesigned to incorporate IT.</li> <li>• Number of IT related events attended by prospective and PK-16 educators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met twice, March 28 and June 5, 2002, to discuss NTNT activities and technology competencies.</li> <li>• Not in place for 2001/2002; in development.</li> <li>• None, faculty currently redesigning syllabi to embed technology.</li> <li>• 42 NTNT events: UMM faculty present at 39; PK-12 consortium schools at 23; business partners at 8; and UMM students at 2 events (see Appendix A). Consortium schools provided tutor/practicum student teaching assistance, graduate standards/licensure, and support for the grant within the school community (see Appendix C for in-kind contributions).</li> </ul>

Please note that the following issues, during the first year of implementation, were not addressed.

- Conduct workshops with PK-12 Consortium Technology Directors and first adopters of IT to develop a CD with a common set of basic communication and instruction tools for teachers in partner schools for implementation in Fall 2002.
- Prepare and disseminate materials that communicate expectations of student entering teacher education in fall 2002 when laptop computers will be required.
- Initiate design of IT based program for Native American Teacher Aides to become licensed teachers.
- Design instruction program for teacher aides from Sisseton-Wahpeton using IT for full implementation in fall 2003.

UMM staff will use the evaluation results reported above to identify the strengths of the program, discuss challenges encountered with implementation during the first year, and make improvements for year two.

## Spring 2002 – Survey Results

In Spring of 2002 (May-June), the University of Minnesota at Morris surveyed four groups of people, (1) UM-Morris Faculty, (2) UM-Morris student teachers, (3) PK-12 consortium school teachers, and (4) PK-12 consortium students, to identify how students and teachers access and use IT on campus and in PK-12 classrooms. The survey results will serve as a baseline to determine if PK-16 students and educators have improved knowledge and abilities to use IT in the classrooms over the next two years. The surveys will also be used to guide UMM's efforts to revise and improve implementation strategies. The following are the overall findings from the surveys, followed by individual survey results<sup>2</sup>.

### Overall Findings

- Positive attitudes about IT. Generally, educators and students felt that integrating IT into the curriculum would help students do well in school and see their assignments visually.
- Weekly use of IT. Prospective and consortium school educators reported using IT weekly in their classrooms. PK-12 students also reported using IT at similar levels.
- IT partially to not at all integrated. Overall, educators at consortium schools reported that IT was partially integrated into their curriculum. Prospective educators also reported the same level of integration. UMM educators, however, felt that IT was not at all integrated.
- Need more help and time with IT. Educators wanted more training in a variety of areas such as using web-development packages and hardware devices, as well as more time to incorporate IT.
- Requiring handheld devices and laptops at UMM not favored. An overwhelming majority of educators at UMM were not in favor of requiring students to purchase laptops or handheld devices.

### UM-Morris Faculty Surveys (n=57)

- Overall, faculty believed that integrating IT would benefit both faculty and students.
- Most agreed that hardware and software at UMM is sufficiently advanced enough to support effective learning.
- Faculty reported having most experience with using basic IT applications (e.g. email, Internet, MS Office), prepare instructional materials, and conduct administrative tasks.
- The need for training was high in nearly all aspects of IT use, particularly in areas where faculty had the least experience in using closed environments (e.g. WebCT), operating web-development packages, using course management software, and using the net to post instructional materials.
- Faculty, however, felt that IT was not at all integrated into their teaching.
- Limited time was the number one barrier cited by faculty.
- An overwhelming majority disagreed that students should be required to purchase laptops and handheld devices.

---

<sup>2</sup> The surveys were completed on the Internet by University staff, participating teachers, student teachers, and PK-12 students. Fifty-seven out of 150 UMM faculty (representing 38%); Ten out of 60 UMM student teachers (17%) completed the survey; 124 out of approximately 1000 PK-12 school teachers (12%); and 620 out of approximately 5000 PK-12 school students (12%). The PK-12 consortium student survey results reflected the population more precisely (with a 99% confidence level and a 5% confidence interval). The data represents only the group of participants who responded to the survey.

**Morris Student Teacher Surveys (n=10)**

- Overall, student teachers surveyed used IT for activities related to teaching weekly.
- A large majority of student teachers noted that integrating IT in their student teaching will help their students do well in school, better understand materials in class, complete quality assignments, and see their assignments visually.
- Student teachers indicated having most experience in using basic IT applications and in assessing student performance, and least experience with conducting administrative tasks and using hardware devices.
- Most reported that IT was partially integrated into their teaching.
- Student teachers wanted more training in early all aspects of IT use.
- The three primary issues that student teachers perceived prevented them from using IT for activities related to teaching included lack of time, lack of adequate knowledge about technology, and lack of access to the proper resources.

**PK-12 Consortium School Teacher Surveys (n=124)**

- Overall, consortium teachers surveyed used IT for activities related to teaching weekly.
- They believed that IT would help their students do well in school, better understand materials presented in class, and see their assignments visually.
- Consortium teachers had the most experience with using basic IT applications and with preparing instructional materials, and the least experience with using hardware devices.
- Most reported that IT was partially integrated into their teaching and more training in using hardware devices, guiding student use of technology, and assessing student performance..
- Teachers perceived three main issues that prevented them from adequately utilizing IT in their classrooms. These included time to learn, prepare, and use technology, access to adequate technology, and knowledge of instructional technologies that would best enhance and compliment their curriculum.

**PK-12 Student Technology Surveys (n=620)**

- PK-12 students reported using IT daily to weekly at school and for in-class activities.
- Often, students used Office applications and the Internet to get information.
- Many students reported their school has taught them to use IT well.
- Students felt that integrating IT would help them to do well in school, complete quality assignments, and see their assignments visually.
- Most students go to other students and teachers for help with IT.
- Students cited that their school can improve IT by acquiring better equipment and software, allowing more time to work with and use technology, and providing more relevant applications of IT.

Response frequencies to each item are presented in Appendix D.

## **Spring 2002 – Site Visit Summary Consortium Schools**

Site visits were conducted at a sample of five consortium schools on April 23-24 of 2002. Each site visit was conducted by two ACET consultants and lasted approximately 2 hours. Four sites served elementary students and one served elementary and secondary students. Student populations at these schools ranged from 73 to 425 students, with 7 to 27 full-time equivalent (FTE) teaching staff. The purpose of the site visits was to validate the surveys collected for the NTNT project and to alert the evaluation team and the UMM NTNT staff about implementation issues and new developments.

Each site was observed and profiled using a site visit protocol designed by the evaluation team. This protocol included the following elements:

- Observation of a class session integrating IT into the curriculum.
- Observation of IT hardware and software available at each site.
- Brief interview with the site contact regarding NTNT participation and perceptions.
- Focus groups were conducted with a sample of staff and students regarding perceptions of IT at their school and the UMM NTNT project.

Following is a summary gathered from the five site visits and interviews/focus groups.

### **Strengths**

- High enthusiasm for IT. The evaluators noted an overall enthusiasm for the potential uses of IT at each site. Students and school staff expressed ideas and optimism for the potentials of IT and learning. Many school staff reported attending UMM NTNT sponsored activities such as the GIS workshop, training on Marco Polo, and the IT Fair. These activities provided the staff with new ideas and improved motivation for IT use. Students reported that IT could help them visualize concepts more easily (i.e. through the use of video formats and computer presentations) and make learning more exciting.
- Awareness of intentions and promise of the NTNT grant. School staff were aware of the potential impacts that the NTNT project could have on the future of education. They cited the importance of preparing UMM student teachers to integrate IT into their practice and in turn provide support to other teachers. Most felt that a good start has been made in the process of preparing student teachers to integrate IT into their classroom.
- Adequate equipment and resources. All sites observed appeared adequately supplied with IT equipment such as computers, site based servers, and internet access. During the observation the majority of sites utilized the internet, a few used presentation software and digital cameras, and one used a digital smartboard.

### **Challenges**

- IT use remains sparse. The degree to which IT was being used varied by site and by teacher. A few utilized methods that enhanced their instruction while many teachers felt uncomfortable integrating IT. Overall, student and school staff testimony indicated a low to non-existent use of IT in many classrooms. This was attributed to frustrations related to inexperience, misunderstanding of the proper uses and potentials of the IT resources available, and difficulties due to persistent equipment failure and malfunction (i.e. server problems).
- Lack of clarity on roles and expectations for the NTNT project. Many school staff indicated that they did not fully understand their roles and responsibilities in the NTNT project and were not

properly informed enough on the purpose and activities in order to maximize potential impact. They felt, however, that this miscommunication was often attributed to staff turnover and the involvement of limited individuals. Some further noted that they often went away from NTNT sponsored events with more questions than answers.

- Limited time to integrate IT into the curriculum. Most school staff attended a variety of training and were introduced to numerous software packages, but felt they lacked the time to learn and experiment with these ideas. These individuals felt that the responsibilities of teaching and following the graduate standards allows for little time to develop new, valid curriculum incorporating IT.

### **Recommendations/Future Steps**

- Clarify roles and expectations for the NTNT project.
  1. Provide timely announcements on NTNT activities.
  2. Involve all stakeholders at the school through e-mail/mail correspondence rather than just one primary contact.
  3. Provide documentation to clarify NTNT consortium school responsibilities.
  4. Ensure timely feedback about questions and concerns regarding the NTNT project.
  5. Update contact addresses periodically due to staff turnover and changes in leadership.
- Provide training relevant to consortium teachers.
  1. Include concrete examples of proven uses of IT in contexts that the teachers can easily relate to their curricula.
  2. Provide follow-up for teachers so that they have adequate time to forge understanding and confidence of new tools.

## **Spring 2002 – Site Visit Summary University of Minnesota at Morris**

A site visit was conducted at UMM by two ACET consultants on April 25, 2002. The purpose of the site visit was to check the validity of the surveys collected for the NTNT project, document the uses of IT in university instruction and in student teaching classroom experience, and to gauge perceptions of the NTNT project.

The site was observed and profiled using a site visit protocol designed by the evaluation team. This protocol included the following elements:

- Observations of pre-service teaching courses integrating IT.
- Focus groups were conducted with Division of Education faculty and a sample of student teachers.
- Information was gathered from the NTNT Grant Coordinator pertaining to the grant evaluation questions.

Following is a summary gathered from the site visit and interviews/focus groups.

### **Strengths**

- Positive perceptions of IT. Overall, students and faculty expressed a desire to learn effective methods of IT integration to compliment their curriculum. Many of these individuals felt that IT has a place in the classroom and can benefit the learning process by changing the way teachers instruct and students learn.
- Increased awareness and support of IT integration. Students and faculty both cited an increased awareness of the implications IT holds for modern education. They felt that the level of support has increased as a result of the NTNT project and the activities related to the grant have helped expose them to new ideas such as the uses of handheld devices in the classroom and the effective uses of presentation software. Nearly all faculty noted changes as a direct result of the NTNT project. These changes included more available equipment and more experience using and interacting with IT.

### **Challenges**

- Restricted time to integrate IT. Time was cited as a major limiting factor to both faculty and students. They felt that these new techniques need more experience, practice, and understanding in order to make an effective impact in the classroom.
- Limited use of IT. Many students cited that there is limited use of IT at the university and then only by certain faculty. Students perceived many of their instructors as having limited knowledge in the use of IT. They further commented on the desire for a formal IT methods course.
- Unclear expectations about technology integration. Nearly all students reported that they have difficulty making connections between what they are expected to do and what they are capable to do with IT. Students gave several examples of how they were expected to use IT in their teaching but were not instructed explicitly on how to do this to benefit instruction. When this occurred, they felt that the technology often had little practical relevance to their teaching and thus is warranted little value.

### **Recommendations/Future Steps**

- Make technology relevant.
  1. Offer ideas and proven practices on how IT can work effectively in the classroom.
  2. Create formal courses in IT methods.
  3. Provide students with well-defined guidelines of what IT integration means.
- More support for IT use.
  1. Provide follow-up support training on the use and incorporation of IT.
  2. Allocate time for faculty and students to experiment and practice with new software packages.
  3. Provide training for faculty in technologies they can directly apply to their courses such as Excel, video editing, and web development applications.
- Enhance communication about the NTNT project.
  1. Provide regular updates about the current state of the NTNT project.
  2. Form a community of practice in which students and faculty interact periodically with established resources and experts to ask questions and learn from one another.
- Seek out more funding.

## **Spring 2002 – Business Partner Interviews**

The following is a summary of telephone interviews conducted with four of 26 NTNT business partners in May of 2002. The NTNT Grant Coordinator provided contact names. Four sites were chosen at random with the purpose of gauging levels of involvement and perceptions of partner participation in the NTNT project.

The interviews addressed these two key issues:

- Involvement and satisfaction with the NTNT project.
- Suggestions for improvement.

### **Key Findings**

- Overall, two business partners were very involved and two were not involved with the project.
- The two most involved partners were very satisfied with their companies' involvement in the NTNT project. These partners,
  - Contributed by providing software donations for faculty and training labs, discounted software for students, support for the IT Fair, and provided staff training.
  - Cited the enthusiasm of the project staff and organization as positive attributes of their involvement in the NTNT project.
- The two sites that were not involved had not heard of the UMM NTNT project and were not aware that they were the contact person for this initiative. They cited staff changes and miscommunications as the primary cause for non-participation.
- All four partners interviewed wanted to be more involved in the NTNT project.
- The main suggestion made for improvement pertained to the NTNT project staff knowing exactly what they want and articulating this directly to the business partners through better lines of communication.

**Appendix A**  
**NTNT Grant Activities Attendance**  
**July 2001-June 2002**

2001

- August 1-5: Washington PT3 Conference
  - 1) Attended: (3)
    - a. Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b. Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - c. Michelle Page – Education Faculty
- August 7: PT3 Summit
  - 1) @ Eagan, Minnesota
  - 2) MN PT3 grant schools had a planning meeting
  - 3) Attended: (1)
    - a. Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
- August 9: School Superintendent Grant Meeting
  - 1) All schools were invited to an informational meeting about NTNT
  - 2) Discussed level of participation, need for their school, etc.
  - 3) Attended: (15)
    - a. Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff
    - b. Casey Wagner – NTNT Staff
    - c. Ethan Quirt – NTNT Staff
    - d. Laurie Hedlund – NTNT Staff
    - e. Carl Remmers (Benson) – School Partner
    - f. Mary Burgess (Brandon) – School Partner
    - g. Al Hanson (Chokio-Alberta) – School Partner
    - h. Janine Teske (Clinton-Graceville-Beardsley) – School Partner
    - i. Dale Swanson (Hancock) – School Partner
    - j. Jim Lentz (MACCRA Y) – School Partner
    - k. Yvonne Sorenson (Montevideo) – School Partner
    - l. Pam Solvie (Morris) – School Partner
    - m. Jeff Taylor (Ortonville) – School Partner
    - n. Tim Cannon (St. Mary's – Morris) – School Partner
    - o. Erin Gillespie (Wheaton) – School Partner
- August 13-14: Instructional Technology Institute, UMM
  - 1) UMM Continuing Education, Computing Services, Media Services, and the NTNT Grant held a two-day skills workshop for area teachers
  - 2) Attended: (30 – 26 from our consortium schools)
    - a. Teachers from various School Partners
- August 13-17: Faculty IT Implementation Workshop
  - 1) Education Faculty worked on technology skills
  - 2) developed personal timelines for technology implementation for their syllabi and division goals
  - 3) Attended: (7)
    - a. Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b. Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
    - c. Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - d. Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty

- e. Michelle Page – Education Faculty
- f. Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
- g. Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
- August 16-17: Marco Polo Training
  - 1) Pam Solvie attended Marco Polo training and has been offering her knowledge to UMM campus and area schools
  - 2) Attended: (1)
    - a. Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
- August 20-21: UMM Faculty Retreat at Peter’s Resort
  - 1) @ Glenwood, Minnesota
  - 2) Meeting topic was Instructional Technology facilitated by UMM Consortium
  - 3) Attended: (75)
    - a. Various UMM faculty
- September 14: Visit to Digital Media Center
  - 1) Attended: (4)
    - a. Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - b. Ethan Quirt – NTNT Staff
    - c. Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - d. Linda Jorn – NTNT Staff
- October 10: Instructional Technology (IT) Fair, UMM
  - 1) UMM Consortium, area schools, private vendors, and UMM faculty held the IT Fair at the UMM Student Center
  - 2) Attended: (approximately 300) – there was no registration, hard to count walk throughs
    - a. 100 Students (80 Education / 20 Other)
    - b. 7 Education Faculty
      - i. Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
      - ii. Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
      - iii. Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
      - iv. Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
      - v. Michelle Page – Education Faculty
      - vi. Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
      - vii. Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - h. 7 NCATE Review Committee Members
    - i. 7 International GST Supervisors
    - j. 40 UMM Faculty
    - k. Presentors
      - i. Briggs Library
      - ii. Media Services
      - iii. Computing Services
      - iv. Nancy Hoyt – Office of the General Counsel
      - v. Judy Fox – Curriculum Transformation and Disability
      - vi. Diane Nelson – NTNT School Partner
      - vii. Les Gunderson – NTNT School Partner
      - viii. Ken Gagner – NTNT School Partner
      - ix. ESRI – Business Partner
      - x. Blackboard – Business Partner
      - xi. McGraw Hill (2) – Business Partner
      - xii. Kidspiration – Business Partner

- xiii. Lightspan – Business Partner
- xiv. Lifetime Learning – Business Partner
- xv. Apple Computer – Business Partner
- l. 9 UMM Department Booths
  - i. Computing Sciences
  - ii. Studio Art
  - iii. History
  - iv. Continuing Education
  - v. Theatre Arts
  - vi. UMM WWW Group
  - vii. Economics
  - viii. Computing Services
  - ix. Faculty Center for Learning and Teaching
- m. 8 Business Partners - additional 10 Business Partners sent door prizes and promotional materials
  - i. Blackboard
  - ii. Lifetime Learning
  - iii. Lightspan
  - iv. McGraw Hill
  - v. Apple Computer
  - vi. ESRI
  - vii. Lakes Country Service Cooperative
  - viii. Partstock Computer
  - ix. AlphaSmart
  - x. Classroom Connect
  - xi. Inspiration/Kidspiration
  - xii. Intel R
  - xiii. Knowledge Adventure
  - xiv. Microsoft
  - xv. Netschools
  - xvi. Schepp Turner
  - xvii. Texas Instruments
  - xviii. Tom Snyder Internet Tools
- n. 5 UMM Partners – (16)
  - i. Matt Connor, David Wuolu - Briggs Library
  - ii. Roger Boleman, Ron Kubik, Mike Cihak - Media Services
  - iii. John Bowers, Pam Solvie, David Savela - Computing Services
  - iv. Bert Ahern - Faculty Center for Learning and Teaching
  - v. All faculty - Division of Education
- October 26: Augsburg Conference
  - 1) Research conference was held at Radisson South
  - 2) Attended: (3)
    - a. Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - b. Stella SiWan Cheung – NTNT Staff
    - c. Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
- November 14: Geographic Information Systems Day
  - 1) UMM held a reception and program for UMM faculty
  - 2) 5 School Partners celebrated GIS Day in their own school

July 11, 2002

- 3) Attended: (20)
  - Various UMM Faculty
- November 21: Classroom Connect Convention
  - 1) @ Long Beach
  - 2) Attended: (2)
    - a. Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff
    - b. Anne Riggs – Education Faculty
- November : TIES Conference
  - 1) Attended: (1)
    - a) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - b) Ethan Quirt – NTNT Staff

## 2002

- January 12: GIS class
  - 1) by Quinto Lotti
  - 2) Attended: (6)
    - a) Various UMM Faculty
- January 15: Lightspan Presentation
  - 1) by Sherry Carlstrom – Business Partner
  - 2) Attended: (17)
    - a) Keith Redfield – Morris – School Partner
    - b) Brad Korn – Morris – School Partner
    - c) Nistler – Morris – School Partner
    - d) Pam Solvie – Morris – School Partner
    - e) Brent Jacobson – Browns Valley – School Partner
    - f) Terry Quist – Alexandria Public Schools – Former School Partner
    - g) Jeannie Nelson – St. Mary’s Alex – School Partner
    - h) Marilyn Maack – St. Mary’s Alex – School Partner
    - i) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - j) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - k) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - l) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - m) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - n) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - o) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - p) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - q) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
- January 17: PDF Files Presentation
  - 1) by John Bowers and Pam Gades
  - 2) Attended: (8)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
- January 18: Lectora Presentation

July 11, 2002

- 1) by Fred Sowar
  - 2) Attended: (8)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
    - i) Ethan Quirt – NTNT Staff
- January 25: Handheld Conference
    - 1) @ Eagan
    - 2) Attended: (4)
      - a) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
      - b) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
      - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
      - d) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
  - January 28: Presentation Program
    - 1) @ North Hilton in Twin Cities
    - 2) Dave Samson – Tom Snyder Internet Tools – Business Partner
    - 3) Steve Sborov – Lifetime Learning – Business Partner
    - 4) Christine Greenhow & Larry Bundy – Technology Integration – IMMEX – Business Partner
    - 5) Barry Brahier – Handheld – Leadership in Hand – Business Partner
    - 6) Attended: (8)
      - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
      - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
      - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
      - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
      - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
      - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
      - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
      - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
  - February 4: Electronic Portfolio Presentation
    - 1) by Bill Bierdan – Business Partner
    - 2) Attended: (16)
      - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
      - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
      - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
      - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
      - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
      - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
      - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
      - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
      - i) Kathleen Axtmann – School Partner
      - j) Rhonda Schmeichel – School Partner
      - k) Joan Thoren – School Partner

July 11, 2002

- l) Peg Greenwaldt – School Partner
- m) Lori Boettcher – School Partner
- n) Bert Ahern – UMM Partner
- o) Linda Meichsner – School Partner
- p) George Peper – School Partner
- February 5: Handheld Presentation
  - 1) by Chad Zeman – NTNT Staff
  - 2) Attended: (8)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
- February 11: Electronic Portfolio Presentation
  - 1) by Joan Wallin of Apple Inc. – Business Partner
  - 2) Attended: (22)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
    - i) Kathleen Axtmann – School Partner
    - j) Rhonda Schmeichel – School Partner
    - k) Tim Cannon – School Partner
    - l) Gretchen Gillis – School Partner
    - m) Joan Donovan – School Partner
    - n) Ruth Roquotte – School Partner
    - o) Peg Greenwaldt – School Partner
    - p) Joan Thoren – School Partner
    - q) Lori Boettcher – School Partner
    - r) Linda Meichsner – School Partner
    - s) George Peper – School Partner
    - t) Rob Flagel – School Partner
    - u) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - v) Pam Gades – Computing Services - UMM Partner
- February 12: Shoot Day
  - 1) Extra footage was shot for upcoming NTNT IT Fair Promotional Video
  - 2) Attended: (8)
    - a) Greg Randolph – Business Partner
    - b) Roger Boleman – Media Services – UMM Partner
    - c) Mike Cihak – Media Services – UMM Partner
    - d) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty

- e) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff / Morris – School Partner
- f) Hope Zeltwanger – Morris – School Partner
- g) Tim Cannon – St. Marys of Morris – School Partner
- h) Barbara Spaulding - St. Marys – School Partner
- February 18: Texas Instruments Presentation
  - 1) by Ellen Johnston – Business Partner
  - 2) Attended: (24)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
    - i) Chad Zeman – NTNT Staff
    - j) Josh Wallestad – Education Student
    - k) Leon Johnson – School Partner
    - l) Paula Perdoni – School Partner
    - m) Kathleen Axtmann – School Partner
    - n) Ruth Roquette – School Partner
    - o) Peg Greenwaldt – School Partner
    - p) Joan Thoren – School Partner
    - q) George Peper – School Partner
    - r) Linda Meichsner – School Partner
    - s) Emilie Brustuen – School Partner
    - t) Tom Tillma – School Partner
    - u) Ron Koester – School Partner
    - v) Theresa Erickson – School Partner
    - w) Donna Caneen – School Partner
    - x) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
- February 25: Finalizing UMM Education Technology Competencies
  - 1) Attended: (9)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - c) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - d) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - e) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - f) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - g) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - h) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
    - i) Ethan Quirt – NTNT Staff
- February 25: WebCT Training
  - 1) by John Bowers and Pam Gades – Computing Services – UMM Partner
  - 2) Attended: (6)
    - a) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - b) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - c) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty

- d) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
- e) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
- f) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
- March 4: WebCT Training
  - 1) by John Bowers and Pam Gades – Computing Services – UMM Partner
  - 2) Attended: (6)
    - a) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - b) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - c) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - d) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - e) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - f) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
- March 14: Access Presentation
  - 1) by Doug Williams – Computing Services - UMM Partner
  - 2) Attended: (4)
    - a) Pat Nelson – Education Staff
    - b) Sheila Windingstad – Education Staff
    - c) Jenny Riley – Education Staff
    - d) Jana – Education Staff
- March 15: Handheld Conference @ Morris Area High School
  - 1) by Barry Brahier of Leadership in Hand – Business Partner
  - 2) Attended: (12)
    - a) Ethan Quirt – NTNT Staff
    - b) Brad Korn – Morris – School Partner
    - c) Gretchen Gillis – Morris – School Partner
    - d) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - e) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff / Morris – School Partner
    - f) Cork Loge – Morris – School Partner
    - g) Keith Redfield – Morris – School Partner
    - h) Brent Jacobson – Morris – School Partner
    - i) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - j) Monica Sleiter – St. Marys Morris – School Partner
    - k) Jerry Witt – Morris – School Partner
    - l) Tammie Grossman – Morris – School Partner
- March 18: WebCT Training
  - 1) by John Bowers and Pam Gades – Computing Services – UMM Partner
  - 2) Attended: (6)
    - a) Ruth Tragaser – Education Faculty
    - b) Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - c) Gwen Rudney – Education Faculty
    - d) Rebecca Williams – Education Faculty
    - e) Michelle Page – Education Faculty
    - f) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
- March 28: IT Task Force Meeting
  - 1) Review of Implementation Year One
  - 2) Discussion of Implementation Year Two
  - 3) Vision Presentation by Linda Jorn
  - 4) Attended: (10)

July 11, 2002

- a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
- b) Stacy Aronson – UMM Partner
- c) Pam Gades – Computing Services – UMM Partner
- d) Greg Thorson – UMM Partner
- e) Engin Sungur – UMM Partner
- f) Andy Lopez – UMM Partner
- g) Ethan Quirt – NTNT Staff
- h) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
- i) Linda Jorn – NTNT Staff
- j) Jenny Joiner – UMM Partner
- April 26: ITI activities Meeting
  - 1) with Karen Johnson in Continuing Education – UMM Partner
  - 2) Attended: (7)
    - a) Various UMM Partners / ITI Planning Committee
- May 17: Meeting with Minnewaska
  - 1) Attended: (8)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) 7 Minnewaska Faculty
- May 21-22: COTF Conference
  - 1) State Conference
  - 2) Attended: (1)
    - a) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
- May 31: Meeting with WesMN.net
  - 1) Application and Partnership meeting / Regional
  - 2) Attended: (1)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
- June 3: Handheld Conference with Barry Brahier at Morris Area High School
  - 1) Distribution of 31 Handheld devices to Morris Area School Faculty
  - 2) Attended: (36)
    - a. 31 Morris Faculty – School Partner
    - b. Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff / Morris – School Partner
    - c. Carol Marxen – Education Faculty
    - d. Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - e. Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
    - f. Casey Wagner – NTNT Staff
- June 5: IT Task Force Meeting at UMM
  - 1) Attended: (10)
    - a) Linda Jorn – NTNT Staff
    - b) John Bowers – Computing Services – UMM Partner
    - c) Joel Brenckman – School Partner
    - d) Bert Ahern – Faculty Center – UMM Partner
    - e) Engin Sunger – UMM Partner
    - f) Keith Redfield – School Partner
    - g) Dave Fluegel – UMM Partner
    - h) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff / Morris – School Partner
    - i) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - j) Casey Wagner – NTNT Staff
- June 6: SHOT Meeting at UMM with Linda Jorn

July 11, 2002

- 1) Attended: (20)
  - a) Consortium of MNSCU and UMM Partners
- June 11: Meeting with Computing Services to discuss Instructional Technology issues
  - 1) Attended: (4)
    - a) Pam Gades – Computer Services – UMM Partner
    - b) John Bowers – Computing Services – UMM Partner
    - c) Casey Wagner – NTNT Staff
    - d) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
- June 13: Meeting with new Education Division chair
  - 1) Attended: (4)
    - a) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - b) Casey Wagner – NTNT Staff
    - c) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - d) Judy Kuechle – Education Faculty
- June 17 – 19: NECC Conference in San Antonio
  - 1) Attended: (4)
    - a) Anne Riggs – Education Faculty
    - b) Pam Solvie – NTNT Staff
    - c) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - d) Craig Kissock – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
- June 28: Meeting with Willmar to discuss technology needs
  - 1) Attended: (2)
    - a) Bill Riggs – NTNT Staff / Education Faculty
    - b) Joel Brenckman – School Partner

**Appendix B**  
**Current NTNT Business Partners**

1. AdVenture
2. AlphaSmart
3. Apple Computer
4. Blackboard
5. Briggs Library
6. Classroom Connect
7. Computing Services
8. Continuing Education
9. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI)
10. Faculty Center for Learning and Teaching
11. Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
12. Inspiration/Kidspiration
13. Intel R
14. Knowledge Adventure
15. Lakes County Service Cooperative
16. Leadership in Hand
17. Lifetime Learning
18. Lightspan
19. McGraw Hill Publishing
20. Media Service
21. Microsoft
22. Netschools
23. Partstock Computer store
24. Schepp Turner
25. Texas Instruments
26. Tom Snyder Internet Schools

**Appendix C**  
**PK-12 Consortium School:**  
**In-kind Contributions 2001-2002**

<b>Summary of In-Kind Contributions</b>						
<b>June 2001 – March 2002</b>						
<b>All Schools (including IT Task Force Time)</b>						
	<i>Wages</i>	<i>Expenses</i>	<i>Equipment</i>	<i>Totals</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Ashby	\$ 195.00	\$ 154.75	\$ 8,461.00	\$ 8,810.75	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 1,189.25
Battle Lake	\$ -	\$ 1,635.00	\$ 9,123.00	\$ 10,758.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (758.00)
Benson	\$ -	\$ 17.25	\$ -	\$ 17.25	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 9,982.75
Brandon	\$ 1,093.88	\$ 2,365.39	\$ 6,665.00	\$ 10,124.27	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (124.27)
Browns Valley	\$ 1,396.34	\$ 14,343.07	\$ 16,774.00	\$ 32,513.41	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (22,513.41)
Chokio-Alberta	\$ -	\$ 4.14	\$ -	\$ 4.14	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 9,995.86
CGB	\$ 240.00	\$ 20.70	\$ -	\$ 260.70	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 9,739.30
CMST	\$ 6,151.68	\$ -	\$ 2,985.30	\$ 9,136.98	\$ 3,000.00	\$ (6,136.98)
Evansville	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Hancock	\$ -	\$ 5.52	\$ -	\$ 5.52	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 9,994.48
Herman-Norcross	\$ 128.00	\$ 20.90	\$ -	\$ 148.90	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 2,851.10
Lac Qui Parle	\$ 608.00	\$ 51.76	\$ 11,145.66	\$ 11,805.42	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (1,805.42)
MACCRAY	\$ 140.00	\$ 49.53	\$ -	\$ 189.53	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 9,810.47
Minnewaska	\$ 2,883.60	\$ 38.64	\$ 42,458.77	\$ 45,381.01	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (35,381.01)
Montevideo	\$ 312.00	\$ 69.00	\$ 49,184.00	\$ 49,565.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (39,565.00)
Morris	\$ -	\$ 2,525.83	\$ 50,539.66	\$ 53,065.49	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (43,065.49)
Ortonville	\$ -	\$ 56.44	\$ 12,073.57	\$ 12,130.01	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (2,130.01)
Osakis	\$ -	\$ 9,225.00	\$ 4,980.00	\$ 14,205.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (4,205.00)
Parkers Prairie	\$ 500.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,620.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (620.00)
St. Mary's-Alexandria	\$ -	\$ 387.60	\$ 7,881.00	\$ 8,268.60	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 1,731.40
St. Mary's-Morris	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 5,148.63	\$ 6,022.50	\$ 12,271.13	\$ 3,000.00	\$ (9,271.13)
West Central Area	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Wheaton	\$ -	\$ 28.98	\$ -	\$ 28.98	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 9,971.02
Willmar	\$ -	\$ 7,325.62	\$ 35,215.95	\$ 42,541.57	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (32,541.57)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 14,748.50</b>	<b>\$ 43,593.75</b>	<b>\$273,509.41</b>	<b>\$331,851.66</b>	<b>\$219,000.00</b>	<b>\$(112,851.66)</b>

## Appendix D Survey Results

<b>MORRIS FACULTY TECHNOLOGY SURVEY (n=57)</b>
--

Which statement best describes your use of IT in your courses?

- IT is not at all integrated into my teaching      41 (71.9%)
- IT is partially integrated into my teaching      9 (15.8%)
- IT is fully integrated into my teaching      5 (8.8%)

Please rate your IT **experience/knowledge** and **need for training** in the following areas: (missing percentages represent no response)

(Circle ONE number)	Experience/Knowledge				
	Extensive	Lots	Some	Minimal	None
(a) Preparing instructional materials	10 (17.5%)	17 (29.8%)	24 (42.1%)	5 (8.8%)	0 (0.0%)
(b) Conducting administrative tasks	9 (15.8%)	17 (29.8%)	21 (36.8%)	7 (12.3%)	2 (3.5%)
(c) Assessing student performance	0 (0.0%)	10 (17.5%)	18 (31.6%)	21 (36.8%)	6 (10.5%)
(d) Sending/receiving e-mail messages	43 (75.4%)	11 (19.3%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)
(e) Searching the Internet for resources	33 (57.9%)	16 (28.1%)	4 (7.0%)	3 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)
(f) Using Office applications (e.g. Word)	35 (61.4%)	12 (21.1%)	6 (10.5%)	3 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)
(g) Using hardware devices (e.g. scanners)	10 (17.5%)	14 (24.6%)	19 (33.3%)	8 (14.0%)	5 (8.8%)
(h) Operating audio/video equipment	8 (14.0%)	19 (33.3%)	20 (35.1%)	6 (10.5%)	3 (5.3%)
(i) Guiding student use of technology	3 (5.3%)	14 (24.6%)	30 (52.6%)	4 (7.0%)	5 (8.8%)
(j) Using closed environments (e.g. WebCT)	1 (1.8%)	5 (8.8%)	18 (31.6%)	14 (24.6%)	18 (31.6%)
(k) Operating web-development packages	2 (3.5%)	7 (12.3%)	12 (21.1%)	12 (21.1%)	22 (38.6%)
(l) Using net to post instructional material	15 (26.3%)	8 (14.0%)	11 (19.3%)	7 (12.3%)	15 (26.3%)
(m) Using course management software	1 (1.8%)	2 (3.5%)	11 (19.3%)	14 (24.6%)	28 (49.1%)

(Circle ONE number)	Need for Training				
	Extensive	Lots	Some	Minimal	None
(n) Preparing instructional materials	1 (1.8%)	13 (22.8%)	24 (42.1%)	10 (17.5%)	8 (14.0%)
(o) Conducting administrative tasks	3 (5.3%)	6 (10.5%)	24 (42.1%)	12 (21.1%)	11 (19.3%)
(p) Assessing student performance	2 (3.5%)	9 (15.8%)	22 (38.6%)	13 (22.8%)	10 (17.5%)
(q) Sending/receiving e-mail messages	6 (10.5%)	2 (3.5%)	5 (8.8%)	16 (28.1%)	27 (47.4%)
(r) Searching the Internet for resources	6 (10.5%)	3 (5.3%)	12 (21.1%)	16 (28.1%)	19 (33.3%)
(s) Using Office applications (e.g. Word)	7 (12.3%)	4 (7.0%)	10 (17.5%)	14 (24.6%)	21 (36.8%)
(t) Using hardware devices (e.g. scanners)	5 (8.8%)	7 (12.3%)	25 (43.9%)	8 (14.0%)	11 (19.3%)
(u) Operating audio/video equipment	4 (7.0%)	2 (3.5%)	22 (38.6%)	16 (28.1%)	12 (21.1%)
(v) Guiding student use of technology	5 (8.8%)	12 (21.1%)	18 (31.6%)	12 (21.1%)	9 (15.8%)
(w) Using closed environments (e.g. WebCT)	9 (15.8%)	7 (12.3%)	18 (31.6%)	12 (21.1%)	10 (17.5%)
(x) Operating web-development packages	10 (17.5%)	12 (21.1%)	13 (22.8%)	10 (17.5%)	10 (17.5%)
(y) Using net to post instructional material	11 (19.3%)	8 (14.0%)	20 (35.1%)	5 (8.8%)	12 (21.1%)
(z) Using course management software	9 (15.8%)	7 (12.3%)	16 (28.1%)	11 (19.3%)	11 (19.3%)

What types of software do you use regularly?

- Office applications (Word, Excel, etc.)
- Math and Statistics (SPSS, etc.)
- Web-authoring (Dreamweaver, etc.)
- Web browsers
- FTP
- Video/graphics

Please indicate to what extent you **agree** or **disagree** with each of the following:

(Circle ONE number)	At the University of Minnesota Morris				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
(a) Students should be required to purchase laptop computers	1 (1.8%)	6 (10.5%)	29 (50.9%)	18 (31.5%)	3 (5.3%)
(b) Students should be required to purchase handheld devices	2 (3.6%)	1 (1.8%)	20 (35.1%)	29 (50.8%)	5 (8.8%)
(c) Enough computers to support quality use and accelerate the learning process	4 (7.2%)	23 (40.4%)	20 (35.1%)	2 (3.6%)	8 (14.0%)
(d) Hardware is sufficiently advanced to support quality software/multimedia	4 (7.2%)	28 (49.1%)	11 (19.3%)	5 (8.8%)	9 (15.8%)
(e) Variety of quality software to support effective learning in my curriculum area	5 (8.8%)	26 (45.6%)	15 (26.3%)	5 (8.8%)	6 (10.5%)

Do you believe integrating IT will:

(Circle ONE number)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
(a) Increase your quality of instruction	7 (12.3%)	36 (63.2%)	11 (19.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.3%)
(b) Enhance professional communication	13 (22.8%)	34 (59.6%)	8 (14.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.5%)
(c) Enhance student learning	7 (12.3%)	37 (64.9%)	9 (15.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (7.0%)
(d) Facilitate interactions with students	7 (12.3%)	38 (66.7%)	10 (17.5%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.8%)
(e) Support professional productivity	10 (18.0%)	31 (54.4%)	9 (15.8%)	2 (3.5%)	5 (8.8%)
(f) Access professional growth opportunities	10 (18.0%)	31 (54.4%)	6 (10.5%)	2 (3.5%)	8 (14.0%)

What prevents you from using IT for activities relating to teaching?

- Limited time 42 (73.7%)
- Lack of knowledge 19 (33.3%)
- Not enough training 16 (28.1%)
- Lack of quality software 15 (26.3%)
- Lack of technical support 13 (22.8%)
- Lack of quality hardware 10 (17.5%)
- Limited access 9 (15.8%)
- Not a high priority 9 (15.8%)
- Nothing 6 (10.5%)

Which of the following most closely describes your position?

- Assistant Professor 21 (36.8%)
- Associate Professor 16 (28.1%)
- Professor 13 (22.8%)
- Lecturer 3 (5.3%)
- Other 3 (5.3%)

What is your discipline?

- Social Science 16 (32.0%)
- Science 12 (17.7%)
- Education 9 (16.1%)
- Other 7 (13.0%)
- Liberal Arts 6 (10.6%)
- Mathematics 6 (10.6%)

How many total years of teaching experience at a college/university level do you have?

- More than ten years 29 (50.9%)
- Six to ten years 16 (28.1%)
- One to five years 10 (17.5%)
- Less than one year 1 (1.8%)

**MORRIS STUDENT TEACHER TECHNOLOGY SURVEY (n=10)**

How often do you use IT for activities relating to teaching? (Check ONE option)

- Once a week                      4 (33.3%)
- Daily                                 3 (25.0%)
- Less than once a month    3 (25.0%)
- Two-three times a week    2 (16.7%)
- Once a month                    0 (0.0%)
- Not at all                         0 (0.0%)

Which statement best describes your use of IT in your student teaching classroom?

- IT is partially integrated into my teaching        7 (58.3%)
- IT is fully integrated into my teaching            3 (25.0%)
- IT is not at all integrated into my teaching      2 (16.7%)

Please rate your IT **experience** and **need** in each of the following areas:

(Circle ONE number)	<b>Experience</b>				
	Extensive	Lots	Some	Minimal	None
(a) Preparing instructional materials	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)
(b) Conducting administrative tasks	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)
(c) Assessing student performance	1 (8.3%)	6 (50.0%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)
(d) Sending/receiving e-mail messages	9 (75.0%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)
(e) Searching the Internet for resources	6 (50.0%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)
(f) Using Office applications (e.g. Word)	8 (66.7%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
(g) Using hardware devices (e.g. scanners)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)
(h) Operating audio/video equipment	4 (33.3%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)
(i) Guiding student use of technology	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.7%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)

(Circle ONE number)	<b>Need</b>				
	Extensive	Lots	Some	Minimal	None
(j) Preparing instructional materials	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)
(k) Conducting administrative tasks	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)
(l) Assessing student performance	0 (0.0%)	6 (50.0%)	4 (33.3%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (8.3%)
(m) Sending/receiving e-mail messages	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)
(n) Searching the Internet for resources	4 (33.3%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)
(o) Using Office applications (e.g. Word)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)
(p) Using hardware devices (e.g. scanners)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	3 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)
(q) Operating audio/video equipment	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)
(r) Guiding student use of technology	3 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)

Please indicate to what extent you **agree or disagree** with each of the following:

(Circle ONE number)	<b>In Your Student Teaching Classroom</b>				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
(a) Enough computers to support quality use and accelerate the learning process	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	1 (8.3%)
(b) Hardware is sufficiently advanced to support quality software/multimedia	1 (8.3%)	6 (50.0%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)
(c) Variety of quality software to support effective learning in my curriculum area	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.7%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)

(Circle ONE number)	<b>At the University of Minnesota Morris</b>				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
(d) Enough computers to support quality use and accelerate the learning process	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)
(e) Hardware is sufficiently advanced to support quality software/multimedia	1 (8.3%)	6 (50.0%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)
(f) Variety of quality software to support effective learning in my curriculum area	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.7%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)

Do you believe integrating IT will help the students in your student teaching classroom to:

(Circle ONE number)	Yes	No	Not Sure
(a) Do well in school	8 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (25.0%)
(b) Better understand materials presented in class	8 (66.7%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)
(c) Complete quality assignments	10 (83.4%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)
(d) Solve real world problems	5 (41.7%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)
(e) Work with other students	7 (58.4%)	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.3%)
(f) See their assignments visually	11(100%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

What prevents you from using IT for activities relating to teaching?

- Lack of time
- Lack of knowledge
- Lack of access to the proper resources

What year (e.g. junior) are you as a student at the University of Minnesota Morris?

- Senior: 6 (50.0%)
- Other: 5 (41.7%)

What grade level (e.g. elementary) are you currently pursuing your license?

- Secondary: 7 (58.3%)
- Elementary: 4 (33.3%)

What is your major(s)?

- Elementary Ed. 5 (41.7%)
- Social Science 3 (25.0%)
- Music 1 (8.3%)
- Masters 1 (8.3%)

What is the name of the school where you spend most of your time student teaching?

10 different schools were listed

How many weeks have you spent at this school? (Please specify in weeks)

- 10-14 weeks 5 (41.7%)
- 20-47 weeks 3 (24.9%)

**CONSORTIUM SCHOOL TEACHER TECHNOLOGY SURVEY (n=124)**

How often do you use IT for activities relating to teaching? (No response = 1 (0.8%))

- Daily 36 (29.0%)
- Two-three times a week 34 (27.4%)
- Once a week 26 (21.0%)
- Once a month 11 (8.9%)
- Less than once a month 10 (8.1%)
- Not at all 6 (4.8%)

Which statement best describes your use of IT in your classroom?

- IT is partially integrated into my teaching 72 (58.1%)
- IT is not at all integrated into my teaching 31 (25.0%)
- IT is fully integrated into my teaching 20 (16.1%)

Please rate your IT **experience** and **need** in each of the following areas:

(Circle ONE number)	<b>Experience</b>				
	Extensive	Lots	Some	Minimal	None
(a) Preparing instructional materials	30 (24.2%)	33 (26.6%)	43 (34.7%)	12 (9.7%)	6 (4.8%)
(b) Conducting administrative tasks	23 (18.5%)	27 (21.8%)	42 (33.9%)	20 (16.1%)	12 (9.7%)
(c) Assessing student performance	21 (16.9%)	31 (25.0%)	45 (36.3%)	19 (15.3%)	8 (6.5%)
(d) Sending/receiving e-mail messages	54 (43.5%)	44 (35.5%)	15 (12.1%)	5 (4.0%)	6 (4.8%)
(e) Searching the Internet for resources	42 (33.9%)	45 (36.3%)	22 (17.7%)	9 (7.3%)	6 (4.8%)
(f) Using Office applications (e.g. Word)	40 (32.3%)	51 (41.1%)	18 (14.5%)	8 (6.5%)	7 (5.6%)
(g) Using hardware devices (e.g. scanners)	11 (8.9%)	16 (12.9%)	47 (37.9%)	33 (26.6%)	17 (13.7%)
(h) Operating audio/video equipment	17 (13.7%)	34 (27.4%)	39 (31.5%)	24 (19.4%)	10 (8.1%)
(i) Guiding student use of technology	21 (16.9%)	30 (24.2%)	46 (37.1%)	17 (13.7%)	9 (7.3%)

(Circle ONE number)	Need				
	Extensive	Lots	Some	Minimal	None
(j) Preparing instructional materials	17 (13.7%)	27 (21.8%)	50 (40.3%)	19 (15.3%)	9 (7.3%)
(k) Conducting administrative tasks	13 (10.5%)	24 (19.4%)	44 (35.5%)	25 (20.2%)	16 (12.9%)
(l) Assessing student performance	10 (8.1%)	35 (28.2%)	48 (38.7%)	18 (14.5%)	11 (8.9%)
(m) Sending/receiving e-mail messages	13 (10.5%)	16 (12.9%)	19 (15.3%)	39 (31.5%)	34 (27.4%)
(n) Searching the Internet for resources	17 (13.7%)	22 (17.7%)	33 (26.6%)	30 (24.2%)	20 (16.1%)
(o) Using Office applications (e.g. Word)	17 (13.7%)	20 (16.1%)	41 (33.1%)	23 (18.5%)	21 (16.9%)
(p) Using hardware devices (e.g. scanners)	15 (12.1%)	32 (25.8%)	39 (31.5%)	21 (16.9%)	15 (12.1%)
(q) Operating audio/video equipment	13 (10.5%)	26 (21.0%)	38 (30.6%)	28 (22.6%)	17 (13.7%)
(r) Guiding student use of technology	15 (12.1%)	29 (23.4%)	43 (34.7%)	22 (17.7%)	10 (8.1%)

Please indicate to what extent you **agree** or **disagree** with each of the following at this school:

(Circle ONE number)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
(a) Enough computers to support quality use and accelerate the learning process	13 (10.5%)	57 (46.0%)	36 (29.0%)	16 (12.9%)	2 (1.6%)
(b) Hardware is sufficiently advanced to support quality software/multimedia	9 (7.3%)	60 (48.4%)	32 (25.8%)	19 (15.3%)	4 (3.2%)
(c) Variety of quality software to support effective learning in my curriculum area	8 (6.4%)	53 (42.7%)	39 (31.5%)	20 (16.2%)	4 (3.2%)

Do you believe integrating IT will help the students in your classroom to:

(Circle ONE number)	Yes	No	Not Sure
(a) Do well in school	100(80.6%)	6 (4.8%)	18 (14.5%)
(b) Better understand materials presented in class	96 (77.4%)	8 (6.5%)	20 (16.1%)
(c) Complete quality assignments	85 (68.5%)	19 (15.3%)	20 (16.1%)
(d) Solve real world problems	77 (62.1%)	21 (16.9%)	26 (21.0%)
(e) Work with other students	81 (65.3%)	26 (21.0%)	17 (13.7%)
(f) See their assignments visually	103(83.1%)	10 (8.1%)	10 (8.1%)

What prevents you from using IT for activities relating to teaching?

- Time to learn, prepare, and use technology
- Access to adequate technology
- Knowledge of instructional technologies that best enhance and complement a given curriculum

July 11, 2002

How do you classify your current position at this school?

- Full-time 114 (91.9%)
- Part-time 5 (4.0%)
- Substitute 4 (3.2%)
- Other (Please specify) 1 (0.8%)

What grade level (e.g. elementary) are you licensed to teach?

- Secondary: 72 (58.5%)
- Elementary: 51 (41.5%)

What subject(s) do you teach?

- Elementary Education 48 (38.7%)
- Other 40 (32.3%)
- English 23 (18.5%)
- Mathematics 21 (16.9%)
- Social Science 21 (16.9%)
- Art/Theatre/Music 15 (12.1%)
- Science 18 (14.5%)
- Foreign Language 10 (8.1%)

What is the name of the school where you teach?

At least 29 different schools were identified (Please note that it is difficult to record the exact number of schools. Some respondents left the item blank, some used different spellings, and some abbreviated school names.)

How long have you been teaching at this school?

- More than ten years 64 (51.6%)
- One to five years 29 (23.4%)
- Six to ten years 22 (17.7%)
- Less than one year 6 (4.8%)

**PK-12 STUDENT TECHNOLOGY SURVEY (n=620)**

How often do you use IT at this school?

- |                          |         |             |                          |                   |           |
|--------------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |         |             | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not at all        | 35 (5.6%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Daily   | 230 (37.1%) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than monthly | 24 (3.9%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Weekly  | 224 (36.1%) |                          |                   |           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Monthly | 65 (10.5%)  |                          |                   |           |

How often do you do the following things at this school?

(Check ONE option)	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less than Monthly	Not at All
(a) Send/receive an email message	58 (9.4%)	54 (8.7%)	14 (2.3%)	38 (6.1%)	455 (73.4%)
(b) Have a conversation on the Internet (e.g. chat room)	38 (6.1%)	30 (4.8%)	25 (4.0%)	26 (4.2%)	498 (80.3%)
(c) Use the Internet to get information	108 (17.4%)	257 (41.5%)	158 (25.5%)	68 (11.0%)	23 (3.7%)
(d) Use Office applications (e.g. Word)	141 (22.7%)	218 (35.2%)	85 (13.7%)	72 (11.6)	93 (15.0%)
(e) Play a computer game	58 (9.4%)	86 (13.9%)	80 (12.9%)	114 (18.4%)	279 (45.0%)
(f) Design a computer program	2 (0.3%)	17 (2.7%)	21 (3.4%)	66 (10.6%)	505 (81.5%)
(g) Use hardware devices (e.g. scanners)	42 (6.8%)	82 (13.2%)	88 (14.2%)	136 (21.9%)	263 (42.4%)
(h) Use a TV/VCR to get information	50 (8.1%)	69 (11.1%)	123 (19.8%)	151 (24.4%)	222 (35.8%)
(i) Help other students to use computer technology	55 (8.9%)	134 (21.6%)	138 (22.3%)	152 (24.5%)	131 (21.1%)
(j) Help teachers to use computer technology	16 (2.6%)	33 (5.3%)	60 (9.7%)	160 (25.8%)	345 (55.6%)

How often do you use technology for any of the following activities at this school?

(Check ONE option)	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less than Monthly	Not at All
(a) In-class activities	147 (23.7%)	227 (36.6%)	114 (18.4%)	81 (13.1%)	39 (6.3%)
(b) Homework assignments	114 (18.4%)	210 (33.9%)	124 (20.0%)	89 (14.4%)	69 (11.1%)
(c) Extracurricular activities	23 (3.7%)	65 (10.5%)	63 (10.2%)	106 (17.1%)	347 (56.0%)
(d) Personal use	152 (24.5%)	106 (17.1%)	80 (12.9%)	92 (14.8%)	174 (28.1%)

July 11, 2002

Please rate how well this school has taught you to use IT?

- |                                     |             |  |            |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Well       | 250 (40.3%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Not very well | 75 (12.1%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adequately | 145 (23.4%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all    | 20 (3.2%)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very well  | 95 (15.3%)  |  |            |

Does the use of IT at this school help you to:

(Check ONE option)	Yes	No	Not Sure
(a) Do well in school	377 (60.8%)	85 (13.7%)	151 (24.4%)
(b) Better understand materials presented in class	327 (52.7%)	142 (22.9%)	143 (23.1%)
(c) Complete quality assignments	437 (70.5%)	80 (12.9%)	96 (15.5%)
(d) Solve real world problems	2 (0.3%)	217 (35.0%)	242 (39.0%)
(e) Work with other students	314 (50.6%)	165 (26.6%)	133 (21.5%)
(f) See your assignments visually	330 (53.2%)	141 (22.7%)	142 (22.9%)

Who do you go to when you need help with IT at this school?

- |  |             |  |            |
|--|-------------|--|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other students              | 472 (76.1%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other         | 69 (11.1%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers                    | 435 (70.2%) | <input type="checkbox"/> The Principal | 14 (2.3%)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computer specialist/teacher | 319(51.5%)  | <input type="checkbox"/> Counselors    | 9 (1.5%)   |

What gets in the way of using IT for your assignments at this school?

- |   |             |   |            |
|---|-------------|---|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computers are too slow | 297 (47.9%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough hardware            | 95 (15.3%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough time to use | 278 (44.8%) | <input type="checkbox"/> None of my assignments require | 93 (15.0%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Email is not available | 211 (34.0%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify)         | 91 (14.7%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough computers   | 164 (26.5%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Internet is not available      | 46 (7.4%)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nothing                | 109 (17.6%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Do not know anything about     | 44 (7.1%)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough software    | 104 (16.8%) | <input type="checkbox"/> Nobody can help                | 21 (3.4%)  |

Please name up to three things this school can do better to help you improve your IT skills.

- Better equipment and software
- More time to work with and use technology
- More relevant applications of IT

What is your grade level? (Check ONE option)

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ninth grade            | 242 (39.0%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) | 158 (25.4%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Twelfth grade          | 122 (19.7%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sixth grade            | 98 (15.8%)  |

What is the name of your school?

At least 29 different schools were identified (Please note that it is difficult to record the exact number of schools. Some respondents left the item blank, some used different spellings, and some abbreviated school names.)

### **Action Consulting And Evaluation Team**

The Action Consulting and Evaluation Team (ACET, Inc.) is an independent research group specializing in the evaluation of PK-16 educational and community-based programs. Located in Minneapolis, Minnesota, ACET contracts with a variety of professional consultants to work with clients in identifying program strengths and challenges, evaluating goal attainment, and providing recommendations for program improvement. Program evaluation activities involve both qualitative (e.g. interviews, focus groups, site-visits) and quantitative (e.g. statistical analysis, data management, surveys,) analysis. The President of ACET is Stella SiWan Cheung.

**Stella SiWan Cheung** has consulted with a variety of organizations including the Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning, the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, the Minneapolis Foundation, and the St. Paul Foundation. Some of her current evaluation projects include serving as Principal Investigator for the University of Minnesota Morris New Teachers New Technology Project, the Words Work Literacy Initiative (five-year longitudinal analysis), the Cargill Foundation/University of Minnesota Schools First Initiative, and two Minnesota State Incentive Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drug Prevention Programs. The New York Times and several major U.S. newspapers and local radio and television programs have cited her research and commentaries. She has presented and facilitated sessions on evaluation for the U.S. Department of Education, the New Twin Cities Charter School Project, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and the Minnesota Association of Charter Schools.

Ms. Cheung was recently announced an Arizona State University College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Leader for being a distinguished graduate. She was also named a Woodrow Wilson Fellow in 1996 and completed the Woodrow Wilson Summer Program in Public Policy and International Affairs at Princeton University. She earned a B.A. in Family Studies from Arizona State University Honors College and an M.A. in Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.

**Jason Butler** has consulted with a number of Minnesota charter schools and non-profit community organizations as an ACET consultant. He has worked extensively with the Committee on Academic Uses of Technology (CAUT) for the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Minnesota. Currently, Mr. Butler is working on a five-year longitudinal literacy study funded by the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. His primary interests stem from his experiences as a Pre-school teacher in Northern California and include reading comprehension, early literacy development, and integration of technology into the classroom. Mr. Butler earned a B.S. in Psychology from North Dakota State University and an M.A. in Educational Psychology with a minor in Program Evaluation from the University of Minnesota.