DRAFT

The 2006 Report on the Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUCs) Survey at the University of Southern Mississippi

Faculty, Staff and Graduate Student (FSGS) Responses on the Status of the HVUCs

July 2006

Executive Summary

PURPOSE

In 2001, The University of Southern Mississippi received a $1.78 million Title III-A Strengthening the Institution grant from the U. S. Department of Education to assist in the implementation of technology into classroom instruction. A direct result of that grant is the more than 40 HVUCs spread throughout our institution. Sadly, our HVUCs on the Gulf Coast campuses at Gulf Park and the Gulf Coast Research Lab (GCRL) were wiped out by Hurricane Katrina.

In 2004, and again in 2006, the HVUCs Survey was administered by the Title III-A Project Directors in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the grant, to assess improvements in classroom multimedia technology, to ensure that the instructional technology needs of faculty, staff, and students were being recognized, and to facilitate better planning to meet future maintenance and faculty development needs.

METHODOLOGY

The 2006 Survey was designed to replicate as many questions as possible from the 2004 Survey to enable longitudinal analysis of the Title III-A grant. Two of the demographic questions were updated ("number of courses taught in the "SMART" classrooms and using the HVUC equipment", and "the first semester taught in a HVUC room"). The 2006 Survey added one question (the importance of SPSS software to accomplishing course objectives) and changed the format of one item (from a Likert scale response on "This equipment has improved student participation in my class." to the open-ended response "In what ways has this equipment impacted student participation in your class?") SPSS software had been installed on the instructor's computer station in many of the HVUC rooms so the researchers wanted to assess its importance. The alteration of the format for the student participation question was done for two reasons: first, to replace the somewhat biased word "improved" with the more objective word "impacted"; next, to allow participants to list the specific ways in which the equipment had impacted their students.

In 2006, the Learning Enhancement Center (LEC) hand-entered the data into an Excel file and the researcher imported the Excel file into a SPSS file. This transition from Excel to SPSS required certain coding and recoding to make the 2006 data compatible with the 2004 data. A key to that coding/recoding is available in Appendix B of this report.

IMPORTANCE OF THE HVUC EQUIPMENT AND SOFTWARE TO USERS

The Computer, SMART Sympodium, Data Video Projector, Audio and Internet Access are clearly what FSGS consider the most important pieces of equipment to the accomplishment of their course objectives. The DVD/VCR Player, External Laptop Connectivity, and the Visual Presenter (Elmo) were the second most important, while the Camera, Microphone, and the Mac Adaptor were the least important. By contrast, FSGS in the 2004 Survey ranked the equipment in this order: Computer, Data Video Projector, SMART Sympodium, Internet Access, DVD/VCR Player, Audio, Visual Projector (Elmo), External Laptop Connectivity, Mac Adaptors, Camera, and the Microphone.

While many pieces of equipment changed rankings between the 2004 and the 2006 Surveys, the DVD/VCR Player was the only piece to move out of the top five; however, that is likely due to random variation since it moved only to the position of the sixth most important piece of equipment.

FSGS considered MS Office Suite to be the most important software in the accomplishment of their course objectives. The Adobe Acrobat Reader, and the MS Media and QuickTime Movie Players were the second most important, while the Macromedia Flash, SMART Notebook, and SPSS Statistical Software were the least important. The only different ranking in the 2004 Survey (excluding the SPSS software since that question was not asked in 2004) was that QuickTime Movie Player was ranked higher than MS Media Player.

ISSUES OF USER SATISFACTION WITH THE HVUCs

Nearly all FSGS in the sample know how to use the HVUC equipment and received adequate training to do so. An overwhelming 94.5% reported that they had attended a scheduled training session conducted by the LEC personnel. FSGS noted that they needed additional hardware and software training on the following: Data Video Projectors, SMART Sympodiums, Visual Presenters (Elmos), External Laptop Connectivity (for iBook), Macromedia Flash, Web Conferencing, SMART software, ESRI-ARC 9 and updated versions of all of the installed software.

CONCLUSIONS

Items assessing the importance of equipment in accomplishing course objectives indicated the SMART Sympodium, Audio, and External Laptop Connectivity gained importance in the achievement of course objectives in 2006.

MS Office applications continue to be the most important software in accomplishing course objectives in 2006. However, there was a shift in the video file player of choice between the QuickTime Movie Player in 2004 to the MS Media Player in 2006.

Issues of User Satisfaction with the HVUCs in 2006 included: an increased demand for HVUCs for meetings and classes, and additional professional development. Virtually all the FSGS reported overall satisfaction with the HVUCs, a substantial increase since 2004. The goals and objectives for the Title III-A Strengthening the Institution grant were exceeded.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **SPA:**
  - Encourage faculty to submit new grant proposals which provide additional technology resources for their Colleges and the University.
  - Maintain workshops focused on securing funding for technology resources.

- **LEC:**
  - Continue to market faculty professional development particularly in online formats.
  - Encourage Title III-A Faculty Technology Mentors in every college to provide on-site training and support to their fellow faculty, whenever possible.
  - Market instructional and multimedia designers who support the effective integration of technology into the curricula, perhaps by sending a LEC representative to outline services at each College's Convocation.
- **iTech:**
  - Persist in resolving Internet and network access issues and establishing a systematic plan to renew hardware.
  - Market existing campus resources and continue to focus on customer service issues by engaging faculty who might not have responded to the Technology Survey(s) and the HVUCs Survey(s).

DRAFT

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 3

Issues of User Satisfaction with the HVUCs

CHAPTER 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

DRAFT

Chapter 1

Purpose and Methodology

Purpose of the Report

The 2004 and 2006 Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUCs) Surveys[1] were administered to assess the users' perceptions of the HVUCs, which were designed and placed into operation from 2002-2004, funded by a $1.78 million Title III-A Strengthening the Institution Grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The HVUCs are "SMART" classrooms which typically contain the following hardware, software and instructional technology equipment:

- SMART Sympodium with lectern
- Dell Optiplex GX270 Small Mini Tower P4 computer
- USB-PC Wireless adapter
- Ceiling-Mounted Video Data Projector
- DVD/VCR combo
- Audio System
- Wall-mounted Screen
- SMART USB to serial adapter for laptop connectivity
- Key Span Presentation remote control
- Elmo Visual Presenter (video overhead projector)
- Wireless Internet access
- Microsoft Office Suite software
- SMART software
- Adobe Reader software
- SPSS software
- Macromedia Flash software
- Internet Explorer and Netscape Navigator Internet Browsers
- Microsoft Media Player software
- Quick Time software
- Science Lab HVUCs are also equipped with digital cameras and microscope adapters that integrate into the HVUC equipment.

The 2004 survey provided formative evaluation for the goals and objectives of the Title III-A grant. The results informed administrative decisions in instructional technology hardware and software acquisitions and faculty technology development efforts.

The administration of the 2006 Survey measured the University's success in attaining the Title III-A goals and objectives over the life of the grant. It documents the interventions implemented from 2002 to 2006, and the impact of those interventions.

Methodology

In 2004, 101 questionnaires were campus-mailed to the faculty, staff, and graduate students (FSGS), who had been trained to use the HVUCs, from all university campuses with 57 usable surveys returned for a response rate of 27%. In 2006, 261 questionnaires were campus-mailed to HVUC-trained FSGS on all University campuses with an updated letter from the researchers encouraging participation; 55 usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 21.07%. In 2004, the University's Center for Research Support hand-entered the data into an SPSS file for data analyses

The 2004 Survey gathered demographic data including rank, PEF faculty status, college and campus affiliations, race, age group, highest level of education attained, number of courses taught in the "SMART" classrooms and using the HVUC equipment, and the first semester taught in a HVUC room. Participants were asked to describe the importance of 17 specific pieces of HVUC software, hardware, and other technology equipment to accomplishing their course objectives. Questions also addressed FSGS satisfaction with HVUC room access, equipment, software, training, frequency of use, and overall satisfaction.

The 2006 Survey was designed to replicate as many questions as possible from the 2004 Survey to enable longitudinal analysis of the Title III-A grant. Two of the demographic questions were updated ("number of courses taught in the "SMART" classrooms and using the HVUC equipment", and "the first semester taught in a HVUC room"). The 2006 Survey added one question (the importance of SPSS software to accomplishing course objectives) and changed the format of one item (from a Likert scale response on "This equipment has improved student participation in my class." to the open-ended response "In what ways has this equipment impacted student participation in your class?") SPSS software had been installed on the instructor's computer station in many of the HVUC rooms so the researchers wanted to assess its importance. The alteration of the format for the student participation question was done for two reasons: first, to replace the biased word "improved" with the objective word "impacted"; next, to allow participants to list the specific ways in which the equipment had impacted their students.

In 2006, the LEC hand-entered the data into an Excel file and the researchers imported the Excel file into a SPSS file. This transition from Excel to SPSS required certain coding and recoding to make the 2006 data compatible with the 2004 data. The key to the coding/recoding of the 2006 data is in Appendix B of this report.

Breakdown of Responses

The return rate for the 2006 Survey was similar to the rate for the 2004 Survey, as expected. The researchers believe that reliable information can be obtained from the survey since the survey reliability, as assessed by Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha equaled .90, which is acceptable. All participants reported their ***status*** and there was a good distribution of responses among ranks, particularly among the tenure-track professors (56.4%).

Table 1: Summary of Responses by Status

Status	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=55)
Missing Data	0	0
Staff	6	10.9
Graduate Teaching Assistant	6	10.9
Part-time Faculty	5	9.1
Instructor	4	7.3
Visiting Professor	3	5.5
Adjunct Professor	0	0
Assistant Professor	22	40
Associate Professor	0	0
Professor	9	16.4

The breakdown by ***college*** contained a low level of missing data with only 2 participants declining to indicate their college affiliation. The College of Arts and Letters participated in higher numbers than any other college, which was commendable, yet unsurprising since they have the greatest number of FSGS among the 5 Colleges. While 7 participants didn't indicate their ***Professional Education Faculty (PEF) status***, 75% of the sample reporting was PEF.

Table 2: Summary of Responses by College and PEF Status

College	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=55)
Missing Data	2	3.6
College of Arts and Letters	19	35.8
College of Business	4	7.5
College of Health	12	22.6
College of Science and Technology	6	11.3
College of Education and Psychology	11	20.8
Honors College	1	1.9
PEF Status		
Missing	7	12.7
PEF	36	75
Non-PEF	12	25

There were no missing data in the breakdown by ***race.*** Caucasian participants formed the largest percentage of the sample.

Table 3: Summary of Responses by Race

Race	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=55)
Missing Data	0	0
American Indian	3	5.5
Asian	0	0
African American	3	5.5
Caucasian	48	87.3
Hispanic	0	0
Other	1	1.8

The breakdown by ***age groups*** contained no missing data. The mean age group was the 30-39 year old age group. Participants aged 40-49 were the most likely to report and participants aged 20-29 were the least likely to report.

Table 4: Summary of Responses by Age Group

Age Group	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=55)
Missing Data	0	0
20-29	7	12.7
30-39	16	29.1
40-49	19	34.5
Above 50	13	23.6

The breakdown by ***highest education level*** contained no missing data. Participants with Ph.D, Ed.D, and J.D. degrees were the most likely to report and participants with BA/BS or "Other" degrees were the least likely to report.

Table 5: Summary of Responses by Highest Education Level

Highest Education Level	**Total Number of Responses**	**Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=55)**
Missing Data	0	0
BA/BS	1	1.8
MA/MS/MFA	20	36.4
Ph.D./Ed.D./J.D.	33	60
Other	1	1.8

There were no missing data in the breakdown by the ***Number of Courses Taught in "SMART" rooms using HVUC Equipment.*** Participants who had taught 0-2 courses formed the largest percentage of the sample. That pattern held throughout this breakdown, that the HVUC users who had taught the fewest courses were the most likely to participate in the Survey.

Table 6: Summary of Responses by Number of Courses Taught in "SMART" Rooms Using HVUC Eqpt

Number of Courses Taught in "SMART" Rooms Using HVUC Eqpt	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=55)
Missing Data	0	0
0-2 Courses	32	58.2
3-5 Courses	14	25.5
6-8 Courses	4	7.3
9-11 Courses	1	1.8
12-14 Courses	0	1.8
More than 17 Courses	3	5.5

There were no missing data in the breakdown by the ***Summary of First Semester taught in a HVUC room.*** Participants who had taught 0-2 courses formed the largest percentage of the sample. That pattern held throughout this breakdown, that the HVUC users who had taught the fewest courses were the most likely to participate in the Survey.

Table 7: Summary of Responses by First Semester Taught in a HVUC Room

First Semester Taught in a HVUC Room	Total Number of Responses	Approximate Percentage of Total Responses (N=55)
Missing Data	1	1.9
Never taught in HVUC Room	2	3.7
Before January 2003	9	16.7
June 2003	2	3.7
August 2003	6	11.1
January 2004	1	1.9
June 2004	0	0
August 2004	12	22.2
January 2005	6	11.1
June 2005	1	1.9
August 2005	14	25.9
January 2006	1	1.9

Score Interpretations and Scale

As you read the data results, you will notice that some of the number of participants in some of the questions will vary slightly. The reason for this is that, for some questions, respondents would indicate their age group, for example, but not their academic rank. When the data were analyzed or grouped based upon age group, that particular respondent would be included in the data; however, when the information were grouped based upon academic rank, that respondent would *not* be included in the data since he/she did not indicate academic rank.

The Survey results were tallied based upon a **Likert scale** of 1-5 for the items which asked the FSGS to describe how important each hardware or software item was in accomplishing their course objectives:

1 = Not Important at All
2 = Somewhat Unimportant
3 = Neutral
4 = Somewhat Important
5 = Extremely Important

The Survey results for the items which assessed FSGS satisfaction with room access, equipment, software, training, and overall satisfaction were tallied on a different **Likert scale:**

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

The questions were answered in most cases, although there are some missing data. For the purposes of establishing a mid-range score for the data, the center score of "3" was chosen. Scores above "3" will be interpreted as agreement and scores below "3" will be interpreted as disagreement.

[1]The Highly Visible Undergraduate Classroom Survey administered in 2004 and 2006 was written by Evelyn Green, and Drs. Lin Harper, J.T. Johnson and Mary Nell McNeese. Copies of both of these surveys are included in Appendix C of this report.

Chapter 2

Importance of the HVUC Equipment and Software to Users

Importance of Equipment in Accomplishing Course Objectives

FSGS at Southern Miss described the importance of certain types of technology equipment in the HVUCs in accomplishing their course objectives in 2006 Survey items a – g and n-q. Since the data on these 11 pieces of equipment are skewed the medians, rather than the means and standard deviations, will be reported. The importance of each individual piece of equipment is discussed below:

Data Video Projector (item a): The median of the importance of the data video projector was 5. This median shows the highest level of perceived importance. An overwhelming 85.4% of the FSGS agreed that the projector played an important role in the success of their class. A slightly higher percentage of FSGS (89.3%) agreed that this equipment was important on the 2004 Survey.

Computer (item b): The median for computer importance was 5, showing the same highest level as that of the data video projector. Almost 93% of the FSGS perceive the computer to be an important aid to their accomplishing course objectives. In the 2004 Survey, virtually the same percentage of participants agreed with this assessment.

DVD player/VCR (item c): The median of the importance of the DVD play/VCR was 4, which was slightly lower than the medians for the computer and data video projector. Around 72.7% of the participants agreed the players held importance to their teaching, while 82.5% described them as important in the 2004 Survey.

Visual Presenter (Elmo) (item d): This item of equipment held the same level of importance for FSGS as the DVD/VCR (Median = 4). Almost 59% of respondents agreed that the Elmo was important, compared to virtually the same percentage from the 2004 sample (60%).

SMART Sympodium (item e): Like the data video projector and the computer, the median of the importance of the SMART Sympodium was 5. Eighty-seven percent of the FSGS agreed that the SMART Sympodium was important, while 90.7% agreed it was important on the 2004 Survey.

External Laptop Connectivity (item f): The external laptop connectivity is in the same median category (4) as the DVD player/VCR and the Visual Presenter (Elmo) in terms of importance to the achievement of course objectives. In the 2006 Survey, 68.5% of the FSGS agreed that this connectivity was important to them, contrasted to 65.4% in the 2004 Survey.

Internet Access (item g): The median for the importance of Internet access was 5, ranking it on par with the data video projector, the computer, and the SMART Sympodium. Approximately 85.4% perceived Internet access as important, just as 86% had remarked in the 2004 Survey.

Microphone (item n): By far the lowest median thus far (1), the microphone was not considered by FSGS to be as important in the accomplishment of course objectives. Only about 40% assessed it as important, compared to 19.6% in 2004.

Camera (item o): The only median of 3 was associated with the importance of the camera. Approximately 25.4% of the FSGS agreed that it was important to them, contrasted to 27.8% in 2004.

Audio (item p): The audio shares the same median (5) with the data video projector, the computer, the SMART Sympodium and Internet Access. Fully 76.4% of the FSGS described the audio equipment as important, while 78.2% had done so in 2004.

Mac Adaptors (item q): Sharing the median category (1) only with the microphone, the Mac adaptors were important to only 22.6% of the FSGS, while 32.7% deemed them important in 2004.

Table 8: Ranked List of Importance of Equipment in Accomplishing Course Objectives

List of Equipment	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important	Total Importance
Computer	10.9%	81.8%	92.7%
SMART Sympodium	29.6%	57.4%	87%
Data Video Projector	10.9%	74.5%	85.4%
Internet Access	23.6%	61.8%	85.4%
Audio	20.9%	45.5%	76.4%
DVD/VCR Player	29.1%	43.6%	72.7%
External Laptop Connectivity	20.4%	48.1%	68.5%
Visual Presenter (Elmo)	32.1%	26.4%	58.5%
Microphone	12.7%	18.2%	30.9%
Camera	12.7%	12.7%	25.4%
Mac Adaptor	11.3%	11.3%	22.6%

Summary

The Computer, SMART Sympodium, Data Video Projector, Audio and Internet Access are clearly what FSGS consider the most important pieces of equipment to the accomplishment of their course objectives. The DVD/VCR Player, External Laptop Connectivity, and the Visual Presenter (Elmo) were the second most important equipment, while the Camera, Microphone, and the Mac Adaptor were the least important. By contrast, FSGS in the 2004 Survey ranked the equipment in this order: Computer, Data Video Projector, SMART Sympodium, Internet Access, DVD/VCR Player, Audio, Visual Projector (Elmo), External Laptop Connectivity, Mac Adaptors, Camera, and the Microphone. In 2006, the SMART Sympodium, Audio, and External Laptop Connectivity gained importance in the achievement of course objectives.

Importance of Software in Accomplishing Course Objectives

FSGS at Southern Miss described the importance of certain types of technology software in the HVUCs in accomplishing their course objectives in 2006 Survey items h-m and r. Since the data on these 7 software applications are skewed the medians, rather than the means and standard deviations, will be reported. The importance of each individual software application is discussed below:

Microsoft (MS) Office Suite (item h): The median of the importance of the MS Office Suite was 5. This median shows the highest level of perceived importance. Almost three-quarters (71%) of the FSGS agreed that this software played an important

role in the success of their class. A slightly higher percentage of FSGS (77.2%) agreed that this software was important on the 2004 Survey.

SMART Notebook (item i): The median for the importance of the SMART Notebook software was 3, showing reduced significance of that software compared to MS Office Suite. Almost 44.2% of the FSGS perceive the SMART Notebook software to be an important aid to their accomplishing course objectives. In the 2004 Survey, 33.3% of participants agreed with this assessment.

Adobe Acrobat Reader (item j): The median of the importance of the Adobe Acrobat Reader was 4, which was in-between than the medians for the MS Office Suite and SMART Notebook. Around 63% of the participants agreed the Reader held importance to their teaching, while 72.7% described it as important in the 2004 Survey.

Macromedia Flash Software (item k): This software held the same level of importance for FSGS as the SMART Notebook (Median = 3). Almost 49% of respondents agreed that Flash was important, compared to a much smaller percentage from the 2004 sample (29.1%).

MS Media Player (item l): Like the Adobe Acrobat Reader, the median for the importance of the MS Media Player was 4. Almost 52% of the FSGS agreed that the SMART Sympodium was important, while a slightly smaller percentage (45.5) agreed it was important on the 2004 Survey.

Quick Time Movie Player (item m): The Quick Time Movie Player is in the same median category (4) as the Adobe Acrobat Reader and the MS Media player in terms of importance to the achievement of course objectives. In the 2006 Survey, almost 52% of the FSGS agreed that this connectivity was important to them, which is virtually the same percentage as in the 2004 Survey.

SPSS Statistical Software (item r): The median for the importance of Internet access was 3, ranking it on par with the Macromedia Flash and the SMART Notebook software. Approximately 31.5% perceived that SPSS was important, which cannot be compared to the 2004 Survey, since this was a new item in 2006.

Table 9: Ranked List of Importance of Software in Accomplishing Course Objectives

List of Software	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important	Total Importance
MS Office Suite	5.5%	65.5%	71%
Adobe Acrobat Reader	27.8%	35.2%	63%
MS Media Player	29.6%	22.2%	51.8%
QuickTime Movie Player	25.9%	25.9	51.8%
Macromedia Flash	22.6%	26.4%	49%
SMART Notebook	19.2%	25%	44.2%
SPSS Statistical Software	11.1%	20.4%	31.5%

Summary

FSGS considered MS Office Suite to be the most important software in the accomplishment of their course objectives. The Adobe Acrobat Reader, and the MS Media and QuickTime Movie Players were the second most important software applications, while the Macromedia Flash, SMART Notebook, and SPSS Statistical Software were the least important. The only different ranking in the 2004 Survey (excluding the SPSS software since that question was not asked in 2004) was that QuickTime Movie Player was ranked just higher than MS Media Player. In 2006, the MS Media Player has become the video file player of choice among FSGS.

Chapter 3

User Satisfaction with the HVUCs, and HVUC Training and Support

Room Access

Table 10 below shows that FSGS desire to schedule all their classes in HVUCs far more in 2006 than in 2004 (60%). In fact, this item rose from the bottom rank in 2004 to the top rank in 2006. The good experiences that FSGS have had in HVUCs have clearly increased the demand for these rooms.

Access for meetings decreased from being the top rank in 2004 to the bottom rank in 2006. Increased demand for HVUCs for meetings, as well as classes, is evident.

Table 10: Ranked List for Room Access by Percentage of Agreement

Item	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Agreement
I would like to schedule all my classes in an HVUC room.	11.3	75.5	86.8
The key to the HVUC room and podium are easily accessible.	33.3	50	83.3
When planning a course or meeting, I try to reserve an HVUC room.	24.5	49.1	73.6
I can get access to an HVUC for teaching whenever I want it.	22.2	13	35.2
I can get access to an HVUC for meetings whenever I want it.	18.9	11.3	30.2

Equipment/Software/Training

Table 11 below shows that nearly all FSGS in the sample know how to use the HVUC equipment and received adequate training to do so. An overwhelming 94.5% reported that they had attended a scheduled training session conducted by the LEC personnel. These numbers are markedly higher than in 2004. FSGS in 2006 indicated the same need for additional software and software training as their cohorts did in 2004. FSGS noted that they needed additional hardware and software training on the following: Data Video Projectors, SMART Sympodiums, Visual Presenters (Elmos), External Laptop Connectivity (for iBook), Macromedia Flash, Web Conferencing, SMART software, ESRI-ARC 9 and updated versions of all of the installed software.

Table 11: Ranked List for Equipment/Software/Training by Percentage of Agreement

Item	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Agreement
I know how to use the equipment in the classroom.	45.5	47.3	92.8
I received adequate training on the hardware.	29.1	63.6	92.7
I know how to use the software installed on the computer.	41.8	43.6	85.4
The equipment is easy to use.	47.3	34.5	81.8
The equipment works properly.	58.2	21.8	80
I received adequate training on the software.	27.3	50.9	78.2
The software that I need is installed on the computer.	27.8	50	77.8

Overall Satisfaction

Table 12 below measures the overall approval on the HVUCs. Virtually all the FSGS reported overall satisfaction, a substantial increase since 2004.

Table 12: Ranked List for Overall Satisfaction by Percentage of Agreement

Item	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Agreement
I would recommend the equipment to other faculty.	23.6	74.5	98.1
I believe my students' experience has been enhanced by the use of the equipment.	27.8	66.7	94.5
My overall experience using the equipment has been good.	40	54.4	94.4

Frequency of Use

Table 13 below shows that most FSGS used the HVUCs two or more time per week followed by a few times per semester. The smallest percentages were in the special "other" categories.

Table 13: Frequency of Use

Frequency of Use	Percent
Never	16.4
Once a semester	7.3
Once a week	25.5
One or two times/month	1.8
Two or more times/wk	40
Other (Never)	1.8
Other (HVUC not available)	1.8
Other (Few times/semester	27.8
Other (Not specified)	1.8

Rooms Most Used

In table 14 below, there is a listing of all the HVUCs that FSGS reported using the most. Among those, the LAB labs (101 and 102) were reported the most frequently.

Table 13: Rooms Most Used

Room	Times Reported
ANH 105	1
OMH 109	5
LAB 203	1
WSB 137	2
PAYNE 202	3
HPR 203	2
TAD 124	2
SRB 101	1
SRB 142	1
SRB 201	1
LAB 101	6
LAB 102	7
GHB 113	1
HPR 202	2
LAB 108	2
EHH 101	1
EHH 102	1
OMH 105	1
OMH 125	1
JCH 303	1
JCH 201	1
JCH 217	1
SHS 202	1
WSB 120	1
IC 101	2
FG 112	2
JST 314	1
TEC 411	1

Student Participation

FSGS were asked “In what ways has this equipment impacted student participation in your class?” Here are there responses:

- The SMART rooms stimulate more classroom involvement.
- The SMART software keeps notes moving along in PowerPoint
- I am able to do demonstrations and show resources in addition to just the pros of multimedia.
- The rooms make lecture come alive.
- The ease of showing video/PowerPoint enhances student discussions.
- Images and video often start a discussion among students or bring up student questions.
- Students seem to grasp concepts and events at much faster pace with visual components like PowerPoint & documentary clips. It also brings history alive for them allowing them to relate to the people of the past and thus to have an intellectual curiosity about them.
- Students in late night classes are more engaged & pay more attention than they did. Several of my students have gone on to use the SMART Board themselves in student presentations & later on in their own teaching!
- Students are more willing to ask questions or repeat a point. When I use the chalkboard only, due to the time and drawing involved, they ask fewer questions.
- Student feedback has been wonderful. The equipment allows demonstration and examples that otherwise would not be available and which are invaluable.
- The handy availability of VCR/DVD players allows showing short videos

which help stimulate student thought.

- Note taking-SPSS & WEBCT practice and demonstrations-PowerPoint presentations student presentations
- There's no difference.
- We can go on the internet and see applications of the concepts covered in class.
- We have used the SMART rooms for student presentations and small group brainstorming results.
- The rooms have broadened our learning resources.
- It helps with the adult learning model by providing alternative methods of delivery to reach all types of learning styles.
- In a large class, it ensures all students can do a presentation.
- They are eager for lecture b/w of the interaction & would like it in WSB 109 & 125 as >800 students pass through these rooms each year.
- They can respond to visual questions. I believe they only take notes when the PowerPoint slide has outline material.
- They can interact with the internet.
- It enhances the quality of education for visual learners.
- It has helped visual learners with interactive material.
- There is no real effect, but there are more channels of communication for learning styles, which is good.
- I can show an item/picture to entire class for discussion. This is an improvement over passing materials around. We can follow up on questions/comments immediately by use of web.
- Students become engaged when they can see & hear the subject matter. They are more talkative.

- They made great videos for my American political thought assignment to do a skit about a famous thinker. Also, they used the PowerPoint in the assignment, too.

DRAFT

Chapter 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

The administration of the 2004 and the 2006 HVUCs Surveys is one measurement the University's success in attaining the Title III-A goals and objectives over the life of the grant. It documents the overwhelming successes of Co-Principal Investigators, Drs. Cynthia Moore and Lin Harper, in meeting the challenges of strengthening the human and material resources at Southern Miss. The grant goals and objectives related to the HVUCs are listed below, matched with their measured results:

Title III-A Grant Goals and Objectives

Activity I: Purchase of Equipment to Improve Academic Programs

Objective 1

By 2002, assess the state of readiness of existing classrooms used for "highly visible undergraduate programs" for the incorporation of educational technology related to instruction.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule. Using information primarily from the departmental chairs and deans, 38 classrooms in "highly visible undergraduate programs" were identified. These classrooms were inspected to ascertain what equipment should be acquired and what physical adaptations might be necessary to make that equipment fully operational.

Objective 2

During 2002-2006, 75% to 100% of the classrooms used for "highly visible undergraduate programs" will be adapted for multimedia instruction.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule. While at least 40 classrooms (some additional ones were funded by college deans) were adapted for multimedia instruction, only approximately 36 HVUCs remain after Hurricane Katrina.

Objective 3

By 2006, a minimum of 60% of USM faculty will report being "satisfied" to "very satisfied" with available classroom technologies.

Results

Between 94 and 98% of USM Faculty (along with Staff and Graduate Students who teach) reported being "satisfied" to "very satisfied" with available classroom technologies on the 3 questions in the 2006 Survey which measured overall satisfaction.

Activity 2: Faculty Professional Development

Objective 1

By 2006, 50% of the faculty will report adequate skill levels in basic technology applications and instructional equipment operation, including word processing, spreadsheets, electronic communications, electronic presentation methodologies, and other applications relevant to educational technology.

Results

An overwhelming 94.5% reported that they had attended a scheduled training session conducted by the LEC personnel. Furthermore, 93% reported that they knew how to operate the instructional equipment and around 85% also know how to utilize the installed software applications according to the 2006 Survey.

Objective 2

In each project year, present emerging instructional technologies on an ongoing basis throughout the project year to all faculty.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule. According to LEC records, at least 2,669 faculty, staff and graduate students have been trained in face-to-face workshops. Online training is also available on a continuous basis through LEC's website (http://www.usm.edu/lec/training_tutorials.html).

Objective 3

By 2006, the number of fully or partially online courses will increase from 100 to 300.

Results

This objective does not apply to the HVUCs.

Objective 4

Between 2003 and 2006, the number of online degree programs offered by the University of Southern Mississippi will increase to 6.

Results

This objective does not apply to the HVUCs.

Objective 5

By 2003, 50% of USM faculty will report using email, email lists and/or ListServ to enhance teaching and learning activities.

Results

This objective does not apply to HVUCs.

Objective 6

By 2004, 45% of USM faculty will report using web pages for instructional purposes.

Results

This objective does not apply to HVUCs.

Objective 7

By 2006, 50% of USM faculty will report using multimedia presentation methods, including audio and/or video clips, slide production, and/or animation to augment curricula.

Results

This objective was not specifically measured in the 2004 and the 2006 HVUCs Surveys. However, in the 2004 Faculty Technology Survey, an overwhelming majority of faculty (86.8%) expressed the desire to use audio/video clips, animation, or slides to augment curricula. Around 80% of the faculty wanted to use multimedia presentations. These percentages were virtually unchanged in the 2006 Survey.

Objective 8

By 2006, there will be 4 faculty members from each college (with the exception of the Honors College and the College of Continuing, International and Distance Education) who are able to serve as mentors and providing training and guidance to their colleagues related to educational technology.

Results

This objective was completed on schedule as shown in the list below where newest mentors listed are first:

Mentors from the College of Business (CoB):

1. Dr. Kuy Lane Chen, Accountancy and Information Systems
2. Dr. Melody Lo, Economics, Finance and International Business
3. Dr. Chang-Tseh Hsieh, Accountancy and Information Systems
4. Dr. Michael Vest-Management and Marketing

Mentors from the CoH:

1. Dr. Janie Butts, Nursing
2. Dr. Lee Terrio, Speech and Hearing
3. Dr. Elaine Molaison, Nutrition and Food Systems
4. Dr. Nancy Speed, Human Performance and Recreation
5. Dr. Sabrina Bryant, Medical Technology
6. Dr. Trenton E. Gould, Human Performance and Recreation
7. Dr. Ben Velasquez, Human Performance and Recreation
8. Dr. Mary Lux, Medical Technology
9. Dr. Pat Sims, Marriage and Family Therapy

Mentors from the CoEP:

1. Dr. Elizabeth Haynes, Library and Information Sciences
2. Dr. Hollie Filce and Dr. Elgen Hillman, Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
3. Ms. Kim Walker, Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
4. Dr. Karen Juneau, Technology Education
5. Dr. Mary Nell McNeese, Educational Leadership and Research
6. Dr. Shuyan Wang, Technology Education
7. Dr. Steve Yuen, Technology Education
8. Dr. M.J. Norton, Library and Information Sciences
9. Dr. Taralynn Hartsell, Technology Education
10. Dr. Thelma Roberson, Educational Leadership and Research

Mentors from the CoAL:

1. Dr. Michael Salda, English
2. Dr. Bruce Tychinski, Music
3. Dr. Fei Xue, Mass Communication and Journalism
4. Dr. William Powell, Foreign Languages and Literatures
5. Dr. Marie Danforth, Anthropology and Sociology
6. Ms. Shellie Nielsen, Theatre and Dance
7. Cpt. Leigh Ann Fletcher, Aerospace Studies
8. Dr. Brigitte Burgess, Interior Design
9. Dr. Linda Dysart Goff: Speech Communication
10. Dr. Leah Fonder-Solano and Christopher Miles, Foreign Languages and Literatures
11. Dr. Lawrence A. Hosman, Speech Communication
12. Dr. Jae-Hwa Shin, Mass Communication and Journalism
13. Dr. William Kuskin and Dr. Phyllis Jestice: English and History, respectively
14. Dr. Cindy Brown, Mass Communication and Journalism
15. Dr. Steve Moser, Music
16. Dr. David Davies, Mass Communication and Journalism
17. Dr. Anita Davis, Music

18. Dr. Joan Traylor, Interior Design
19. Dr. Elizabeth Drummond, History
20. Dr. David Butler, Political Science

Mentors from the CoST:

1. Dr. Sherry Herron, Center for Science and Mathematics Education
2. Dr. Joseph Kolibal, Mathematics
3. Dr. Jeffrey Evans, Chemistry and Biochemistry
4. Dr. R. D. Ellender, Biological Sciences
5. Dr. Kenneth Curry, Biological Sciences
6. Dr. Gary Anderson, Biological Sciences

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Utilization Rate:

Spr	2004:	345 classes with 11,978 enrolled
Sum	2004:	181 classes with 3,176 enrolled
Fall	2004:	357 classes with 13,312 enrolled
Spr	2005:	362 classes with 12,361 enrolled
Sum	2005:	212 classes with 3,924 enrolled
Fall	2005:	371 classes with 14,988 enrolled
Spr	2006:	393 classes with 14,219 enrolled

Overall Conclusions:

Items assessing the importance of equipment in accomplishing course objectives indicated the SMART Sympodium, Audio, and External Laptop Connectivity gained importance in the achievement of course objectives in 2006.

MS Office applications continue to be the most important software in accomplishing course objectives in 2006. However, there was a shift in the video file player of choice between the QuickTime Movie Player in 2004 to the MS Media Player in 2006.

Issues of User Satisfaction with the HVUCs in 2006 included: an increased demand for HVUCs for meetings and classes, and additional professional development. Virtually all the FSGS reported overall satisfaction with the HVUCs, a substantial increase since 2004. The goals and objectives for the Title III-A Strengthening the Institution grant were exceeded.

Overall Recommendations:

- **SPA:**
  - Encourage faculty to submit new grant proposals which provide additional technology resources for their Colleges and the University.
  - Maintain workshops focused on securing funding for technology resources.

- **LEC:**
  - Continue to market faculty professional development particularly in online formats.
  - Encourage Title III-A Faculty Technology Mentors in every college to provide on-site training and support to their fellow faculty, whenever possible.
  - Market instructional and multimedia designers who support the effective integration of technology into the curricula, perhaps by sending a LEC representative to outline services at each College's Convocation.
- **iTech:**
  - Persist in resolving Internet and network access issues and establishing a systematic plan to renew hardware. Market existing campus resources and continue to focus on customer service issues by engaging faculty who might not have responded to the Technology Survey(s) and the HVUCs Survey(s).

APPENDIX A

Frequencies and Percentages for the Sample

Data_Video_Projector

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	3	5.5	5.5	5.5
	2.00	2	3.6	3.6	9.1
	3.00	3	5.5	5.5	14.5
	4.00	6	10.9	10.9	25.5
	5.00	41	74.5	74.5	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Computer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
	3.00	3	5.5	5.5	7.3
	4.00	6	10.9	10.9	18.2
	5.00	45	81.8	81.8	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

DVD_playerVCR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	6	10.9	10.9	10.9
	2.00	2	3.6	3.6	14.5
	3.00	7	12.7	12.7	27.3
	4.00	16	29.1	29.1	56.4
	5.00	24	43.6	43.6	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Visual_PresenterElmo

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	10	18.2	18.9	18.9
	2.00	3	5.5	5.7	24.5
	3.00	9	16.4	17.0	41.5
	4.00	17	30.9	32.1	73.6
	5.00	14	25.5	26.4	100.0
	Total	53	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.6		
Total		55	100.0		

Smart_Sympodium

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	3.6	3.7	3.7
	2.00	1	1.8	1.9	5.6
	3.00	4	7.3	7.4	13.0
	4.00	16	29.1	29.6	42.6
	5.00	31	56.4	57.4	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

External_Laptop_Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	5	9.1	9.3	9.3
	2.00	3	5.5	5.6	14.8
	3.00	9	16.4	16.7	31.5
	4.00	11	20.0	20.4	51.9
	5.00	26	47.3	48.1	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

Internet_Access

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
	2.00	1	1.8	1.8	5.5
	3.00	5	9.1	9.1	14.5
	4.00	13	23.6	23.6	38.2
	5.00	34	61.8	61.8	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Microsoft_Office_Suite

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	4	7.3	7.3	7.3
	2.00	2	3.6	3.6	10.9
	3.00	10	18.2	18.2	29.1
	4.00	3	5.5	5.5	34.5
	5.00	36	65.5	65.5	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Smart_Notebook

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	7	12.7	13.5	13.5
	2.00	4	7.3	7.7	21.2
	3.00	18	32.7	34.6	55.8
	4.00	10	18.2	19.2	75.0
	5.00	13	23.6	25.0	100.0
	Total	52	94.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	5.5		
Total		55	100.0		

Adobe_Acrobat_Reader

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	4	7.3	7.4	7.4
	2.00	4	7.3	7.4	14.8
	3.00	12	21.8	22.2	37.0
	4.00	15	27.3	27.8	64.8
	5.00	19	34.5	35.2	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

Flash_Software

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	8	14.5	15.1	15.1
	2.00	6	10.9	11.3	26.4
	3.00	13	23.6	24.5	50.9
	4.00	12	21.8	22.6	73.6
	5.00	14	25.5	26.4	100.0
	Total	53	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.6		
Total		55	100.0		

MS_Media_Player

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	8	14.5	14.8	14.8
	2.00	5	9.1	9.3	24.1
	3.00	13	23.6	24.1	48.1
	4.00	16	29.1	29.6	77.8
	5.00	12	21.8	22.2	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

QuickTime_Player

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	6	10.9	11.1	11.1
	2.00	4	7.3	7.4	18.5
	3.00	16	29.1	29.6	48.1
	4.00	14	25.5	25.9	74.1
	5.00	14	25.5	25.9	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

Microphone

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	16	29.1	29.1	29.1
	2.00	9	16.4	16.4	45.5
	2.50	1	1.8	1.8	47.3
	3.00	12	21.8	21.8	69.1
	4.00	7	12.7	12.7	81.8
	5.00	10	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Camera

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	16	29.1	29.1	29.1
	2.00	6	10.9	10.9	40.0
	3.00	19	34.5	34.5	74.5
	4.00	7	12.7	12.7	87.3
	5.00	7	12.7	12.7	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Audio

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
	2.00	1	1.8	1.8	10.9
	3.00	7	12.7	12.7	23.6
	4.00	17	30.9	30.9	54.5
	5.00	25	45.5	45.5	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Mac_Adaptors

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	24	43.6	45.3	45.3
	2.00	6	10.9	11.3	56.6
	3.00	11	20.0	20.8	77.4
	4.00	6	10.9	11.3	88.7
	5.00	6	10.9	11.3	100.0
	Total	53	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.6		
Total		55	100.0		

SPSS_Software

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	17	30.9	31.5	31.5
	2.00	6	10.9	11.1	42.6
	3.00	14	25.5	25.9	68.5
	4.00	6	10.9	11.1	79.6
	5.00	11	20.0	20.4	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

Room_Access_1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	13	23.6	24.1	24.1
	2.00	9	16.4	16.7	40.7
	3.00	13	23.6	24.1	64.8
	4.00	12	21.8	22.2	87.0
	5.00	7	12.7	13.0	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

Room_Access_2_

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	7	12.7	13.2	13.2
	2.00	14	25.5	26.4	39.6
	3.00	16	29.1	30.2	69.8
	4.00	10	18.2	18.9	88.7
	5.00	6	10.9	11.3	100.0
	Total	53	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.6		
Total		55	100.0		

Room_Access_3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	3	5.5	5.7	5.7
	2.00	3	5.5	5.7	11.3
	3.00	8	14.5	15.1	26.4
	4.00	13	23.6	24.5	50.9
	5.00	26	47.3	49.1	100.0
	Total	53	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.6		
Total		55	100.0		

Room_Access_4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	3.6	3.8	3.8
	2.00	1	1.8	1.9	5.7
	3.00	4	7.3	7.5	13.2
	4.00	6	10.9	11.3	24.5
	5.00	40	72.7	75.5	100.0
	Total	53	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.6		
Total		55	100.0		

Room_Access_5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	6	10.9	11.1	11.1
	2.00	1	1.8	1.9	13.0
	3.00	2	3.6	3.7	16.7
	4.00	18	32.7	33.3	50.0
	5.00	27	49.1	50.0	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

Eqpt_1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
	2.00	2	3.6	3.6	5.5
	3.00	8	14.5	14.5	20.0
	4.00	32	58.2	58.2	78.2
	5.00	12	21.8	21.8	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Eqpt_2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
	3.00	8	14.5	14.5	18.2
	4.00	26	47.3	47.3	65.5
	5.00	19	34.5	34.5	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Eqpt_3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
	3.00	3	5.5	5.5	7.3
	4.00	25	45.5	45.5	52.7
	5.00	26	47.3	47.3	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Software_1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
	3.00	3	5.5	5.5	14.5
	4.00	23	41.8	41.8	56.4
	5.00	24	43.6	43.6	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Software_2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	3	5.5	5.6	5.6
	3.00	9	16.4	16.7	22.2
	4.00	15	27.3	27.8	50.0
	5.00	27	49.1	50.0	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

Training_1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	4	7.3	7.3	7.3
	4.00	16	29.1	29.1	36.4
	5.00	35	63.6	63.6	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Training_2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
	3.00	10	18.2	18.2	21.8
	4.00	15	27.3	27.3	49.1
	5.00	28	50.9	50.9	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Overall_Satistaction_1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	3	5.5	5.5	5.5
	4.00	22	40.0	40.0	45.5
	5.00	30	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Overall_Satisfaction_2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
	4.00	13	23.6	23.6	25.5
	5.00	41	74.5	74.5	100.0
	Total	55	100.0	100.0	

Overall_Satisfaction_3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	1	1.8	1.9	1.9
	3.00	2	3.6	3.7	5.6
	4.00	15	27.3	27.8	33.3
	5.00	36	65.5	66.7	100.0
	Total	54	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.8		
Total		55	100.0		

APPENDIX B

Key to Coding/Recoding of the HVUC 2006 SPSS Data file

Status	**Recoded as:**	**2004:**
1-Asst proff	3	1= prof
2-Asst proffesor	3	2= assoc prof
3-FT Instructional Staff	6	3= asst prof
4-GA	5	4= adjunct
5-Other Instructor	7	5= graduate asst
6-Other Instructor Full time	7	6= staff
7-Other Visiting	8	7= others (specify)
8-Other Visiting instructor	8	
9-Part time	9	**2006 revisions:**
10-Proff	1	7= instructor
11-Proffessor	1	8= visiting faculty
12-Staff	6	9= part-time faculty
13-Staff/Part time	6	

PEF	**Recoded as:**	**2004/2006:**
1-No	2	1=Yes
2-Yes	1	2= No

College	**Coded/Recoded as:**	**2004/2006:**
1- Arts & Letters	1	1=Arts & Letters
2-Business	2	2=Business &
3-Business & Economic Dev	2	Economic Dev
4-Education & Psychology	3	3= Educ & Psych
5-Health	4	4=Health
6-Honors	6	6=Honors
7-N/A		Missing
8-Science & Technology	5	5=Science & Tech

Campus	**Coded as:**	**2004/2006**
1- Hattiesburg	1	1= Hattiesburg 2= Gulf Park

DRAFT

Race	**Coded/Recoded as:**	**2004/2006:**
1- African	3	1=Am. Indian
2- African/American	3	2=Asian
3- American Indian	1	3=African Am.
4- Caucasian	4	4= Caucasian
5- Other	6	5= Hispanic
		6= Other

Age	**Coded/Recoded as:**	**2004/2006:**
1-1	1	1=20-29
2-20-29	1	2=30-39
3-30-39	2	3=40-49
4-40-49	3	4=Above 50
5-Above 50	4	

Education	**Coded/Recoded as:**	**2004/2006:**
1- BA/BS	1	1=BA/BS
2-MA	2	2=MA/MS/MFA
3-MA/MS/MFA	2	3= Ph.D./Ed.D./J.D.
4-MFA	2	4=Other
5-MS	2	
6-Others ABD	4	
7-Ph. D./Ed.D./J.D.	3	

Number Courses	**Coded/Recoded as:**	**2004:**	**2006:**
1- 1	1	0=0	1=0-2
2- >17	7	1=1	2=3-5
3- 0-2	1	2=2	3=6-8
4- 12-14	5	3=3	4=9-11
5- 12-34	7	4=4	5= 12-14
6- 3-5	2	5=5	6= 15-17
7- 6-8	3	6= > 5	7= > 17
8- 6_8	3		
9- 9-11	4		

First Semester	**Coded/Recoded as:**	**2004:**	**2006:**
			0= Never
1- 1	1	1=Aug 02	1≤ Jan 03
2- August 2003	3	2=Jan 03	2= June 03
3-August 2004	6	3=June 03	3= Aug 03
4-Jan 2006	9	4=Aug 03	4= Jan 04
5-Aug 2005/Jan 2006	8	5=Jan 04	5= June 04
6-Never-want to be	0		6= Aug 04
7-Never	0		7= Jan 05
8-Jan 2003	1		8= June 05
9-Jan 2004	4		9= Aug 05
10-Jan 2005	7		10= Jan 06
11-Jan 2006	9		
12-June 2003/June 2005	2		
13-June 2003	2		

Training 3	**Coded as:**	**2004/2006:**
1-No	1	1= No
2-Yes	2	2= Yes

Frequency of Use	**Coded/Recoded as:**	**2004:**	**2006:**
1-1	1	0= never	0=never
2-Never	0	1≥ 2/wk	1≥ 2/wk
3-Once/semester	4	2= 1/wk	2=1/wk
4-Once/week	2	3=1-2/mo	3=1/2/mo
5-One/two times/month	3	4=1/sem	4=1/sem
6-Other	5	5= Other	5=Other
7-Other (never)	0		6= few times/sem
8-Other- unavailable	5		
9-Other-few times/semester	6		
10-Two/three times/week	1		

Appendix C

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Master List

http://www.usm.edu/lec/HVUC_list.html

Year 3 (2004)	**12 Hattiesburg**	**1 GCRL**	
Building	**Room**	**Campus**	**Dept**
JGH	115	H	Business
FG	207	H	Social Work
SRS	202	H	Speech & Hearing Sc
SH	215	H	Mass Comm
TEC	411	H	Chemistry
SH	119	H	Mass Comm
**WSB	153	H	Biological Sc
**WSB	138	H	Biological Sc
PAYN	202	H	HPR
SRS	101	H	CISE
SRS	200	H	CISE
OMH	105	H	Ed/Psych
Caylor	104	GCRL	GCRL

DRAFT

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Master List (continued)

http://www.usm.edu/lec/HVUC_list.html

Year 2 (2003)	11 Hattiesburg	1 LEC	2 Gulf Park
LAB	103	H	Political Science
LAB	203	H	English
LAB	204	H	Anthro/Sociology
JGH	218	H	Econ/Finance/Business
OMH	109	H	Teacher Education
HPR	203	H	HPR
FG	112	H	Dietetics
FG	109	H	Child & Family St.
TAD	124	H	Theater & Dance
WSB	150	H	Biological Sciences
PSRC	105	H	Polymer Science
OMH	103	H	LEC
AEC	108	GP	Nursing
AEC	104	GP	Business

DRAFT

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms (HVUC) Master List (continued)

http://www.usm.edu/lec/HVUC_list.html

Year 1 (2002)	**12 Hattiesburg**	**1 Gulf Park**	
Building	**Room**	**Campus**	**Dept**
LLOYD	308	GP	Biology/Marine Sc
*SH	303	H	Math
WS	150	H	Biological Sciences
NUR	101	H	Nursing
JGH	212	H	Management
OMH	125	H	Psychology
GHB	113	H	Art
PAC	109	H	Music
AKH	124	H	Geography
HPR	202	H	HPR
LAB	101	H	History
LAB	102	H	History
SRS	142	H	Elementary Education
	*Data projector and screen only	** HVUC equipment plus digital camera/color video camera to support scientific needs	

Appendix D

2004-2006 Highly Visible Undergraduate Classroom Survey Instruments

2004 HVUC Survey Instrument

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms Survey

(By the U.S. Dept. of Education Title III-A Strengthening Institutions Grant)

Please check the appropriate response.

Status:

Professor	Assoc Professor	Asst Professor	Part-Time/ Adjunct	Graduate Assistant	Staff	Others (Please specify)

PEF Faculty:

Please indicate if you are a member of the Professional Education Faculty (responsible for K-12 teacher preparation:

Yes ___ No ___

College Affiliation:

Arts & Letters	Business & Economic Development	Education & Psychology	Health	Science & Technology

Campus Affiliation:

Hattiesburg	Gulf Park

Race:

American Indian	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	Other

Age Group:

20-29	30-39	40-49	Above 50

DRAFT

Highest Education Level Attained:

BA/BS	MA/MS/MFA	Ph.D/Ed.D/J.D.	Others

Number of courses taught in the "SMART" classrooms and using the HVUC equipment:

None	1	2	3	4	5	More than 5 courses

First semester taught in an HVUC room:

Fall 2002-03 (August 2002)	Spring 2002-03 (January 2003)	Summer 2003-04 (June 2003)	Fall 2003-04 (August 2003)	Spring 2003-04 (January 2004)

Please indicate your responses on a five-point scale.

Not Important At All	Somewhat Unimportant	No Opinion	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important
1	2	3	4	5

For each question below, circle the number to the right that best describes how important each hardware or software item is in accomplishing your course objectives. Use the scale above to match your opinion.

Equipment/Software Importance	Scale				
a. Data Video Projector	1	2	3	4	5
b. Computer	1	2	3	4	5
c. DVD player /VCR	1	2	3	4	5
d. Visual Presenter (Elmo)	1	2	3	4	5
e. Smart Sympodium	1	2	3	4	5
f. External Laptop Connectivity	1	2	3	4	5
g. Internet Access	1	2	3	4	5

h. Microsoft Office Suite	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
i. Smart Notebook	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
j. Adobe Acrobat Reader	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
k. Flash Software	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
l. MS Media Player	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
m. QuickTime Player	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
n. Microphone	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
o. Camera	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
p. Audio	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
q. Mac Adaptors	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please indicate your responses on a five-point scale.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	Strongly Agree
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Room Access	**Scale**				
I can get access to an HVUC for teaching whenever I want it.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
I can get access to an HVUC for meetings whenever I want it.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
When planning a course or meeting, I try to reserve an HVUC room.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
I would like to schedule all my classes in an HVUC room.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
The key to the HVUC room and podium are easily accessible.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Equipment	**Scale**				
The equipment works properly.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
The equipment is easy to use.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

I know how to use the equipment in the classroom.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Software	**Scale**				
I know how to use the software installed on the computer.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
The software that I need is installed on the computer	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Training	**Scale**				
I received adequate training on the hardware.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
I received adequate training on the software.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

DRAFT

Please check the appropriate answer.	No	Yes
I attended a scheduled training session conducted by the Learning Enhancement Center (LEC) personnel.		
I would like more hardware training. List hardware here:		
I would like more software training. List software here:		

Please indicate your responses on a five-point scale.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Overall Satisfaction	Scale				
My overall experience using the equipment has been good.	1	2	3	4	5
I would recommend the equipment to other faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
This equipment has improved student participation in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe my students' experience has been enhanced by the use of the equipment.	1	2	3	4	5

Frequency of Use

How frequently do you use the HVUC equipment?

- ○ Two or more times per week
- ○ Once a week
- ○ One or two times per month
- ○ Once a semester
- ○ Other

The room(s) that I use most is(are):

_____

2006 HVUC Survey Instrument

Highly Visible Undergraduate Classrooms Survey

(By the U.S. Dept. of Education Title III-A Strengthening Institutions Grant)

Please check the appropriate response.

Status:

Professor	Assoc Professor	Asst Professor	Part-Time/ Adjunct	Graduate Assistant	Staff	Others (Please specify)

PEF Faculty:

Please indicate if you are a member of the Professional Education Faculty (responsible for K-12 teacher preparation:

Yes ___ No ___

College Affiliation:

Arts & Letters	Business & Economic Development	Education & Psychology	Health	Science & Technology

Campus Affiliation:

Hattiesburg	Gulf Park

Race:

American Indian	Asian	African American	Caucasian	Hispanic	Other

Age Group:

20-29	30-39	40-49	Above 50

Highest Education Level Attained:

BA/BS	MA/MS/MFA	Ph.D/Ed.D/J.D.	Others

Number of courses taught in the "SMART" classrooms and using the HVUC equipment:

0-2	3-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17	More than 17 courses

First semester taught in an HVUC room:

Spring 2002-03 (January 2003) or before	Summer 2003-04 (June 2003)	Fall 2003-04 (August 2003)	Spring 2003-04 (January 2004)	Summer 2004-05 (June 2004)

First semester taught in an HVUC room:

Fall 2004-05 (August 2004)	Spring 2004-05 (January 2005)	Summer 2005-2006 (June 2005)	Fall 2005-2006 (August 2005)	Spring 2005-2006 (January 2006)

Please indicate your responses on a five-point scale.

Not Important At All	Somewhat Unimportant	Neutral	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important
1	2	3	4	5

For each question below, circle the number to the right that best describes how important each hardware or software item is in accomplishing your course objectives. Use the scale above to match your opinion.

Equipment/Software Importance	Scale				
r. Data Video Projector	1	2	3	4	5
s. Computer	1	2	3	4	5
t. DVD player /VCR	1	2	3	4	5
u. Visual Presenter (Elmo)	1	2	3	4	5

v. Smart Sympodium	1	2	3	4	5
w. External Laptop Connectivity	1	2	3	4	5
x. Internet Access	1	2	3	4	5
y. Microsoft Office Suite	1	2	3	4	5
z. Smart Notebook	1	2	3	4	5
aa. Adobe Acrobat Reader	1	2	3	4	5
bb. Flash Software	1	2	3	4	5
cc. MS Media Player	1	2	3	4	5
dd. QuickTime Player	1	2	3	4	5
ee. Microphone	1	2	3	4	5
ff. Camera	1	2	3	4	5
gg. Audio	1	2	3	4	5
hh. Mac Adaptors	1	2	3	4	5
ii. SPSS Software	1	2	3	4	5

Please indicate your responses on a five-point scale.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Room Access	Scale				
I can get access to an HVUC for teaching whenever I want it.	1	2	3	4	5
I can get access to an HVUC for meetings whenever I want it.	1	2	3	4	5
When planning a course or meeting, I try to reserve an HVUC room.	1	2	3	4	5

I would like to schedule all my classes in an HVUC room.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
The key to the HVUC room and podium are easily accessible.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Equipment	**Scale**				
The equipment works properly.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
The equipment is easy to use.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
I know how to use the equipment in the classroom.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Software	**Scale**				
I know how to use the software installed on the computer.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
The software that I need is installed on the computer	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Training	**Scale**				
I received adequate training on the hardware.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
I received adequate training on the software.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please check the appropriate answer.	No	Yes
I attended a scheduled training session conducted by the Learning Enhancement Center (LEC) personnel.		
I would like more hardware training. List hardware here:		
I would like more software training. List software here:		

Please indicate your responses on a five-point scale.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Overall Satisfaction	Scale				
My overall experience using the equipment has been good.	1	2	3	4	5
I would recommend the equipment to other faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe my students' experience has been enhanced by the use of the equipment.	1	2	3	4	5

Frequency of Use

How frequently do you use the HVUC equipment?

- ○ Two or more times per week
- ○ Once a week
- ○ One or two times per month
- ○ Once a semester
- ○ Other

The room(s) that I use most is(are): _____

Student Participation

In what ways has this equipment impacted student participation in your class?

_____

_____

_____

DRAFT

Special Thanks go to the following persons for their patient assistance in providing information or editorial assistance for this report:

Homer Coffman
Dr. Clyde N. Ginn
Evelyn Green
Dr. Jay Grimes
Dr. Lin Harper
Dr. J.T. Johnson
Dr. Cynthia Moore
Sheri Rawls
Becky Thompson
Megan M. Tousignant
Casey Turnage