

Digital Language and Literacy: An Educational Technology Assistance Program

*Kristine L. Blair
Deborah M. Alvarez
Amie Bauer-Wolf
Elizabeth A. Monske
Bowling Green State University*

This paper profiles a discipline-specific educational technology assistance program titled Digital Language and Literacy, linking technologically literate graduate students in English with faculty developing online courses for the first time. As part of our reporting and assessment process, we include the voices of two faculty and two students, chronicling the possibilities and constraints of implementing a team-development model for online course design and offering guidelines for academic units wishing to adopt similar models. Such models not only help with online course design but also help to establish technological and pedagogical learning communities among current and future faculty.

INTRODUCTION

Many instructional design specialists can attest to the difficulties of helping faculty integrate technology and pedagogy in ways that genuinely enhance student learning outcomes. Despite the amount of consulting, despite the quality, quantity, and diversity of technology workshops developed, and despite well-attended sessions, faculty follow-through is often limited. The reasons are typical: Workload, inadequate incentive and reward for technology-based teaching, and educational philosophies that don't necessarily favor the student-centered pedagogies that technology has the potential to foster. Indeed, as Baldwin (1998) has noted, failure to utilize technology to its fullest extent is tied to "insufficient or obsolete hardware or software, inadequate facilities and support services, lack of time and money, and inappropriate reward system, lack of information about good practice, and underestimation of the difficulty in adopting new technologies" (p. 13).

Not unlike faculty at other universities, faculty at our university have been encouraged to put courses online at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, largely to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse Ohio student population of adult learners who commute, regardless of the institutional constraints Baldwin outlines. Ironically, our own distance education office is referred to as IDEAL, Interactive Distance Education for All Learners. Despite this marketing of online learning as "ideal" for busy adult students, the question of how "ideal" distance learning initiatives are to faculty remain to be seen. In addition, many faculty across the university are skeptical about online learning, with questions about curricular and pedagogical integrity, academic honesty, and intellectual property. Such concerns may reflect faculty ideologies that presume a hierarchical relationship between teachers and students. Our own English Department faculty have

been no different, raising similar concerns about the quality of educational experience that fit in with Carstens and Worfold's (2000) caution that online education is at odds with liberal learning, or the "give and take of communication," and may contribute to the elimination of interpersonal communication and academic and cultural literacy. As a number of early department meetings revealed, many of the English faculty are unfamiliar with research that suggests that online learning has the potential to increase student responsibility and student interaction as opposed to the traditional lecture-discussion format of both undergraduate and graduate classes. At the same time, however, our English department has suffered loss of enrollment in our general Master's program, and with demands from upper administration to find new audiences for the program in order to keep it from being eliminated, several faculty cautiously "signed up" to teach their first online course. Although this was not the "ideal" exigency for the development of an online program, it certainly allowed for more compromise among programs to pilot five online graduate seminars to attract a public school market of public school teachers needing a master's degree as part of their teaching certification.

While a number of financial incentives existed (including development funds from IDEAL and additional teaching stipends), faculty continued to express concern about technical and pedagogical support, particularly given the six-month development timeframe from December 2002 to June 2003. This article overviews these concerns and addresses the role of educational technology assistance programs in alleviating the gap between technological training and pedagogical implementation. Within our English Department, we have attempted to address the sustainability of technological and pedagogical training by developing an educational technology assistance program called Digital Language and Literacy. This program links our doctoral and master's students in rhetoric and technical communication with faculty desiring to integrate technology into their teaching, specifically in the development of fully online courses. The design of Digital Language and Literacy (DLL) stems from a number of university level and campus models at the local and international level, including the House Calls program at the University of Alberta's Academic Technologies for Learning (2003), where in addition to their regular technology and faculty development programs, there exists a program in which instructional design specialists make "house calls" to faculty members across campus. Admittedly, our own University, through its Center for Instructional Media, has a similar program in which a small number of faculty can apply for such educational assistance from undergraduate students. Yet our own department model is more closely aligned with The Ohio State University's Digital Media Project (2003), an in-house English Department teaching and learning community complete with a computer facility, graduate student support staff, and a series of consultation and workshop programs. As we shall stress, these forms of educational technology assistance not only mesh with a team-development model of online course development but also is philosophically aligned with learning community models of teaching enhancement. Such a model also supports Moore's (2001) conclusions about technology and faculty development, specifically that faculty do not resist the use of technology when provided with resources and support, that technology can be used effectively to improve teaching in all disciplines and by faculty with varying degrees of expertise, and that faculty

support must be easily accessible and ongoing to account for growth in expertise and approach.

As part of this process, each of us provides a narrative of our various roles within the Digital Language and Literacy Program. Kris Blair, in her role as an educational technologist, shares a philosophy and methodology of in-house technology development. Deb Alvarez, with expertise in training pre-service language arts and college-level writing teachers, explores the ways in which the principles of good teaching manifest themselves online, dialoguing with online course designer and doctoral candidate Amie Wolf about their collaborative working relationship and the move toward a team-development model of course design. Deb and Amie ground their discussion of collaborating on online course development within Chickering and Gamson's (1987), and later Chickering and Ehrmann's (1996) identification and application of the seven principles of good teaching practice within electronic learning spaces. Finally, Elizabeth Monske, also a doctoral candidate and online course designer writing a dissertation on the assessment of online courses, explores the material and cultural contexts in which a "learning community" such as ours can flourish, noting that faculty buy in is key.

In co-authoring this paper, we utilize the role of narrative as a research methodology to tell a story of faculty development needs in technology and pedagogy. Validating the use of narrative in this way, Mortensen and Kirsch (1996) note the need to recognize "that there are many forms of qualitative research: Oral histories, narrative inquiry...observational descriptive narratives...and more" (p. xi). Our voices go beyond mere anecdote, however. Rather, our voices as educational technology specialists, graduate students, and faculty work together to address the logistical and institutional constraints upon successful faculty development in technology, and also the ways in which teaching and learning communities in the area of technology and pedagogy should extend to academic units to foster discipline-specific discussions of how best practices can and should transfer from the face-to-face classroom to the fully online classroom. From our perspective, such models provide support and sustainability to the valuable technology-based teaching and learning initiatives by university-wide faculty development units, as well as provides professional development not just for faculty but also for future faculty in a discipline-specific model that allows both groups to more thoughtfully assess the impact of technology on teaching and learning. Finally, we conclude with suggested unit guidelines for implementing technology assistance programs, including the need for departmental support in reconfiguring various support structures to sustain the program by providing faculty and graduate students an incentive to participate, creating technology-based learning communities within the academic units where such professional development is greatly needed.

KRIS: BUILDING A LEARNING COMMUNITY

During my two years as faculty associate/associate director of my university's Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology, I developed over twenty-five technology and pedagogy workshops for faculty and graduate student instructors, including several institutes. As a faculty member with educational technology and faculty development

expertise, I knew that what faculty and graduate student instructors needed was a self-paced, yet extended opportunity to experiment with course management tools such as Blackboard and that all too many workshops focused on the technological skills set as opposed to the pedagogical and curricular context and were often paced too quickly for participants to understand either the technological or the pedagogical possibilities. For that reason, in summer 2002 I developed and delivered a fully online course titled “Online Learning for English Educators,” a six-week summer offering that addressed such topics as why teach online, virtual classroom management, assessment of online learning, copyright and intellectual property online. My own philosophy of online teaching includes the belief that before teaching online, instructors should have the opportunity to be students online to understand the learning style, motivation, and alternative delivery and assessment strategies necessary for course and student success. In addition, as someone charged with preparing future faculty in our doctoral program in Rhetoric to teach in electronic environments, I felt that our students needed a course that addressed the vast bodies of literature outside of English studies and computers-mediated communication that informed online learning, including distance education, faculty development, and assessment.

As the first group of nine students enrolled in the course, I realized our department would have an eager cadre of instructional design student specialists who could assist in our online course development needs and to expand their understanding of faculty roles and rewards with technology. Thus, in the spring and summer of 2003, we plunged in with a pilot group of four graduate students assigned to four faculty in a team-development model of course design that in which I encouraged the faculty to be more than just content development experts and the students to be more than just technical support. Rather, what I hoped would evolve was a learning community model in which both the individual teams and the entire group could share ideas about best practices in teaching and the ways that through the students’ experiences online that those practices might successfully manifest themselves. Such a model is consistent with Milt Cox’s (2001) nationally recognized efforts at Miami University of Ohio to bridge faculty and student learning communities and to create more supportive and sustainable professional development models for faculty at all levels, going beyond the traditional one-shot workshop model. Yet, as Deb, Amie, and Liz’s stories suggest, there were certainly constraints as well as possibilities to implementing and sustaining the consulting and learning community model.

DEB AND AMIE: A WORKING COLLABORATION

Deb: As a beginner in any new enterprise, there are those moments of genuine success—beginner’s luck—followed by the realization of complexity and inability to produce the same successful outcome each time. So it was for me when I agreed to teach a course on line for the first time.

There are successful pedagogical patterns that an educator learns through theory, experience and praxis, but as I discovered, the successful pedagogical patterns required a different conceptual understanding in an on-line classroom. I grew up with typewriters,

carbon paper, then erasable typewriters to a computer as a word processor, and finally now as a technological tools that demands more of me than just turning the switch to “ON.”

In order to translate the concepts of the F2F Teaching of Literature to the on-line class, I knew that I needed dialogue and explanation about the delivery system the Blackboard system provided and how best to manipulate its features. That required a discussion with someone who could do two things: first, teach me the computer skills I needed to effectively manage an online course; second, have a dialectical discussion on the pedagogical strategies for teaching an online course as it differs from the F2F course.

The literacy literature reminds us that as teachers we are constructed learners through our social interactions, associations and cultural situations (Cook-Gumperz, 1983). At this point I need more practical advice and skills than theoretical knowledge about literacy and learning, and literacy and learning on line. In order to assimilate and associate the teaching strategies I have developed through 25 years of teaching in various classrooms, geographical locations and academic levels, I had to have a bridge built between the known and comfortable pedagogical theories of classroom practice and the unknown computer skills and pedagogical online strategies that would by necessity alter any previous experience.

I state it this way because through this process, I came to realize my hidden resistance to thinking and restructuring thinking demanded by a different pedagogical delivery tool. Secondly, I became aware of the degree of vulnerability and uncertainty which this situation demanded of a seasoned instructor, who has already spent much of her career in establishing an authoring and scholarship around pedagogy of the F2F structures. I am still puzzled by the degree of openness and vulnerability which learning anything new requires. Being reduced to the novice status is difficult, but absolutely necessary to acquire new skills and generate new knowledge. In many ways, I approached the mentoring with a graduate student as a metacognitive process: a chance to study my learning to teach online as a sneak preview into the process of acquiring new knowledge. Yet, embracing the learning meant that I did not want to learn the necessary computer skills in the classroom with 15 other people or 10 other people. I wanted the one-to-one mentoring which could fill the gaps in my understanding of how to use the programs like Blackboard as the delivery tool, and manipulate the possibilities that the online forum provided and restricted.

In the beginning of my association with Amie, I knew that Amie had an interest and experience with the subject matter in the course I would be teaching: Teaching of Literature. Her knowledge of the subject matter, as well as her experience with the assignments and assessments for the course proved to be valuable prerequisite for our working relationship. Amie’s expertise with Blackboard and her knowledge of computers contributed to the successful rendering of the F2F teaching of literature in an online environment.

Amie: My first experience with a fully online course was Kris's "Online Learning for English Educators." I took a lot from the course: one of the texts from the course, Chickering and Gamson (1987), noted seven principles to follow when planning an undergraduate course. While working with Deb, I attempted to follow these principles while transforming English 609: The Teaching of Literature from a traditional face-to-face course into an online course.

The first principle discussed by Chickering and Gamson is "Encourages contacts between students and faculty" (p. 4). Deb is known for being a very hands on professor in her traditional courses. She frequently conferences with students outside of the classroom and takes time during seminars and class sessions to provide individualized attention. In order to translate this open communication online, I encouraged Deb to make herself as available to students as she was comfortable with. In addition to having her email address, which she checked frequently, students were also able to contact Deb during her virtual office hours. During a set time every week, Deb was logged into the course shell and into the Virtual Chat, which allowed students to have a synchronous discussion with her and possible other students. Deb also made this available by appointment to extend this opportunity to students unable to "meet" with her during the virtual office hours. In addition to making herself available for students, during discussions I also encouraged Deb to contact students herself not only after assignments and during the discussion board postings, but also when students seemed to disappear from the class itself.

Deb: In answering my questions about the operation of the online Blackboard system and more general concepts like html or pdf and basic functioning of chat rooms, loading external links and creating the readings for students, Amie guided me through the process of building the class in modules and then creating the four modules to effectively parallel the themes of the F2F course. Specifically, she sat next to me at the machine, discussed what the session would be about for that day's work; for example, how to work the discussion board, and load the module with the questions. I did not understand how a "discussion" could really be held on line. This involved not only showing me the system to enter a discussion, but how to make sure the discussion would stay on one strand before opening to another: How does the discussion board work so that students can read each other's ideas? What about my ability to comment or enter the discussion, save it and make these discussion available through the class? It seemed as we entered into the practical nature of the course delivery, that I had more strategic computer technology questions that I had to understand in order to understand the pedagogical capabilities of the Blackboard system as well as designing pedagogical strategies for on line learning. This exchange would mean that the F2F Teaching of Literature could not be directly placed in an online system. The very nature of the two delivery systems required that the concepts from the F2F course stay the same, but have a different series of strategies for students to follow in order to learn the concepts. This variation in pedagogical strategies required in the two environments was one of the most valuable learning themes from this process.

Amie: The second principle discussed by Chickering and Gamson is “Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students” (p. 4). In order to preserve this interaction between students, Deb included a group project in the course. Additionally, we created two types of discussion board threads. In one set of threads, the goal was for students to simply respond to Deb’s statements or questions. In the other, students were to post their responses and then respond to all of the other posts. Deb took this idea of creating community for the students a bit further and we discussed the option of having students post certain assignments and having the rest of the class respond to them as well.

Deb: The second way in which Amie facilitated my learning for the course was to specifically address what I wanted the students to learn. I would tell her what I wanted them to do or what I was thinking would work on the Blackboard frame from what I had learned of the computer program and capabilities. Then, she would provide me with strategies, lore from her experiences with online courses, and other points of delivery for me to consider. In one instance, I wanted to be flexible about the time assignments were delivered, or the method of delivery. Amie listened and then provided me with caveats about students leaving online courses because they were not required to do specific tasks; that some students considered an online course an opportunity to glide through required material easily and never really engage or make themselves known. While I cannot totally restrict or determine who will engage, I can set demands, expectations and clear instructions for how and when material is delivered.

Amie: The third principle discussed in Chickering and Gamson (1987) is “Uses active learning techniques” (p. 5). In order to maintain the level of active learning in an online course, Deb and I discussed at length the possibilities of various assignments she had used previously and how to translate them into the online environment. Nearly all of the active learning assignments could be transformed into the online class. Other assignments were modified or changed entirely to ensure that students were active in the class, discussions, and material.

Deb: It seemed with each pedagogical consideration for the course’s concepts, there was another computer consideration, which required me to rethink how to use the machine and the Blackboard to facilitate the learning of concepts about teaching of literature. With each process, question or development, over the course of one semester, Amie and I only would load the preliminary course materials, questions, instructions into the shell, and then rearrange, edit and revise within the preliminary materials. One of the best features of this system of mentoring was to have Amie in the same room, telling me what steps to take, and making me do them on the computer several times until it seemed to her that I had learned the system well enough to function independently.

At some point in order to facilitate the course’s development, Amie built certain structures for me: the modules, the discussion folders, and did the arrangement of colors and backgrounds. Eventually, after some time had passed and I was more skilled with the basics in Blackboard, then she showed me how to change these items myself.

Amie: The fourth and fifth principles discussed in Chickering and Gamson (1987) are “Give prompt feedback” and “Emphasizes time on task” (p. 5). These two principles were not difficult to incorporate into the online class. Deb made a goal to have materials graded or commented upon and returned to the students within one week of the due date and stuck to it. In planning the syllabus for the online version of the course, initially, Deb was not planning on giving concrete dates, times and manners in which work was to be turned in for every assignment. After minimal discussion, even minor assignments had due dates, with specified times and how they should be turned in. This forced students to be accountable for their work and avoided the end of the semester pile up that often happens to many teachers.

Deb: After the course had finished, I ran into a student from the course. She told me that she had had reservations about the course because how does someone “teach” about teaching without the F2F modeling and unstructured discussion that the classroom offers. She told me that she considered herself a shy student, and easily influenced by the remarks of others, especially because she often disagreed or had very different perspectives about quality and effective teaching methods for literature. Then, she related that she actually learned a great deal more online because the focused inquiry/heuristic lead discussions reverberated far more deeply in her thinking because she was not surrounded by the classroom exchanges. The writing and chats required for the completion of the modules made the students individually deal with the issues, with a minimum of “interference” from other classmates except through peer editing or commentary required for some of the assignments. This illustrated to me that the movement from the F2F pedagogy to on line pedagogy has to be conceptually different, but can be strategically equal. The student’s comment illustrates that the on-line environment for learning is a more self-reflective and independent process for acquiring the knowledge of course concepts, but that for first time on-line courses need to discuss early in the course the various means of knowledge making online versus F2F. In another sense, the students’ comments validated the pedagogical design of the course as Amie and I constructed it. I know that without this mentoring the course would not have been as effective.

Amie: The sixth and seventh principles discussed in Chickering and Gamson are “Communicates high expectations” and “Respects diverse talents and ways of learning” (p. 5-6). As we discussed the task of the syllabus and the goals of the course, Deb and I agreed that not only did the goals and expectations of the course need to remain as high as they were in the face-to-face version, but also that the needed to be spelled out for the students explicitly in the syllabus so that there would be no surprises. In writing the syllabus for the class, Deb tried to maintain the same level of diversity in the types of tasks she assigned. However, as she and I discussed in conferences, an online class is a distinct way of learning in and of itself.

Chickering and Ehrmann (1996) applied technology to the seven principles noted by Chickering and Gamson. Indeed, Chickering and Ehrmann note, “If the power of the new technologies is to be fully realized, they should be employed in ways consistent with the Seven Principles” (p. 3). This is precisely what I attempted to do while working with

Deb. We attempted to take a course that was effective and contained good teaching strategies in a F2F situation and transform it into a fully online course that possessed these same qualities and used the available technology to enhance the learning experience and reflect the seven principles.

Deb: One of the curious observations I made about my learning in this process was a certain level of impatience with reading manuals and having to discover myself through trial and error. I immediately think of a young child who is being shown how to do something by an adult or parent, and grabs the item away and says, "Let me do it myself." While I wanted to do it myself, I was not willing to experiment as the child might have in learning how to do something. I do not know if this is a function of age, experience or my own personal quirk, but Amie's ability to streamline the learning and let me control where and what I wanted to know the intricacies of technology allowed me to be a vulnerable learner and novice in this online environment. The system for learning requires a support and mentoring relationship that does complement the learners experience and expertise while allowing the learner to embrace being a novice.

Amie: When I agreed to work with Deb, I was a bit nervous as we had never built a true professor-student relationship. I would suspect that there was some apprehension on her side as well. However, the match seemed to be a good one based on the fact that the course in question was English 609: Teaching of Literature and the fact that I possess both a BA and MA in literature. I expected the relationship to be very businesslike and very task oriented. However, as we began meeting, every few weeks at first and more frequently towards the start of the online class, our working relationship became much friendlier than I had expected. Deb never treated me as if I was not an equal. I did help her with tasks such as learning about BlackBoard and how to make a Word document into a PDF file. However, she also asked my opinion about how to divide the material into modules and whether assignments or discussion board questions were clear. Our relationship, which began as professor-graduate student or professor-technical advisor, became one of colleagues sharing expertise and ideas as well as learning together.

LIZ—WHEN COLLABORATION FAILS

Before coming into this project, I had been a student in Kris' ENG 780: Online Learning for English Educators course and a member of the DLL under other projects, and I was working on my dissertation dealing with assessment issues in online writing environments. In early fall 2002, I was paired with a second year faculty member who was teaching an online literary theory course. She had taught courses at a distance before in the form of televised courses; however, she had never taught online before or utilized Blackboard beyond checking her roster. We also talked about her comfort levels with technology. It was during December in our first face to face meeting when I learned this about her. When the semester reconvened for the spring semester, we set up another meeting to begin our discussion. We discussed how to use the basics of Blackboard and the audience for her course, mostly non-residential teachers seeking their Masters' degrees. Before our second meeting, she sent me a sample syllabus from the course. At our second meeting, we discussed how her syllabus activities could take place online and

what types of assignments could work for the audience and the environment. It was after the second meeting when scheduling our meetings started to become a problem. Even after sending many emails about potential meetings or offers of help, we did not meet again until the Director of the Continuing Education called for a progress meeting to find out progress and whether the course would be online a couple of weeks ahead of time in order for registered students to check over the course, which did not happen. I did not have the same experience that Deb and Amie did. Even though we did not meet or interact as I had hoped, at the end of the summer course, she thanked me for helping and that she is using Blackboard for her other courses. She also enjoyed the experience and hopes to teach another online course. I still enjoyed the experience. I was able to collaborate in other pair groups, reinforcing the community atmosphere and learned how to handle, sometimes, difficult situations.

CONCLUSION

Based on our different experiences, even those that were positive, we found that there were obstacles to pairing graduate students with faculty members. In our situation, we had the faculty and graduate student hierarchical issues. Faculty need to be willing to confront and disrupt these hierarchical structures in order to optimize their relationship and access to assistance for their online course creation. Faculty workload was another issue; faculty needed to plan this course almost seven months in advance on top of their duties for the semester. In addition to the aforementioned obstacles, we would also like to mention technological literacies. Faculty may have lower technological literacies than earlier predicted. The importance of learning this early is to have the needed technological support available and the planning time in place. In our case, faculty and graduate students were placed together nine months before the summer course was to begin. This allowed for both parties to engage in conversation and plenty of knowledge sharing. In addition to faculty resources, because the graduate students have multiple responsibilities, it is important that all have the available support in the way of resources.

Because of the discipline specific training graduate students received through the ENG 780 Online Learning course, we were fortunate enough to have various knowledge of the course management tools available for teaching with Blackboard, not only what they were but also how to use them. We were also allowed to facilitate lessons, which forced us to decide on how subject material could be handled in digestible chunks for those involved in the class, thereby increasing our effectiveness as trainers.

What we have found through this pilot training program is that it is important to have faculty, departmental and administrative support. In our case, IDEAL provided monies in the form of professional development funds, which they received in part to plan the course and the rest when they were finished teaching. As for departmental support, their role is two-fold, to assist faculty and graduate students. For faculty, departments need to support the changes in evaluations and other traditional forms of assessment. For example, within our department, an ad-hoc technology committee revised our final evaluation to include online design and delivery formats. For graduate students, the English Department was supportive of allowing independent studies called

Online Course Design. For both faculty and graduate students, curricular experience was gained. In order for the faculty to accept this type of program and support the community effort, they need to know how their teaching will benefit. In our case, the knowledge gained in the process of this project provided the ability to crossover the technological and curricular experience into their traditional classrooms.

After having been through our first phase of our pilot training program, a plan to assess the success of our efforts is a necessary next step. Through our creation of Digital Language and Literacy, we have been able to avoid two factors, as mentioned by R.T. Bothel (2002): unrealistic appraisal of the potential of on-line education and computer and telecommunications skills bias and other limitations of the on-line media (p. 99). From a traditional assessment approach, we were able to interview the graduate students and faculty members (including Deb and Amie) involved about the benefits and disadvantages of such a initiative, as well as what could help those going through training in the future. Through the interviews, we found there to be barriers between the graduate student and faculty member. When graduate students are placed with a faculty member, a hierarchical structure exists, which may lead to awkwardness and an inability to work with each other. Despite problems with pair dynamics and faculty commitment, our reconstructed final course evaluation provided us with valuable information for assessment of our project. We were initially quite optimistic and found our optimism to be well-founded from the responses we received.

From a non-traditional assessment plan, membership in organizations, and presenting at conferences, publications such as this, we are provided with outlets that allow us to reflect upon our experiences. Within this reflection, we are then able to assess the success of our efforts, not only because we are placing it in writing but by comparing our experiences with others who have also ventured into the territory.

When assessing this project, we asked: What advice would we give to instructional designers and online educators? With this in mind, we have developed a set of guidelines from our graduate student and faculty experiences.

Guidelines:

- Create a list of what a faculty member wants to accomplish.
- Ask “What’s the benefit of using a certain technology?”
- Discuss which aspects of faculty buy-in, teaching philosophy, etc. are necessary to make this process successful.
- Determine which models of faculty development better ensure that faculty can work independently when they need to.
- Ensure sustainability by making sure that faculty are:
 - Using the technology in other courses
 - Constantly asking questions technology and pedagogical effects.
- Assess technological literacy, not only of the faculty but of the graduate students as well considering that all are in need of improvement.

- Enforce hands-on approach for faculty, in order to encourage continued growth; with technological literacy it is imperative that faculty use the technology and create appropriate assignments for the online environment.
- Be patient: Gaining technical knowledge and rethinking how students learn and require their information to be delivered online.
- Learn from mistakes.
- Admit deficiencies: While this may be considered risky, it has found to benefit students and build relationships.
- Evaluate University resources (financial, library, technological, people).
- Provide incentives.

We have moved into a second year with this program. Our department is still trying to find ways to include these new ventures in tenure and promotion. At recent English Department meetings, we have had discussions about the future of online courses in our departments, elements of control and what aspects of departmental support are available. Within our University, we have faculty technology training and online resources help available; however, it does not provide discipline specific help, the resources to help faculty members on a consistent basis, or the capabilities of providing graduate students with faculty development and instructional design opportunities. Not only has the Digital Language and Literacy Community provided a sense of in-house teaching and learning community that is necessary for graduate students, it has filled a gap from a faculty standpoint as well.

REFERENCES

- [1] Academic technologies for learning. (2003). Retrieved December 8, 2003, from <http://www.atl.ualberta.ca/>
- [2] Baldwin, R. (1998). Technology's impact on faculty life and work. In K. Gillespie (ed.), *The impact of technology on faculty development, life, and work*, pp. 7-21. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- [3] Bothel, R.T. (2002). Epilogue: A cautionary note about on-line assessment. In R. Anderson, J. Bauer, B. Speck (eds.), *Assessment strategies for the on-line class: From Theory to Practice*, pp. 99-104. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- [4] Carstens, R.W., and Knowles, V. (2000). Epilogue: A cautionary note about online classrooms. In R. Weiss, D. Knowlton, B. Speck (eds.), *Principles of effective teaching in the online classroom*, pp. 84-87. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- [5] Cook-Gumperz, J. (1986). *The social construction of literacy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Chickering, A.W., & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39, 3-7.
- [7] Chickering, A.W., & Erhmann, S. (1996). Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever. *AAHE Bulletin*, 49, 3-6.
- [8] Cox, M.D. (2001). Faculty learning communities: Change agents for transforming institutions into learning organizations. In D. Leiberman and C. Wellburg (eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 19. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 69-96). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- [9] Digital media project. (2003). Retrieved December 8, 2003, from <http://www.english.ohiostate.edu/programs/dmp/default.htm>
- [10] Moore, A. (2001). Designing advanced learning communities: Virginia Tech's story. In R. Epper and T. Bates (eds.), *Teaching faculty how to use technology: Best practices from leading institutions*, pp. 79-92. Westport, CT: Oryx Press.
- [11] Mortensen, P. & Kirsch, G. (1996). *Ethics and representation in qualitative studies of literacy*. Urbana, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.