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INTRODUCTION

Prior to pursuing an academic career in higher education, I was a high school mathematics teacher and technology coordinator for five years in the New York City Public Schools. During my tenure, I was awarded teacher of the year for my innovative work and dedication to my students. My biggest challenge as a teacher was in finding ways to transform my students’ learning experiences within the existing educational system. I decided to pursue my master’s in instructional technology as a way to enhance my pedagogy to facilitate transformative learning environments for my students. The preparation that I received at New York Institute of Technology in the Instructional Technology master’s program made me realize that in order for students’ learning environments to be transformed the existing educational system needed to be transformed. I resigned from my teaching position to pursue a Ph.D in Instructional Systems Technology. My graduate training at Indiana University lured me in the direction of Educational Systems Design (ESD) and systemic change in education; my work there primarily involved research on facilitating systemic change in public school districts.

Since the Fall of 2004 I have been working as an Assistant Professor in the Curriculum and Teaching Department at Hofstra University. My research has focused broadly on issues of educational change, and student voice in educational change, and on the development of culturally relevant instruction and products. I developed a Master of Arts and an Online Certificate for Advanced Study in Educational Technology for the department. I created and teach a graduate course in Computer Assisted Technology (CT 212), which allows me to work with my students to design interactive technology-based learning environments for use in k-12 classrooms. I also teach a graduate course on Emerging Technologies in Education where my students and I review and evaluate various innovative technologies (CT 210). Much of my time has been spent on teaching three-to-four courses per semester, advising 20+ master’s students, developing a Masters program, and serving on doctoral committees for the department of Foundations, Leadership and Policy Studies, and the Literacy Studies department. I also serve on various school and university committees. I have a strong teaching record as evidenced from high ratings on my course evaluations. Hofstra University has provided me with the opportunity to further develop my teaching and research skills, and to design and teach new online courses. As a whole my tenure portfolio gives the reader a glimpse into my development as researcher, teacher and practitioner.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

My research and pedagogy is informed by several important scholars in the fields of instructional technology, education leadership and curriculum and instruction. Together these scholars have shaped my thinking and provide a foundation and framework for my research interests. My research has focused broadly on issues of educational change, and student voice in educational change, and on the development of culturally relevant instruction and products.
Student Voice and Educational Change

Having seen and lived through the unequal education that students of color receive, I became interested in Educational Systems Design (ESD) and systemic change in education. My research there primarily involved research on facilitating systemic change in public school districts. Specifically, I wanted to understand how to implement and improve a change process designed to create a new paradigm for learning in the new information age in a small school district. Early in my research career, I published an article in *World Futures: The Journal of Evolution* (Joseph, et al., 2002) that identifies the process values and the process activities that drive any systemic change process. This article was a tribute to the life work of Bela H. Banathy, whose work has taught me how to take a systems view of education. His work is important because it serves as a starting point for providing guidance to school districts wanting to enter into a change process. Process values provide direction and motivation for the design process. A good example of a process value is what Banathy calls, being committed to an ideal design. According to Banathy (1996) “in the ideal systems design approach the target is always the ideal. The target cannot ever be less than ideal. Design is a journey toward the ideal” (p. 194). For any systemic change process to succeed, it should seek to envision and create an ideal system. This process value requires a shift in the way we think about current educational systems. It requires that we intentionally seek to think “outside the box” and ask questions such as: “with unlimited resources, what would my educational system look like?” The people who commit themselves to a process of continual envisioning and revisioning, must be people who “think future—act now” (Banathy, 1991, p.165). Process activities refer to the specific steps that a community should follow when undergoing a systemic change effort. Banathy outlines a series of activities for engaging in the systems design of an educational system.

My mentor Dr. Charles Reigeluth’s work on Educational Systems Design has been instrumental in helping me to make sense of how we might approach designing a totally new educational system. He and I published an article in *Educational Technology* (Reigeluth & Joseph, 2002), where we argued that using technology to support what educators are already doing is not a productive course of action when compared to using technology to create relevant, critical and transformative teaching and learning environments (McLaren, 1998). For example, many teachers use interactive whiteboards (i.e. smartboards) to project an image from their computer station, and use the digital markers to write on the board. They could accomplish the same results with a basic projector and a whiteboard. In this example, the teacher is simply using technology to do business in the same old way. Perhaps a more productive way of using smartboards might be allowing groups of students to come up to the smartboard and interact with a web-based map, ie. Google maps. The mapping exercise might require students to locate the number of liquor stores, Barnes and Noble bookstores, or public swimming pools in their neighborhoods, and compare their results with neighboring school district communities. This activity is relevant to students because it is situating a problem within their community. The activity is critical, because it requires students to compare and contrast, make decisions, and ultimately act on and speak out against inequities. The activity is transformative because it helps students to become aware, and to speak out against the inequities that exist in their community. I believe that systemic changes in education can only occur when students have opportunities to engage in authentic and relevant activities that require critical examination and research on issues that are important in their lives.
For my dissertation, I conducted a study using a qualitative research methodology known as formative research (Reigeluth & Frick, 1999) in order to improve upon the process guidelines that are described in the Guidance System for Transforming Education (GSTE). The GSTE is a design theory for facilitating systemic change in public school districts that was developed by prominent educational researchers in the fields of Instructional Technology and Educational Leadership (Jenlink, Reigeluth, Carr-Chelman, and Nelson). I have written three articles from my dissertation research, two of which are published and one I am revising for resubmission. The first research study investigated the early stages of the systemic change process and was published in a top tier research journal, the British Journal of Educational Technology (Joseph & Reigeluth 2005). The second study focused on the implementation of three events of the Guidance System for Transforming Education (GSTE): a) forming a Core Team of school leaders who will take charge of creating a culture for change in the school district, b) developing this Core Team of leaders in a two-day retreat, and c) building the Core Team’s knowledge base in systems thinking and systems design. This research has provided me the opportunity to work as a process facilitator and researcher in a school district in Indianapolis, Indiana, where I co-facilitated a district-wide systemic change effort with a core team of school leaders (the Superintendent, PTA/O President, Principal, Board Member, and Teacher Association President). A key finding from my dissertation study was that students were excluded from the change process. Allison Cook-Sather’s (2002) work on authorizing student voice has helped me to find a focus for my research and teaching. By authorizing student voice, we focus on what can be learned by listening to students, and using what we learn to inform the design and redesign of learning environments. Authorizing students’ voices is about changing the teacher-student relationship; it is about equalizing and sharing the power we hold as teachers and about trusting and treating students with respect and dignity.

Consequently, my work in the area of student voice in education and change links with my research in the area of culture in educational technology. As I stated above, my dissertation was about a change process to create a new paradigm for learning in schools, one that creates the structures that reflect the new information age. Student voice is critical because it captures the culture of students--how they engage in everyday practices. Na’ilah Nasir’s work has shown me how to adopt a sociocultural perspective in order to study and understand how students learn by focusing on how they participate in particular activities, and how they draw on artifacts, tools, and social others to solve local problems. Gaining a deep understanding of how students engage in their everyday practices should inform how we design instruction and how schools function. By seeking out and working with students to understand and experience their culture, we as teachers and designers can help to incorporate their culture and voice in the design of instruction and technology-based learning environments. I published a second article entitled “The Excluded Stakeholder: In Search of Student Voice in the Systemic Change Process” in Educational Technology (Joseph, 2006). The third article is based on my dissertation literature review. The article, entitled “The Systemic Change Process: A Conceptual Framework,” has been submitted for publication in the International Journal of Organizational Transformation and Social Change. I have received feedback from the reviewers and I am making the necessary revisions and intend to resubmit the article.
Culturally Relevant Technology-Based Environments

Whether you are creating a lesson plan, music video, documentary, web site, car, house, or a new school, there is one thing that these creations all have in common: a **design process**. When most people think of educational technology the first thing that comes to mind is computers in the classroom, or the Internet. My view of educational technology is much broader, and obviously it includes computers, classrooms and the Internet. However, when I think of educational “technology” I think of a design process that continually needs to be improved upon. Seels and Richey (1994) define educational technology as, “the theory and practice of design, development, utilization, management and evaluation of processes and resources for learning” (p. 9). Therefore, **the process of design is educational technology**. So for teachers the design process might entail, 1) determining whether to cover the whole curriculum or just the essential big ideas, 2) analyzing students’ prior understanding of the topic, 3) developing the learning objectives and activities, and 4) designing the assessment instruments. Teachers have to continually make revisions to this lesson design process in order to improve the “technology” of teaching and student learning. As an educational technologist, I am mostly interested in how to improve design processes which in turn should improve the instructional product.

My current research interest centers on understanding how the combination of culture and educational technology can improve student learning. Historically, the field of instructional technology has been culturally neutral. In my view, the field has focused on designing for the masses. Designing for particular cultural groups some view as going against the grain of the field of instructional design. Some have critiqued the idea as being inefficient, cumbersome, and impossible to design for all cultures that exist in schools in America. In my research, I have found the major argument for culturally-based interventions is grounded in the cognitive learning sciences. The argument is, by making instruction culturally relevant and culturally responsive you as the instructor/designer are tapping into your students’ prior knowledge of their culture. By tapping into prior knowledge, we can now link that knowledge to new material which should help students learn.

Several years ago my colleagues and I published an article in *TechTrends*, that we titled: “**The Third Dimension of ADDIE: A Cultural Embrace**,” where we offered guidance to instructional designers on how to begin to incorporate culture throughout the Instructional Systems Design (ISD) process (see Thomas, Mitchell, & Joseph, 2002). We argue that too often the intention is not to make a product that is culturally sensitive or culturally appropriate but culturally neutral. We cannot escape culture; nothing is free of culture or cultural bias. Instructional designers might look to cultural informants and subject matter experts during the design process. In the article, we enhance the ISD process by adding a cultural dimension to the traditional ADDIE model. ADDIE is an acronym for Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation. As our schools are becoming more diverse, our methods for designing instructional products are not meeting the needs of this growing diverse population of students. Gloria Ladson-Billings’ work on culturally relevant pedagogy guides my thinking and research on culturally relevant design of instructional products. According to Ladson-Billings (1995), culturally relevant pedagogy requires students to: 1) experience academic success; 2) develop and/or maintain cultural competence; and 3) develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order (p. 160). In my design-based
research, I strive to use Ladson-Billings’ pedagogical framework to develop culturally relevant technology-based learning environments.

I am currently the lead editor of a special issue of *Educational Technology* which will be devoted to culture and educational technology. In addition to co-writing the introduction article, I also wrote an article to be included in the special issue titled, *Closing the Achievement Gap with Culturally Relevant Technology-based Learning Environments* (Joseph, 2009). In the article, I argue that the most significant educational problem of our time has been the achievement gap. I discuss the need for the field of educational technology to join in the social movement to close this gap. I also provide some background on the significance of incorporating culture throughout the design and development of technology-based learning environments.

**Presentations at Professional Meetings**

I am honored to have been invited to serve as a discussant at the American Educational Research Association on two different occasions. In April 2007, I was a discussant for the SIG-Instructional Technology, and again in April 2009 I was a discussant for the SIG-Critical Examination of Race, Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Education. This is evidence that my scholarship is beginning to be noticed by the larger national and international community. I have also presented my research at large national and international conferences. I take these presentation opportunities very seriously, as they allow me to present my ideas and early drafts of my work prior to submitting them for publication. For example, I presented my research on videoconferencing with my colleagues at AERA in March 2008. This research has since been submitted and accepted for publication in a peer reviewed journal. I previously presented my research on systemic change in education, and culture in the field of educational technology. I have subsequently submitted manuscripts on these topics which have also been published in highly regarded journals.

**Grant Writing**

I am the project co-director with Dr. Marlene Munn-Joseph for the “*Hofstra University Teacher Opportunity Corps (TOC)*,” funded ($160,554) through the *New York State Education Department, Office of K-16 Initiatives and Access Programs*. Dr. Munn-Joseph and I wrote the grant because we saw a need to enhance the preparation of teachers and prospective teachers in addressing the learning needs of students in high need schools, and to increase the participation rate of historically underrepresented and economically disadvantaged individuals in teaching careers. We are in the second year of this three year grant. As part of the grant we work with neighboring school districts on long island that have a high concentration of black and Latino students. I have also collaborated with Dr. Grennon Books to enhance teacher quality in the Roosevelt UFSD School District. Dr. Jacqueline Grennon Brooks and I published an article in *TechTrends*, titled, “*Simple Problems and Integrated Technology: Making Connections Beyond the Curriculum*” (Joseph & Grennon Brooks, 2008). In the article we describe our interdisciplinary work in 3rd grade classrooms in the Centennial Avenue Elementary School in Roosevelt, New York. The collaboration with Dr. Grennon Brooks is part of the *Teacher Leadership Quality Program (TLQP)*, a new York state program authorized by the NCLB act that aims at improving the academic access and success of NY students by enhancing the quality of their teachers.
My colleagues and I have also been awarded two internal grants ($2,200 total) through the Hofstra University Faculty Small Research Grant. The first grant was awarded to begin work on a project we titled: “The Global Classroom: A Pilot Study of Teaching and Learning Through Videoconferencing.” I have been working on this research project with Dr. Grennon Brooks, Dr. Plonczak, and Dr. Stemn since the fall of 2007. The second internal grant was awarded to extend our research on the use of videoconferencing in the classroom. We have presented our research findings at the Annual Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education (SITE) conferences. We have been honored by the SITE conference the “Outstanding Paper Award” for our research paper, “Enhancing Preservice Elementary Teachers’ Field Placements in Math and Science through Videoconferencing” (Plonczak, Joseph & Stemn, 2009). We have published our findings in peer-reviewed journals. We also have an article titled, “Videoconferencing in Math and Science Preservice Elementary Teachers’ Field Placements” that has been accepted for publication and will appear in a 2010 issue of the Journal of Elementary Science Education.

Work in Progress

I am currently working on a research project with colleagues in the school of education (Drs. Elfreda Blue and Blidi Stemn). We have titled this project, “Project Remix: Using Cultural Cues to Improve Academic Progress in Math and Literacy”. Our research project has been approved under expedited review procedures of the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) governing the use of humans as research subjects. This project is an interdisciplinary multi-phased study, Project REMIX, seeks to investigate whether a combination of cultural cues, technology, and instructional scaffolds can positively impact students’ reading comprehension and enhance their mathematical problem solving. This study focuses on student-generated cultural cues.

We shared a math word problem with students and asked them to work with a partner or in groups of three to solve it. Next, students were given the Project REMIX Challenge--Students were told to rewrite the math word problem using their own cultural cues so that someone in their community could read and solve the math word problem. Students’ rewritten math word problems were analyzed using a cultural modeling framework designed to investigate the prevalence and embeddedness of cultural cues employed by fifth graders. The original word problem was compared to the rewritten math problem to determine the types of cultural cues students generate. Various cultural cues emerged within the rewrites of the word problem, each depicting a different aspect of what Brooks (2006) entitled, ethnic group practices. When remixing the word problems we found that students incorporated one or more ethnic group practices, including: locations, names, religion, and foods.

As I mentioned earlier, I am also revising a manuscript on my dissertation literature review. The article, entitled “The Systemic Change Process: A Conceptual Framework,” has been submitted for publication in the International Journal of Organizational Transformation and Social Change. I have received feedback from the reviewers and I am making the necessary revisions and intend to resubmit the article.
My Teaching Philosophy

*Use technology in a transformative way.* I teach my students to use PowerPoint in a way that is very different than how most teachers use it. In most cases when teachers begin to use PowerPoint they use it to extend a lecture style of teaching. In essence the relationship between student and teacher does not change; the teacher has all the power and the knowledge. I teach my students to use PowerPoint in a way that transforms this traditional, lecture-based teaching style into a teaching style that places the student at the center and requires the student to take on more of a shared responsibility in the teaching and learning process. In my introduction to technology for teachers course (CT 200), I teach my students how to create interactive instructional modules. Each module includes learning objectives, an interactive lesson presentation that teaches a concept using PowerPoint’s animation features, and a section providing the student an opportunity to have practice with the concept they have learned in the presentation. The modules also provide the student with immediate feedback to their responses. Each module concludes with an assessment of student learning. My preservice teachers come away amazed at what they can design with PowerPoint. It is a time consuming and challenging project that I believe changes my students’ perceptions about the teaching and learning process. In most of the intensive projects that I assign, I try to encourage my students to use technology in a way that changes the relationship between student, teacher and the content. This is the case whether I am teaching students about the use of Power Point, Smartboards, Digital Storytelling, 3D Virtual Environments, Blogs, Wikis, Web 2.0, or Webquests.

*Meaningful Learning with Technology.* My teaching career began in 1994 as a high school mathematics and computer teacher in Queens New York. It was then that I learned the importance of getting to know my students and the need to create a space to allow their voices to be heard. Allison Cook-Sather’s (2002) work on authorizing student voice has helped me to find a focus for my research and teaching. I believe in listening to students and what they have to say about what is being taught and how they feel they can best learn. I use surveys and writing prompts to gather important information about the teaching and learning process, and to listen to my students’ voices. Like Michelle Fine (2005), I believe in helping students to become researchers, to investigate and seek solutions to problems that have an effect on their lives and their communities. One example of this is in my *emerging technologies in education course,* (CT 210). In this course my students choose from various emerging technologies, and they must research the technology and design an instructional product that can then be used by students in a K-12 environment. This semester my students are working on the following topics: designing stories in 3D virtual worlds, and designing educational games.

To give the reader a sense of where my philosophy started to take shape, I want to share one of my fondest memories as a high school teacher. I was involved in a research experience outside the classroom, working on a grant funded video documentary project (through the Educational Video Center) with my students entitled, WebStories. This project connected my students (who were African-American, Latino and Caribbean) with students in Manhattan (who...
were White). Many of my students had never taken a trip to Manhattan, and many of the students in Manhattan had never been to Queens. The goal of the project was to have our students and the students in Manhattan work on designing and developing a video documentary via the Internet. My students did take several trips to the EVC headquarters in Manhattan to meet the other students and to learn about capturing digital video and editing video footage with advanced software. Both groups of students would meet online to get to know each other, brainstorm ideas for possible topics for the documentary, keep a design journal, story board, upload and download images, and email each other. Finally both groups of students decided to create a video documentary on how adults perceive adolescents. My students came up with the project title: WebStories. They interviewed adults in their communities about their perceptions of adolescents, and created summaries of their interviews on the project website. Both student teams came together to choose which video footage would make the final cut, and to edit the video with the digital editing software. When the video was complete it was shared with the larger school community. The WebStories project had a profound impact on my beliefs as a teacher. It taught me that students can do so much more if we as teachers just get out of their way. I learned a great deal from my students while working on the WebStories project. The time that I spent with my students outside of the classroom getting to know them and their capabilities and interests was a great asset to me in my mathematics and computer classes. I always felt that my students and I had a sense of mutual respect for one another. Our time together outside of the classroom was just as important to me as the time we spent together inside of the classroom. In both spaces we learned how to learn from each other, we learned how to respect one another, and most importantly we got to know one another outside of the constraints of the classroom and lesson plan.

I share this vignette of my experience to provide the reader with a sense of my teaching philosophy and style. I approach the teaching and learning relationship with my students at the university level in very much the same way. Many of the projects that I assign my students require a tremendous amount of development time. The classroom time is mostly devoted to how to use the technological tool. The time outside of class, is mostly spent on using the tool to design and develop an instructional product. I spend a significant amount of time outside the classroom working with my students on completing their projects. It is during this time, outside of the constraints of the classroom that I can really get to know my students and their interests. On many occasions I am in their classrooms helping them to implement their completed projects.

**Curriculum and New Course Development**

I’ve spent the last five years here at Hofstra redesigning and creating new courses and programs in educational technology for the Curriculum and Teaching department. I am most proud of my efforts in revitalizing the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology. Many of the courses in the old program were outdated and no longer offered because they did not meet the needs of teachers and students in 21st century classrooms. Dr. Sharon Whitton and I made revisions to many of these courses by updating the curriculum, syllabi and revising the course names. In order to keep up with the rapid technological changes and needs within the schools we serve, I believe it is imperative that we continue to update the curriculum offered within the CAS in Educational Technology. The improved program will better serve the needs of
teachers working in information age classrooms. The table below provides an outline of the old program juxtaposed with the recently revised program. With the exception of CT 200, the prerequisite requirement, the revised program includes all new required courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD PROGRAM</th>
<th>REVISED PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prerequisite Requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prerequisite Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of at least one course in the operation of (micro) computers in education or CT 200. No credit toward the Advanced Certificate in Educational Computer Technology for either course. Credit by examination may be used to satisfy the prerequisite requirement.</td>
<td>CT 200. Introduction to Computer Technology in Education or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Courses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Required Courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CT 210 – Introduction to Word Processors, Spreadsheets and Databases in Educational Settings, 3 s.h.</td>
<td>• CT 210A – Emerging Technologies for Teaching and Learning, 3 s.h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CT 211 – Introduction to Teaching Programming in Schools, 3 s.h</td>
<td>• CT 211A – Computer Authoring and Scripting Environments, 3.s.h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CT 230 – Methods and Materials for Teaching Pascal in the Schools, 3 s.h.</td>
<td>• CT 212 – Computer-Assisted Instruction, 3 s.h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CT 231 – Methods and Materials for Teaching Computer Science in the Schools, 3 s.h.</td>
<td>• LYST 252 – Digital Literacies: Implications for Research and Pedagogy, 3 s.h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CT 232 – Application of Computer Technology to the Management of Educational Systems, 3 s.h.</td>
<td>• SPED 277 – Technology and Assistive Technology in Special Education, 3 s.h.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have also created a new course, CT 212, Computer Assisted Instruction. It has been offered several times in the past few years and has received positive reviews from my students.

**Online Teaching and Course Development**

I have also been at the forefront of designing, developing and teaching online courses here at Hofstra University. The first course that I transformed from a face-to-face course to an online course was a one credit introductory to technology course for elementary education preservice teachers (ELED 104/258). This is the first course in the history of the Curriculum and Teaching department that has been offered as an online course on a regular basis. ELED 104/258 is the only educational technology course that is required for graduation for all students in the elementary education program.
Advisement

I advise graduate students in the Master of Science in Elementary Education program. I have also served on several dissertation committees for the Department of Foundations, Leadership and Policy Studies and the Literacy Studies Department (see my vita for completing listing of students and dissertation titles).

Course and Teacher Rating (CTR)

My CTR scores show that in most semesters my course and teacher evaluation ratings have been on par or higher than the department average.

Peer Evaluations

My peer evaluations have been critical to my growth as a teacher educator. My colleagues have allowed me to experiment with my teaching, especially as it pertains to teaching in the online format. They have also provided important insights with regard to teaching educational technology across the content areas. This has been a challenge in my development as a teacher educator, and over time, my peers have helped me to address this issue. Peer evaluations by Dr. Janice Koch, Dr. Judith Kaufman, Dr. Doris Fromberg, Dr. Sharon Whitton, Dr. Linda Davey, and Dr. Alan Singer are included as evidence of my teaching competence. Their guidance and feedback has been instrumental to my continued improvement in teaching.

SERVICE

To the Profession

I am most proud of the honor of having been invited to serve as a panel reviewer for the Ford Foundation’s Diversity Fellowships Program. As a panel member, I am responsible for reading and evaluating both dissertation and postdoctoral applications. I have served the field of educational technology as President of the Association of Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) Division of Systemic Change (2003-2005), and as a reviewer for the premier journal in my field, Educational Technology Research and Development (ETR&D) Journal. I also serve as a reviewer for the journal, Excelsior: Leadership in Teaching and Learning, published by the New York Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

To the Community

Since the Fall of 2004, I have served as a liaison for Hofstra University in working with the Roosevelt Union Free School District on Long Island. Every semester I meet with building principals and teachers to analyze their educational technology needs. I provide hands-on professional development within the context of a live classroom so that teachers can see that the methods and strategies I use actually work with “their students”. For example, last year I made weekly visits to three 3rd grade classrooms to help them integrate “Lego Robotics,” within their curriculum. In previous semesters the topics included web-based simulations, educational websites and smartboard technologies. I am committed to working with and serving the high need schools that border Hofstra University.
To the University

I am a member of the University Senate’s Academic Computing Committee. Last year the major work of the committee focused on requiring every student to purchase a laptop. We also spent a significant amount of time reviewing various alternatives to the Blackboard Learning Management system. We voted to retire Blackboard and move to a new system called Angel. Since the vote, Blackboard acquired Angel, and therefore the university will not be changing its learning management system at this time. I was also a member of the Learning Management System Taskforce, which was responsible for reviewing many different systems and their features to determine if we should recommend a different system other than Blackboard.

To the School of Education, Health and Human Services

I currently serve as a co-chair of the Technology and Facilities Committee. My primary responsibility on this committee involves all technology issues. During the Spring and into the summer I was responsible for coordinating the purchase of the new printer/copiers. I am also responsible for updating the faculty room assignment spreadsheet.

I am a member of the Advisory Committee for the Center for Secondary School Administrators and Supervisors. This committee includes district superintendents and principals. The committee is headed by Assistant Dean, Martin Blum. The main work of the committee is to help in developing ideas for conferences and workshops that are held in the School of Education, Health and Human Services. Most recently, I have been working closely with Mr. Blum and Mrs. Rose Tirotta to develop an educational technology conference which will be held in Hagedorn Hall on December 11th, 2009. During the conference I will be offering two workshops. The first workshop is titled, “Digital Story Telling for Middle School utilizing ALICE – 3D.” In this workshop I will be introducing attendees to a system called Alice that teaches and encourages students to create animated stories while providing a motivating context in which to learn programming. The second workshop is titled, “Digital Story Telling: Using Audio & Images. Working with Microsoft PhotoStory.” In this workshop attendees will learn how to use Microsoft Photostory to create digital stories within the context of their subject area. Digital StoryTelling is one engaging application that is on the rise in many schools today. This new art form combines telling stories with various multimedia tools including graphics, audio, video animation, and web publishing.

Every year, I hold an Educational Technology Showcase where my students present their projects to the school community in the lobby of Hagedorn Hall. This year I will be embedding the showcase within the educational technology conference that I am working on with Mr. Blum.

I am also a member of the Affirmative Action Committee. Since the last academic year we have been working on a report for the Provost. I was responsible for coordinating the interview transcriptions and ordering the supplies and equipment for the project.
To the Curriculum and Teaching Department

As a service to the department I have been able to work on the development of a Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology. In addition to working on the curriculum, I was solely responsible to writing up the administrative paper work that had to go for approval through various official offices within the university and then finally for approval by NYSED. As part of that process, I created a new course for the department (CT 212), Computer Assisted Instruction.

Since the fall of 2006 I have been a member of the department’s reinvention committee. My role on the committee has been to lead several initiatives. The first initiative was research-based dealing with incorporating videoconferencing in the elementary math and science methods courses. The second initiative was in experimenting with the development of online courses for the department. For the past few years I have been offering ELED 104/258 as a fully online course. In the spring 2009 semester, I offered CT 200 for the first time as an online course. I was solely responsible for preparing the required administrative paper work and for seeking approval to offer the course online.

I am also a member of the department personnel committee (dpc) and the elementary education program committee.