

Moller MEDT 8461  
DIFFUSION OF INNOVATION

Semester Hours: 3

Semester/Year: Summer 2011  
Class taught **fully online** via WebCT CourseDen

Instructor: Dr. Leslie Moller

Office Location: Virtual

Office Hours: By appointment only, arrange via Skype or email

Office Phone: 605-689-0146  
Media & IT Office - Department Secretary (Ms. Mary Ann Myers): (678) 839-6558  
Distance Education Office and Helpline (Mon - Fri. 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.): (678) 839-6558

E-mail: [Lesmoller@aol.com](mailto:Lesmoller@aol.com) or use course den

Chat: Skype ID: Lesmoller

Distance Support: WebCT Home Page  
<http://webct.westga.edu> ,  
Web CT Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct3/main/help.html> ,  
UWG Distance Learning  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance> ,  
Distance Learning Library Services  
<http://www.westga.edu/~library/depts/offcampus/> ,  
Ingram Library Services  
<http://www.westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>  
UWG Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

(No prerequisites) The course focuses on the processes of innovation and change as they apply to educational systems. Students learn how to apply change models and diffusion theory in order to successfully integrate technology-driven procedures and resources into classrooms and schools.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. By incorporating the theme “Developing Educators for School Improvement”, the College assumes responsibility for preparing educators who can positively influence school improvement through altering classrooms, schools, and school systems (transformational systemic change). Ten descriptors (decision makers, leaders, lifelong learners, adaptive, collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic, knowledgeable, proactive, and reflective) are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing educators who are prepared to improve schools through strategic change. National principles (INTASC), propositions (NBPTS), and standards (Learned Societies) also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured. The mission of the College of Education is to develop educators who are prepared to function effectively in diverse educational settings with competencies that are instrumental to planning, implementing, assessing, and re-evaluating existing or proposed practices. This course’s objectives are related directly to the conceptual framework and appropriate descriptors, principles or propositions, and Learned Society standards are identified for each objective. Class activities and assessments that align with course objectives, course content, and the conceptual framework are identified in a separate section of the course syllabus.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

1. Identify the elements and personnel involved in diffusing an innovation into a social system such as a school or a classroom (Havelock, 1995; Rogers, 1995)  
(Decision Makers; Leaders; Lifelong Learners; Adaptive; Collaborative; Culturally Sensitive; Empathetic; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective; NBPTS 4a, 4b, 5b; ISTE/NTES-T II-b, II- e);
2. Give examples of innovation diffusion in various school systems and use diffusion theory principles to explain why each was successful or unsuccessful (Carson & Smith, 1993; Havelock, 1995; Rogers, 1995, Saettler, 1992)  
(Decision Makers; Leaders; Lifelong Learners; Adaptive; Collaborative; Culturally Sensitive; Empathetic; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective; NBPTS 4a, 4b, 5b; ISTE/NTES-T II-b, II- e);

3. Compare and contrast current models of diffusion discussed in the education and social sciences literature (Havelock, 1995; Rogers, 1995; Tenner, 1996; Valente, 1995)  
(Decision Makers; Leaders; Lifelong Learners; Adaptive; Collaborative; Culturally Sensitive; Empathetic; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective; NBPTS 4a, 4b, 5b; ISTE/NTES-T II-b, II- e);

4. Identify characteristics of educators who are successful change agents (Havelock, 1995; Roblyer & Edwards, 2000; Rogers, 1995, Saettler, 1990)  
(Decision Makers; Leaders; Lifelong Learners; Adaptive; Collaborative; Culturally Sensitive; Empathetic; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective; NBPTS 4a, 4b, 5b; ISTE/NTES-T II-b, II- e);

and

5. Develop a plan for integrating an innovative technology successfully into a school or district (Carson & Smith, 1993; Havelock, 1995; Rogers, 1995)  
(Decision Makers; Leaders; Lifelong Learners; Adaptive; Collaborative; Culturally Sensitive; Empathetic; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective; NBPTS 4a, 4b, 5b; ISTE/NTES-T II-b, II- e).

#### TEXTS, READINGS, AND INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES

##### Required Text:

Ellsworth, J.B. (2000). *Surviving change – a survey of educational change models*. (ERIC Clearing House on Information and Technology, Syracuse, NY. (ED443417) This text is available for download on the WebCT CourseDen course resources page.

##### References

Barr, R., & Parrett, W. (1997). *How to create alternative, magnet, and charter schools that work*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service. (ED419266)

Beck, C., & Schornack, G. (1998). *Understanding educational change: A systems model approach*. Paper presented at the Second North American Conference on the Learning Paradigm, San Diego, CA. (ED420906)

Benham, M. (1999). *Case studies for school administrators: Managing change in education*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc. (ED429332)

Birrell, J., Ostlund, M., Eagan, M., Young, J., Cook, P., DeWitt, P., & Tibbitts, C. (1998). *Collaboration, communities, and covey: A model for personal and professional change*. *Clearing House*, 71(6), 359-362. (EJ568515)

Bohen, S., & Stiles, J. (1998). *Experimenting with models of faculty collaboration: Factors that promote their success*. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 25(4), 39-55. (EJ577732)

- Brandt, R. (1999). No one best way-but many very good ways. Paper presented at the annual conference and exhibit of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, San Francisco, CA. (ED430732)
- Brunner, I., & Davidson, B. (1998). The dissemination of educational innovations: New insights into the coaching model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. (ED425523)
- Clark, K. (1996). Human systems engineering: A leadership model for collaboration and change. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Association for Global Business, Dallas, TX. (ED401448)
- Cooper, R., Slavin, R., & Madden, N. (1998). Success for all: Improving the quality of implementation of whole-school change through the use of a national reform network. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ED420107)
- Donlevy, J., & Donlevy, T. (1997). Teachers, technology, and training: Perspectives on education and school reform-a focus on the sociological perspective. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 24(1), 1-14. (EJ569032)
- Education Commission of the States. (1998). *Comprehensive school reform: Criteria and questions*. Denver, CO: Author. (ED428428)
- Educational Research Service. (1998). *Comprehensive models for school improvement: Finding the right match and making it work*. Arlington, VA: Author. (ED422632)
- Ely, D. (1990a). Conditions that facilitate the implementation of educational technology innovations. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 23(2), 298-305.(EJ421756)
- Fullan, M. (1997). *The challenge of school change: A collection of articles*. Arlington Heights, IL: IRI/Skylight Training and Publishing. (ED409640)
- Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. (ED354588)
- Gaff, J. (1999). *General education: The changing agenda; The academy in transition*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. (ED430438)
- Gelberg, D. (1997). *The "business" of reforming American schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. (ED422637)
- Gross, S. (1998). *Staying centered: Curriculum leadership in a turbulent era*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ED420094)
- Hall, G., Wallace, R., & Dossett, W. (1973). *A developmental conception of the adoption*

process within educational institutions (Report No. 3006). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hall, G. (1992). The local educational change process and policy implementation. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 29(8), 877-904. (EJ453551)

Havelock, R., & Zlotolow, S. (1995). *The change agent's guide*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications. (ED381886)

Havelock, R., Guskin, A., Frohman, M., Havelock, M., Hill, M., & Huber, J. (1969). A comparative study of the literature on the dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge. (ED029171)

Huberman, A., & Miles, M. (1984). People, policies, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement: Vol. IV. Innovation up close: A field study in twelve school settings-a study of dissemination efforts supporting school improvement. Andover, MA: Network of Innovative Schools, Inc. (ED240716)

Khan, B. (1997). The designing matrix: A systemic tool for understanding the visions and images of new educational systems. *Performance Improvement*, 36(2), 32-36. (EJ539719)

Lawson, H., & Briar-Lawson, K. (1997). Connecting the dots: Progress toward the integration of school reform, school-linked services, parent involvement and community schools. Oxford, OH: Institute for Educational Renewal. (ED409696)

Lenaghan, D. (1999). Brave new world: A good news scenario for educational reform. (ED430151)

Louis, K., & Miles, M. (1990). Improving the urban high school: What works and why. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. (ED327623)

MacTaggart, T. (1996). *Restructuring higher education: What works and what doesn't in reorganizing governing systems*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (ED408882)

Marsh, D. (1999). Preparing our schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: 1999 ASCD yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ED427414)

Moore, N. (1996). Using the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria to improve quality in higher education. Paper presented at the Forum of the Association of Institutional Research, Albuquerque, NM. (ED399919)

Myers, C., & Simpson, D. (1997). Re-creating schools: Places where everyone learns and likes it. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. (ED418498)

National Association of College and University Business Officers. (1996). Organizational paradigm shifts. Washington, DC: Author. (ED402888)

New American Schools Development Corp. (1997). Working towards excellence: Results from schools implementing New American Schools designs. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service. (ED420896)

New American Schools Development Corp. (1998). Blueprints for school success: A guide to New American Schools designs. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service. (ED420913)

Nicholls, G. (1997). Collaborative change in education. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, Inc. (ED408932)

Olson, L. (1998). Models for reform. *American Educator*, 22(3), 18-19. (EJ578727)

Plank, D., Scotch, R., & Gamble, J. (1996). Rethinking progressive school reform: Organizational dynamics and educational change. *American Journal of Education*, 104(2), 79-102. (EJ522453)

Pourdavood, R., Cowen, L., & Svec, L. (1999). Complexity of school reform: Order and chaos. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. (ED430286)

Reigeluth, C., & Garfinkle, R., Eds. (1994b). Systemic change in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications. (ED367055)

Roblyer, M. D. (2004). Integrating educational technology into teaching. (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.

Rogers, E.M. (1995) Diffusion of Innovations (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Rosenfeld, S., & Gravois, T. (1996). Instructional consultation teams: Collaborating for change. New York, NY: Guilford Publications. (ED394260)

Saettler, P. (1990). The evolution of American educational technology. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.

Sakofs, M. (1998). Painting and Christopher Columbus: A story about metaphors for school change. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 21(2), 108-111. (EJ580360)

Schmuck, R., & Miles, M. (1972). Handbook of organizational development in schools. Palo Alto, CA: The National Press. (ED071167)

Speck, M. (1996). Best practice in professional development for sustained educational change. *ERS Spectrum*, 14(2), 33-41. (EJ527481)

- Squires, D., & Kranyik, R. (1996). The Comer program: Changing school culture. *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), 29-32. (EJ517889)
- Stanford, B. (1998). *Charting school change: Improving the odds for successful school reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. (ED418497)
- Talley, S., & Martinez, D. (1998). *Tools for schools: School reform models supported by the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students*. Washington, DC: National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students. (ED418174)
- Tenner, E. (1996). *Why things bite back: New technology and the revenge effect*. London, England: Fourth Estate.
- Tutt, B., & Carter, S. (1999). Understanding and using change forces. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC. (ED428049)
- Valente, T., & Rogers, E. (1995). The origins and development of the diffusion of innovations paradigm as an example of scientific growth. *Science communication*, 16(3), 242-273. (EJ499788)
- Valente, T. (1995). *Network models of the diffusion of innovations*. Hampton, VA: Hampton Press Communication Series.
- Van de Ven, A., Rogers, E. (1988). Innovations and organizations: Critical perspectives. *Communication Research*, 15(5), 632-651. (EJ379897)
- Wallace, B., & Braunger, J. (1998). *Teacher stories of curriculum change*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Lab. (ED424205)
- Wertheimer, R., & Zinga, M. (1998). Applying chaos theory to school reform. *Internet Research*, 8(2), 101-114. (EJ566619)
- Williams, B. (1997). Initiating curricular change in the professions: A case study in nursing. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ED411718)
- Zaltman, G., & Duncan, R. (1977). *Strategies for planned change*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

## ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING POLICY

### Link to Conceptual Framework

The focus of this course is on theory and practice of diffusing technological innovations within a school system. In addition to studying diffusion theory, students report on how a past innovation was diffused and create a diffusion plan or project for a new innovation. The overall evaluation for this course is structured on completing individual readings as well as report on a past diffusion and a new diffusion plan. Due to the broad nature of the course, each conceptual framework descriptor is covered in the various course assignments.

As students complete their assignments, they will have demonstrated achievement in the areas of decision making:

selecting topic areas in the student's field of study to design and develop an innovation plan (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

leadership: enhancing his/her knowledge and skills in diffusion in order to integrate technology more extensively on-the-job and to assist others as needed. (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

lifelong learning: studying how to integrate technology into the work place (course activities 1, course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

being adaptive: changing educational practices to meet the needs of learners (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

collaboration: working with colleagues and stakeholders to plan and carry out school improvements in technology (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

cultural sensitivity: adapting interventions and technology innovations to meet the needs of diverse learners (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

empathy: demonstrating sensitivity to the needs of individual, family, and community needs (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

knowledge: drawing on pedagogical, content, and professional knowledge, including knowledge from others' postings in the online bulletin board when developing diffusion plans (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4);

being proactive: implementing new interventions and innovations in technology to better serve learners (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4) and



reflection: engaging in ongoing, continuous reflection related to technology to determine the effectiveness of interventions/ innovations and school changes that are needed to more effectively integrate technology into the curriculum (course activities 2.1-2.2, 3.1-3.4).

Activities and Assessments:

## **2.0 Weekly Work**

### **2.1 Module Discussions (5 modules @ 11 points each = 56)**

In each module, the student will respond to a discussion prompt(s) provided by the instructor. With a few exceptions, the student is expected to make an initial posting on or before Wednesday of that week and follow up with remaining postings during the week. Students are expected to read and participate in all online discussions. Each discussion (except where noted elsewhere) is worth 8 points. You are required to post your initial thoughts (4pts) and respond to AT LEAST two other postings (4pts). A reflective response includes new information, personal perspectives, or other input that shows thought and consideration of the issue. It goes beyond simple agreement or endorsement of responses that have already been posted. (Course Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4; Teacher Observation, *WebCT* BB postings, Online discussions)

### **2.2 Quizzes (36 points)**

There will be a short quiz of no more than nine questions made available through *WebCT* on that module's readings. Please consult the tentative course schedule for each week's readings. The number of points will vary depending on the number of chapters which are required for that week. (Course Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; *WebCT* Quizzes). **Quizzes can be taken at your convenience provided they are all completed by 7/18 2011**

## Student Work

All student work submitted during the course is required to be original. All projects must be completed to be graded.

### 3.1 Project 1: The Interview (10 points)

The student will locate an individual(s) whose job responsibility it is to facilitate the technology integration process into an educational setting and interview that person. The student may conduct the interview in any format they choose (FTF, email, phone, chat, etc). Upon completion of the interview, the student is to create a PowerPoint presentation, videocast, podcast, etc that contains the highlights from the interview. The student must post this presentation to the appropriate *WebCT CourseDen* Assignment Dropbox for grading. (Course Objectives 1, 4, 5; rubric).

### 3.2 Project 2: Diffusion and Adoption Reflection (15 Points)

The student will identify an educational innovation, which they personally witnessed. The student will provide a detailed description of the setting in which the change took place, the personnel involved and an analysis of the success (or failure) using one of the change models presented in the class as a guide. (Course Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4; rubric).

### 3.3 Project 3: Interviewing Stakeholders (15 points)

The student will locate a student and/or a parent of a student and interview that person(s) concerning the technology integration at their school. The student may conduct the interview in any format they choose (FTF, email, phone, chat, etc). Upon completion of the interview, the student is to create a PowerPoint presentation, videocast, podcast, etc that contains the highlights from the interview. The student must post this presentation to *WebCT CourseDen* Assignment Dropbox for grading.

I am flexible about who you interview. Please contact me with your ideas or suggestions if you are having trouble finding someone to interview. (Course Objectives 1, 4, 5; rubric).

### 3.4 Project 4: CHOOSE ONE!

#### 3.4a Hands-on Technology (40 Points):

You may create a video podcast (or otherwise interactive presentation) that will serve a training purpose (e.g. tutorial) to aid in the implementation of a technological advancement in the classroom.

For instance, if you were interested in having teachers use digital portfolios or digital storytelling as an alternative to objective tests, you could create a training video, presentation or an interactive website that will instruct teachers how to use this innovation in an educational setting. This assignment is designed for those of you have a specific idea about an innovation that you actually want to implement in the near future and would find such a tutorial helpful in accomplishing your innovation goals. (Course Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; rubric).

**OR**

#### 3.4b Outlining the Innovation (40 Points):

Rather than writing the paper out in a narrative format, you can create a technology innovation action plan that answers the following questions in a short, well written but detailed manner. This is designed for those of you who have an innovation idea in the beginning stages and want to ascertain how to best implement the innovation. Not all of these questions may apply, and you would be well advised to refer back to specific

models from your reading in your answers. You may change the order of the questions to suit your personal taste/ situation and feel free to add additional material where appropriate.(Course Objectives 1, 2, 3,4, 5; rubric).

These questions were adapted from <http://www.ncrtec.org/capacity/guidewww/eval.htm>

- \*Describe your innovation, and why it is needed.
- \*How and when will you evaluate the impact your technology innovation has on student performance?
- \*Who will be responsible for collecting ongoing data to assess the effectiveness of the innovation?
- \*What windows of opportunity exist for reviewing the effectiveness of the technology innovation? (For example, the plan might be reviewed during curriculum review cycles or in- service times.)
- \*How will accountability for implementation be assessed?
- \*How will you assess the level of technological proficiency gained by students, teachers, and/or staff?
- \*How will you use technology to evaluate teaching and learning?
- \*What is the key indicator of success for each component of the plan?
- \*What are the funding requirements and how will this innovation be funded?
- \* How will you analyze the effectiveness of disbursement decisions in light of implementation priorities?
- \*How will you know if the innovation has failed or needs to be abandoned?
- \* How will you analyze implementation decisions to accommodate for changes as a result of new information and technologies?
- \*What organizational mechanism will you create that allows changes in the implementation of the technology plan and in the plan itself?
- \*Anything else you think is important.

### 3.5 Final Exam (20 points)

A final exam, delivered though *WebCT* will be given during the week listed on the course schedule. The exam will be comprehensive and will consist of questions drawn from the course readings and activities.

(Course Objectives 1,2,3,4, 5; exam).

## Evaluation Procedures

Students are evaluated in the following areas:

Activity	Total Points	Type of Assessment
2.1 Weekly Discussions (Note: Discussions have a hard end date)	56	Teacher Observations
2.2 Quizzes	36	
3.1 Project 1	10	Rubric
3.2 Project 2	15	Rubric
3.3 Project 3	15	Rubric
3.4 Project 4	40	Rubric
4.0 Final Exam	20	WebCT Exam

## GRADING SCALE:

A = 192-172 Points  
B = 171-153 Points  
C = 152-133 Points  
Below 132 Points = F

## CLASS POLICIES

### 1. Submitting Assignments.

**Students are required to submit assignments on time. All components must be completed to receive a grade. Valid reasons for submitting work late must be cleared by the professor in advance. It is the student's responsibility to contact the professor when extenuating circumstances take place.**

**Online discussions have a hard end date. Posting after that date will NOT be included in the grade.**

**All assignments are due by midnight on the date due. Any assignments posted after midnight are considered late. Late penalties may be up to 25%. Very late assignments (more than 2 weeks) may not be accepted. Project 4 will not be accepted late.**

## 2. Professionalism

Students are expected to conduct themselves professionally. This is an essential quality for all professionals who will be working in the schools. All students are expected to display a positive attitude. Professionalism includes but is not limited to the following:

- Participating in interactions and class activities in an online environment in a positive manner.
- Collaborating and working equitably with students in the class.
- Actively participating in class each week.
- Turning in assignments on time.
- Treating class members, professor, and colleagues with respect in and out of the classroom.

Students who display a lack of professionalism will be contacted by the instructor immediately after when violations take place and informed of the consequences. If there is a second violation the student will meet with a departmental committee and may be dismissed from the program for at least one year.

## ACADEMIC HONESTY

Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest Connection and Student Handbook and the Graduate Catalog

Disciplinary procedures described in the latest State University of West Georgia Connection and Student Handbook will be followed when violations take place. Infractions may include cheating, plagiarism, disruptive behavior, and disorderly conduct.

## DISABILITY STATEMENT

I pledge to do my best to work with the University to provide all students with equal access to my classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the American Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please make these known to me, either directly, or through the Coordinator of Disability Services, Dr. Ann Richards.

Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. This is not only my personal commitment, it is your right, and it is the law!

## COMMUNICATION STATEMENT

The official university communication to students is through campus e-mail (myUWG). Be sure to access this several times a week to keep up-to-date on important information.

## DUAL SUBMISSION STATEMENT

Coursework that has been completed or will be completed in another course that duplicates or dovetails with an assignment in this course may not be submitted unless prior approval is granted by the instructor. If you foresee this possibility, contact the instructor as soon as possible to request approval for dual submission.

## CLASS OUTLINE

This class is delivered using WebCT CourseDen at <https://u.view.usg.edu/webct/entryPage.dowebct>.

Students are expected to use WebCT for corresponding with each other and the instructor.

Assignments: Work will be submitted using the assignments feature, discussion board, or testing feature of WebCT.

Class Schedule

SEE WEBCT COURSEDEN!

## **Project Due Date (11:55pm)**

Project 1: Interview – 6 / 15 2011

Project 2: Paper – 6 / 28 2011

Project 3: Interview – 7 / 8 2011

Project 4: Varies – 7/17 2011

Final Exam: 7/18 2011

Discussions: During each module

