

Curriculum Vitae
Nathan M. Smith Jr.

Director of Technology Integration
Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services
Utah State University

2845 Old Main Hill
Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-2845

Nathan.Smith@USU.edu
435 • 797 • 1484

Biography

Nathan Smith currently serves as the Director of Technology Integration for the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services at Utah State University. In that role, he directs the Adele and Dale Young Education Technology Center (YETC). The YETC serves the college as a K-12 curriculum library, student-open access computer facility, Utah's NASA Regional Educator Resource Center, and a technology training and service center. He teaches the required technology integration course for pre-service educators at Utah State University. He also teaches beginning and advanced Photoshop and graphic design courses. He enjoys learning and sharing educational resources worldwide through his TeacherLINK website. He has participated in training IREX/TEA high school teachers from all over the world, including training for Lebanese and Jordanian teachers in Amman, Jordan. He serves on the board of directors for the Utah Coalition for Educational Technology. He has been invited to serve on the board of directors for the Center for Creativity, Innovation, and Discovery, a new charter school focused on project-based learning in Providence, Utah.

Education

1989-90	Utah State University - Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences Master of Science
1977-80	Brigham Young University - Elementary Education - Minor: Art Bachelor of Science

Work Experience

2016-Present	Director of Technology Integration College of Education and Human Services, Utah State University
2000-16	Director of Technology College of Education and Human Services, Utah State University
1992-2000	Associate Director Adele and Dale Young Education Technology Center/NASA Regional Educator Resource Center College of Education and Human Services, Utah State University 2845 Old Main Hill, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-2845
1980-1992	Elementary School Teacher Santa Clara Elementary School, 2950 Crestview Dr, Santa Clara, UT 84765

Outreach Experience

2017-Present	Board of Directors, The Center for Creativity, Innovation and Discovery (CCID) 67 South Sherwood Drive, Providence, UT 84332
2011-Present	Assist with the Utah State University GearUp grant program. http://utahstars.usu.edu
2005-Present	Board of Directors, The Utah Coalition for Educational Technology (UCET) http://ucet.org
2016-12-16	Presented to District Science Specialists and Technology Specialists from the Granite, Alpine, Salt Lake, and Weber School Districts
2016-10-13	Trained Space Dynamics Laboratory employees on basic Photoshop skills
2016-09-23	Trained Sky View High School faculty about technology integration resources
2016-08-17	Presented at the Empowering Teaching Excellence Conference - USU "Integrating Technology and Innovation in Education" https://empowerteaching.usu.edu/conference
2016-06-13	Presented to the Merrill-Cazier Library Faculty and Staff "New Technologies that Will Impact Libraries and Education"
2015-11-06/07	Presented at SUECON (Southern Utah Education Conference) "Photoshop Training" and "Teaching STEM? Great NASA Resources" https://www.suecon.org
2015-04-02/03	Presented at the Utah Coalition for Educational Technology Conference "Beginning Photoshop" and "Advanced Photoshop" http://www.ucet.org
2015-01-16	Presented to Mount Logan Middle School faculty and staff "New technologies for teachers"
2015-12-05	Presented to Elementary Education students at Brigham Young University "NASA Resources for Teachers"
2015-11-07	Presented at the Southern Utah Educators Conference
2015-04-06	Presented to Elementary Education Students at Brigham Young University
2015-04-02/03	Presented to Utah educators at the annual conference for the Utah Coalition for Educational Technology
2015-01-16	Presented to faculty of the Mount Logan Middle School, Logan, Utah
2014-12-05	Presented to Elementary Education Students at Brigham Young University
2014-12-04	Train Mt. Logan Middle School students about technology
2014-04-03/04	Presented to Utah educators at the annual conference for the Utah Coalition for Educational Technology - Advanced Photoshop
2013-12-06 Friday	Presented to Elementary Education students at Brigham Young University - Science
2013-11-01/02	Presented at the Southern Utah Educators Conference - NASA Resources - Photoshop
2013-10-02	Train faculty at Judge Memorial High School, Salt Lake City, Utah

2013-09-18/19	Presented at the GearUP conference in Salt Lake City, Utah
2013-06-12	Salt Lake City - Photoshop Resources presentation to CTE Conference - Murray High School
2013-04-10/17	U.S. State Department trip to Amman, Jordan to train teachers and administrators from Lebanon and Jordan in the use of educational technologies
2013-03-01/03	Presented at Four Corners School of Outdoor Education Conference, Blanding, UT
2012-12-11	Presented to Cache School District Principals about technology resources
2012-09/11	Trained 22 high school teachers from around the world about educational technologies U.S. State Department's IREX/TEA program.
2011-10-13/14	Presented at the Southern Utah Educators Conference, St. George, UT
2011-09-14	Presented to Edith Bowen Laboratory School Faculty - Technology resources
2011-09/11	Trained 20 high school teachers from around the world about educational technologies U.S. State Department's IREX/TEA program

Teaching Experience (See attached IDEA Class Evaluations)

ITLS 5500: Innovative Integration of Technology in Education

ITLS 5230/6230: Instructional Graphics Production I - Beginning Photoshop and Graphic Design

ITLS 5240/6240: Instructional Graphics Production 2 - Advanced Photoshop and Graphic Design

I also teach technology sessions for many of the various college courses offered in the College of Education and Human Services at Utah State University.

Acquired Skills (Scale of 1-5, 5 is expert level.)

Macintosh:	● ● ● ● ●
Windows:	● ● ● ●
iOS:	● ● ● ●
Android:	● ● ●
Photoshop	● ● ● ● ●
Graphic Design	● ● ● ● ●
inDesign:	● ● ● ● ●
Audio Editing	● ● ● ●
Video Editing	● ● ● ●
Photography	● ● ● ●

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Smith, Nathan

Comparison Group = IDEA

Overall Average

A - Progress on Relevant Objectives

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		68		65		64
Higher	57	ITLS 5240, 6240	60	ITLS 5230, 6230	61	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	ITLS 5275, 6275		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5500
Lower						
Much Lower						

Overall Average

B - Excellent Teacher

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		63		60		63
Higher		ITLS 5240, 6240	54	ITLS 5230, 6230	58	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	50		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5500
Lower	ITLS 5275, 6275					ITLS 5240, 6240
Much Lower						

Overall Average

C - Excellent Course

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		67		65		68
Higher		ITLS 5240, 6240	59	ITLS 5230, 6230	61	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	53		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5240, 6240
Lower	ITLS 5275, 6275				49	ITLS 5500
Much Lower						

Overall Average

D - Summary Evaluation

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		67				64
Higher		ITLS 5240, 6240	59		61	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	55		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5240, 6240
Lower	ITLS 5275, 6275				53	ITLS 5500
Much Lower						

Notes: IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction provide one measure of teaching effectiveness. IDEA allows faculty to rate the importance of 12 learning objectives as “essential,” “important,” or “of minor or not importance.” In the IDEA system, students self-report their progress on instructor selected objectives. The bulk of research (Marks et al., Pallett et al.) indicates students’ self-ratings of learning correlate positively with direct external measures. IDEA provides comparative data of teaching effectiveness. With more than 160,000 classes processed annually, IDEA has national benchmark data. Three “comparison groups” are available to benchmark individual instructor scores: 1) The overall IDEA database, with three years of national peer data; 2) A Discipline comparison, a five-year rolling average of all classes taught in a selected discipline; and 3) A USU comparison, a five-year rolling average of all courses evaluated at USU. For more information, please see: http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm. This page will reference only one comparison group, found in the upper right-hand corner. Scores between 45-55 are statistically “similar” to peers in the comparison group, with the average set at 50. A score of 56-62 is statistically “higher” than peers, and a score of 63 or greater is in the upper 10% of all classes. Scores are provided for “Progress on Relevant Objectives,” “Excellent Teacher,” and “Excellent Course.” A “Summary Evaluation” score is 50% weighted to the score from progress on relevant objectives, and 25% weighted to the excellent teacher and excellent course questions respectively.

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Smith, Nathan

Comparison Group = IDEA

Overall Average

A - Progress on Relevant Objectives

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		68		65		64
Higher	57	ITLS 5240, 6240	60	ITLS 5230, 6230	61	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	ITLS 5275, 6275		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5500
Lower						
Much Lower						

Overall Average

B - Excellent Teacher

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		63		60		63
Higher		ITLS 5240, 6240	54	ITLS 5230, 6230	58	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	50		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5500
Lower	ITLS 5275, 6275					ITLS 5240, 6240
Much Lower						

Overall Average

C - Excellent Course

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		67		65		68
Higher		ITLS 5240, 6240	59	ITLS 5230, 6230	61	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	53		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5240, 6240
Lower	ITLS 5275, 6275				49	ITLS 5500
Much Lower						

Overall Average

D - Summary Evaluation

	2013 Spring	2014 Spring	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Fall	2016 Spring
Much Higher		67				64
Higher		ITLS 5240, 6240	59		61	ITLS 5240, 6240
Similar	55		ITLS 5240, 6240		ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5240, 6240
Lower	ITLS 5275, 6275				53	ITLS 5500
Much Lower						

Notes: IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction provide one measure of teaching effectiveness. IDEA allows faculty to rate the importance of 12 learning objectives as “essential,” “important,” or “of minor or not importance.” In the IDEA system, students self-report their progress on instructor selected objectives. The bulk of research (Marks et al., Pallett et al.) indicates students’ self-ratings of learning correlate positively with direct external measures. IDEA provides comparative data of teaching effectiveness. With more than 160,000 classes processed annually, IDEA has national benchmark data. Three “comparison groups” are available to benchmark individual instructor scores: 1) The overall IDEA database, with three years of national peer data; 2) A Discipline comparison, a five-year rolling average of all classes taught in a selected discipline; and 3) A USU comparison, a five-year rolling average of all courses evaluated at USU. For more information, please see: http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm. This page will reference only one comparison group, found in the upper right-hand corner. Scores between 45-55 are statistically “similar” to peers in the comparison group, with the average set at 50. A score of 56-62 is statistically “higher” than peers, and a score of 63 or greater is in the upper 10% of all classes. Scores are provided for “Progress on Relevant Objectives,” “Excellent Teacher,” and “Excellent Course.” A “Summary Evaluation” score is 50% weighted to the score from progress on relevant objectives, and 25% weighted to the excellent teacher and excellent course questions respectively.

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Smith, Nathan

ITLS 5230, 6230

Comparison Group = IDEA

Overall Average

A - Progress on Relevant Objectives

	2015 Fall	2016 Fall
Much Higher	65	61
Higher	ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5230, 6230
Similar		
Lower		
Much Lower		

Much Hig..

Overall Average

B - Excellent Teacher

	2015 Fall	2016 Fall
Much Higher	60	58
Higher	ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5230, 6230
Similar		
Lower		
Much Lower		

Higher

Overall Average

C - Excellent Course

	2015 Fall	2016 Fall
Much Higher	65	61
Higher	ITLS 5230, 6230	ITLS 5230, 6230
Similar		
Lower		
Much Lower		

Much Hig..

Overall Average

D - Summary Evaluation

	2015 Fall	2016 Fall
Much Higher		61
Higher		ITLS 5230, 6230
Similar		
Lower		
Much Lower		

Higher

Notes: IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction provide one measure of teaching effectiveness. IDEA allows faculty to rate the importance of 12 learning objectives as “essential,” “important,” or “of minor or not importance.” In the IDEA system, students self-report their progress on instructor selected objectives. The bulk of research (Marks et al., Pallett et al.) indicates students’ self-ratings of learning correlate positively with direct external measures. IDEA provides comparative data of teaching effectiveness. With more than 160,000 classes processed annually, IDEA has national benchmark data. Three “comparison groups” are available to benchmark individual instructor scores: 1) The overall IDEA database, with three years of national peer data; 2) A Discipline comparison, a five-year rolling average of all classes taught in a selected discipline; and 3) A USU comparison, a five-year rolling average of all courses evaluated at USU. For more information, please see: http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm. This page will reference only one comparison group, found in the upper right-hand corner. Scores between 45-55 are statistically “similar” to peers in the comparison group, with the average set at 50. A score of 56-62 is statistically “higher” than peers, and a score of 63 or greater is in the upper 10% of all classes. Scores are provided for “Progress on Relevant Objectives,” “Excellent Teacher,” and “Excellent Course.” A “Summary Evaluation” score is 50% weighted to the score from progress on relevant objectives, and 25% weighted to the excellent teacher and excellent course questions respectively.

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Smith, Nathan

ITLS 5240, 6240

Comparison Group = IDEA

Overall Average

A - Progress on Relevant Objectives

2016 Spring

63

Much Hig..

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

64
ITLS 5240, 6240

Overall Average

B - Excellent Teacher

2016 Spring

59

Higher

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

63
ITLS 5240, 6240
ITLS 5240, 6240

Overall Average

C - Excellent Course

2016 Spring

64

Much Hig..

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

68
ITLS 5240, 6240
ITLS 5240, 6240

Overall Average

D - Summary Evaluation

2016 Spring

63

Higher

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

64
ITLS 5240, 6240
ITLS 5240, 6240

Notes: IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction provide one measure of teaching effectiveness. IDEA allows faculty to rate the importance of 12 learning objectives as “essential,” “important,” or “of minor or not importance.” In the IDEA system, students self-report their progress on instructor selected objectives. The bulk of research (Marks et al., Pallett et al.) indicates students’ self-ratings of learning correlate positively with direct external measures. IDEA provides comparative data of teaching effectiveness. With more than 160,000 classes processed annually, IDEA has national benchmark data. Three “comparison groups” are available to benchmark individual instructor scores: 1) The overall IDEA database, with three years of national peer data; 2) A Discipline comparison, a five-year rolling average of all classes taught in a selected discipline; and 3) A USU comparison, a five-year rolling average of all courses evaluated at USU. For more information, please see: http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm. This page will reference only one comparison group, found in the upper right-hand corner. Scores between 45-55 are statistically “similar” to peers in the comparison group, with the average set at 50. A score of 56-62 is statistically “higher” than peers, and a score of 63 or greater is in the upper 10% of all classes. Scores are provided for “Progress on Relevant Objectives,” “Excellent Teacher,” and “Excellent Course.” A “Summary Evaluation” score is 50% weighted to the score from progress on relevant objectives, and 25% weighted to the excellent teacher and excellent course questions respectively.

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Smith, Nathan

ITLS 5275,6275

Comparison Group = IDEA

Overall Average

A - Progress on Relevant Objectives

2013 Spring

57

Higher

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

57
ITLS 5275,6275

Overall Average

B - Excellent Teacher

2013 Spring

50

Similar

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

50
ITLS 5275,6275

Overall Average

C - Excellent Course

2013 Spring

53

Similar

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

53
ITLS 5275,6275

Overall Average

D - Summary Evaluation

2013 Spring

55

Similar

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

55
ITLS 5275,6275

Notes: IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction provide one measure of teaching effectiveness. IDEA allows faculty to rate the importance of 12 learning objectives as “essential,” “important,” or “of minor or not importance.” In the IDEA system, students self-report their progress on instructor selected objectives. The bulk of research (Marks et al., Pallett et al.) indicates students’ self-ratings of learning correlate positively with direct external measures. IDEA provides comparative data of teaching effectiveness. With more than 160,000 classes processed annually, IDEA has national benchmark data. Three “comparison groups” are available to benchmark individual instructor scores: 1) The overall IDEA database, with three years of national peer data; 2) A Discipline comparison, a five-year rolling average of all classes taught in a selected discipline; and 3) A USU comparison, a five-year rolling average of all courses evaluated at USU. For more information, please see: http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm. This page will reference only one comparison group, found in the upper right-hand corner. Scores between 45-55 are statistically “similar” to peers in the comparison group, with the average set at 50. A score of 56-62 is statistically “higher” than peers, and a score of 63 or greater is in the upper 10% of all classes. Scores are provided for “Progress on Relevant Objectives,” “Excellent Teacher,” and “Excellent Course.” A “Summary Evaluation” score is 50% weighted to the score from progress on relevant objectives, and 25% weighted to the excellent teacher and excellent course questions respectively.

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Smith, Nathan

ITLS 5240,6240

Comparison Group = IDEA

Overall Average

A - Progress on Relevant Objectives

Overall Average	2014 Spring		2015 Spring	
	64		60	
	Much Higher	68	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240
	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240	Similar	ITLS 5240,6240
	Lower		Much Lower	

Much Hig..

Overall Average

B - Excellent Teacher

Overall Average	2014 Spring		2015 Spring	
	59		54	
	Much Higher	63	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240
	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240	Similar	ITLS 5240,6240
	Lower		Much Lower	

Higher

Overall Average

C - Excellent Course

Overall Average	2014 Spring		2015 Spring	
	63		59	
	Much Higher	67	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240
	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240	Similar	ITLS 5240,6240
	Lower		Much Lower	

Much Hig..

Overall Average

D - Summary Evaluation

Overall Average	2014 Spring		2015 Spring	
	63		59	
	Much Higher	67	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240
	Higher	ITLS 5240,6240	Similar	ITLS 5240,6240
	Lower		Much Lower	

Much Hig..

Notes: IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction provide one measure of teaching effectiveness. IDEA allows faculty to rate the importance of 12 learning objectives as “essential,” “important,” or “of minor or not importance.” In the IDEA system, students self-report their progress on instructor selected objectives. The bulk of research (Marks et al., Pallett et al.) indicates students’ self-ratings of learning correlate positively with direct external measures. IDEA provides comparative data of teaching effectiveness. With more than 160,000 classes processed annually, IDEA has national benchmark data. Three “comparison groups” are available to benchmark individual instructor scores: 1) The overall IDEA database, with three years of national peer data; 2) A Discipline comparison, a five-year rolling average of all classes taught in a selected discipline; and 3) A USU comparison, a five-year rolling average of all courses evaluated at USU. For more information, please see: http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm. This page will reference only one comparison group, found in the upper right-hand corner. Scores between 45-55 are statistically “similar” to peers in the comparison group, with the average set at 50. A score of 56-62 is statistically “higher” than peers, and a score of 63 or greater is in the upper 10% of all classes. Scores are provided for “Progress on Relevant Objectives,” “Excellent Teacher,” and “Excellent Course.” A “Summary Evaluation” score is 50% weighted to the score from progress on relevant objectives, and 25% weighted to the excellent teacher and excellent course questions respectively.

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Smith, Nathan

ITLS 5500

Comparison Group = IDEA

Overall Average

A - Progress on Relevant Objectives

2016 Fall

55

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

55
ITLS 5500

Similar

Overall Average

B - Excellent Teacher

2016 Fall

52

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

52
ITLS 5500

Similar

Overall Average

C - Excellent Course

2016 Fall

49

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

49
ITLS 5500

Similar

Overall Average

D - Summary Evaluation

2016 Fall

53

Much Higher
Higher
Similar
Lower
Much Lower

53
ITLS 5500

Similar

Notes: IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction provide one measure of teaching effectiveness. IDEA allows faculty to rate the importance of 12 learning objectives as “essential,” “important,” or “of minor or not importance.” In the IDEA system, students self-report their progress on instructor selected objectives. The bulk of research (Marks et al., Pallett et al.) indicates students’ self-ratings of learning correlate positively with direct external measures. IDEA provides comparative data of teaching effectiveness. With more than 160,000 classes processed annually, IDEA has national benchmark data. Three “comparison groups” are available to benchmark individual instructor scores: 1) The overall IDEA database, with three years of national peer data; 2) A Discipline comparison, a five-year rolling average of all classes taught in a selected discipline; and 3) A USU comparison, a five-year rolling average of all courses evaluated at USU. For more information, please see: http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_faculty_faq.cfm. This page will reference only one comparison group, found in the upper right-hand corner. Scores between 45-55 are statistically “similar” to peers in the comparison group, with the average set at 50. A score of 56-62 is statistically “higher” than peers, and a score of 63 or greater is in the upper 10% of all classes. Scores are provided for “Progress on Relevant Objectives,” “Excellent Teacher,” and “Excellent Course.” A “Summary Evaluation” score is 50% weighted to the score from progress on relevant objectives, and 25% weighted to the excellent teacher and excellent course questions respectively.