Academic Program:	M.S. Educational Technology	**Date:**	November 11, 2022
Author(s):	Carrie Ball		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		X Learning Outcomes X Curriculum Map X Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		___ Yes X No ___ Hybrid	

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Benchmark for Proficiency**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark**	**Prior Results for Comparison** (if applicable)
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
Standard 2: Development Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences using print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies	CIMT 543 CIMT 620 CIMT 640 CIMT 689 CIMT 793	Class Projects Final Project Workshop/Software Project Final Project Course Grade	Rubric Rubric Rubric Rubric Final Grade	Rubrics: 75% of students receive ratings of "Meets Expectations" or higher. Grades: 100% of students receive grades of "B-" or better.	N/A – not offered in 21-22 0/2 met benchmark 4/4 met benchmark 1/1 met benchmark 0/1 met benchmark	
Standard 4: Management Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles of project, resource, delivery system, and information management	CIMT 620 CIMT 640 CIMT 689 CIMT 793	Final Project Workshop/Software Project Final Project Course Grade	Rubric Rubric Rubric Final Grade		0/2 met benchmark 4/4 met benchmark 1/1 met benchmark 0/1 met benchmark	

Standard 5: Evaluation Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of problem analysis, criterion--referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning	CIMT 543 CIMT 620 CIMT 620 CIMT 640 CIMT 689 CIMT 793	Class Projects Evaluation Project Final Project Workshop/Software Project Final Project Course Grade	Rubric Rubric Rubric Rubric Rubric Final Grade		N/A – not offered in 21-22 0/2 met benchmark 0/2 met benchmark 4/4 met benchmark 1/1 met benchmark 0/1 met benchmark	100% of students met the benchmark in 2020-2021.

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in Blue Reports to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	Consistent communication with students has been the most effective strategy for tracking student progress and supporting students in their program completion efforts.
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	As this program is phased out, our focus will be on consistent and timely advising that promotes semester-to-semester retention and program completion.

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*	Over the past year, a number of students have not completed or not continued their enrollment in this program, and a number of students have registered for courses but have not completed the work or withdrawn. It seems likely that delivering courses using primarily adjunct instructors, coupled with changes in program leadership, have detracted from the student experience and the ability of the department to proactively support student success.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	This program is being phased out due to loss of qualified faculty to deliver coursework. Dr. Carrie Ball has assumed program coordination responsibilities during the phase-out period. Planned strategies to support student success this year include timely and consistent communication about course registration and programs of study, increased efforts to help students identify opportunities for their culminating experience, and reaching out to adjunct faculty periodically to monitor student progress.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Next year we will return to assessment of Standards 1 (Design) and 3 (Utilization); we will continue to monitor Standard 5 (Evaluation). Because this program is being discontinued, we plan to continue with existing assessment strategies.

Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	These results will be shared with faculty who deliver these courses, including our regular adjunct instructors. We hope this will help our partners closely monitor student progress and alert the program coordinator about concerns in a timely manner.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: MS Educational Technology
Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LO language is highly complex, which is okay so long as measures and evaluative tools mirror that complexity.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.	Good use of multiple points of data for each LO to provide various perspectives on student learning from across the curriculum.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) ***–in some cases, see notes*** Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***–to an extent, see notes***	Course grades are not a particularly helpful assessment data point, as they often are composites of many performances. If being used as an indirect measure, they can provide useful reference points for distance between LO mastery and course grades to recalibrate grading structure, if necessary. Rubrics are helpful tools, especially when complex LOs such as these are involved; however, because student data reflects the same scores on assignments across multiple LOs, it is questionable whether these rubrics are using data disaggregated by LO to precisely target the LOs independently of each other. An analytical rubric will allow for this and provide much more accurate data. It could be this is what's happening, and the score consistency was not a concern.	Developing

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described		Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Developing – This is only because this program is in teach-out phase and working on maintaining through closure.

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.