

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20 Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Unit/Program Name: Educational Technology **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Steve Hayden, Ph.D. – steven.hayden@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>ISTE Standard 1 Visionary Leadership Candidates inspire and participate in the development and implementation of a shared vision for the comprehensive integration of technology to promote excellence and support transformational change throughout the instructional environment.</p> <p>AECT Standard 4 Professional Knowledge and Skills Candidates design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-rich learning environments within a supportive community of practice.</p>	<p>Students develop and conduct an <i>Instructional Design Project</i> that requires students to design and create one or more lessons or modules on a topic of strategic importance to the local school or workplace curriculum in <i>CIMT 620</i>.</p> <p>Rubric provided</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or Above on the <i>Instructional Design Project</i></p>	<p>CIMT 620</p> <p>Fall of 2019</p> <p>100% (11 out of 11 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better. The average mastery level for the final major project was 100%. All students earned a min. "A" final grade.</p> <p>Spring of 2020</p> <p>100% (14 out of 15 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 90/100 or better.</p>	<p>This report aligns with the previous two SOAS reports (17-18 and 18-19). In the last year (18-19), the program redesigned the Assessment Plan and Rubric by aligning both the 2012 ISTE Standards for the Preparation of Technology Coaches and the 2012 AECT Standards. Per last years report, the goals in the future were to look "at the Assessment Plan (both the Student Outcomes and the indicators to determine student success) to ensure that the program will continue to meet the needs of students and the requirements of department, university, state, and CAEP."</p> <p>With a new program director, the immediate plan is to conduct an internal structural</p>

				program audit (expanded in Part 2).
<p>ISTE Standard 2 Teaching, Learning, & Assessments Candidates assist teachers in using technology effectively for assessing student learning, differentiating instruction, and providing rigorous, relevant, and engaging learning experiences for all students.</p> <p>AECT 2 Content Pedagogy Candidates develop as reflective practitioners able to demonstrate effective implementation of educational technologies and processes based on contemporary content and pedagogy.</p> <p>Graduate Student Learning Goal 2 Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p>	<p>Students compose a <i>Needs Assessment</i> containing a literature review that establishes the need for school or building-level improvements in the educational technology infrastructure, including teacher professional development, research-based best practices, and learner characteristics of all students in <i>CIMT 630</i>.</p> <p>Rubric provided</p> <p>Students create a strategic <i>School or Workplace Technology Plan</i> that explains how the local school or workplace will achieve strategic goals by using technology to provide instruction, collect data, and evaluate results to determine the extent to which standards are met in <i>CIMT 640</i>.</p> <p>Rubric provided</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or Above on the <i>Needs Assessment and School or Workplace Technology Plan</i></p>	<p>CIMT 630</p> <p>Spring of 2020</p> <p>100% (4 out of 4 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better.</p> <p>CIMT 640</p> <p>Spring of 2020</p> <p>100% (13 out of 13 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better.</p>	<p>See above description (expanded in Part 2)</p>
<p>ISTE Standard 3 Digital-Age Learning Environments Candidates create and support effective digital-age learning environments to maximize the learning of all students.</p>	<p>Students create a <i>Multimedia eLearning Environment</i> incorporating multiple technology tools for active and collaborative learning in <i>CIMT 543</i>.</p> <p>Students develop and conduct an <i>Instructional</i></p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or Above on the <i>Multimedia eLearning Environment, Instructional Design Project, and Needs Assessment</i></p>	<p>CIMT 543</p> <p>Fall of 2019</p> <p>100% (6 out of 6 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better.</p>	<p>See above description (expanded in Part 2)</p>

<p>AECT 3 Learning Environments Candidates facilitate learning by creating, using, evaluating, and managing effective learning environments.</p> <p>Graduate Student Learning Goal 3 Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p>	<p><i>Design Project</i> which requires students to design and create one or more lessons or modules on a topic of strategic importance to the curriculum of the local school or workplace in <i>CIMT 620</i>.</p> <p>Rubric provided</p> <p>Students compose a <i>Needs Assessment</i> containing a literature review that establishes the need for school or building-level improvements in the educational technology infrastructure, including teacher professional development, research-based best practices, and learner characteristics of all students in <i>CIMT 630</i>.</p> <p>Rubric provided</p>		<p>Summer of 2020</p> <p>100% (11 out of 11 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better.</p> <p>CIMT 620</p> <p>Fall of 2019</p> <p>100% (11 out of 11 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better. The average mastery level for the final major project was 100%. All students earned a min. "A" final grade.</p> <p>Spring of 2020</p> <p>100% (14 out of 15 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 90/100 or better.</p> <p>CIMT 630</p> <p>Spring of 2020</p> <p>100% (4 out of 4 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better.</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

- 1) Cohort Sizes
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

What worked well in supporting student success this year? As a new director of the program, what has worked well in supporting student success is anecdotal but informed through meetings with previous and currently involved stakeholders. These meetings centered around understanding the temporal aspects of the Educational Technology program. An overwhelming amount of qualitative and quantitative data suggest the *instructors* have been the most integral variable in supporting student success through critical care, content knowledge, and pedagogy. The instructors have been the glue holding the program together by establishing and maintaining relationships, holding high academic expectations, and instructional design expertise

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year? With renewed attention on the program, optimism surrounds the upcoming year. The plan is to go through a short internal structural audit in the remainder of the Fall 2020 semester, as detailed below. Followed by an external audit in the Spring 2021 semester with updated learning outcomes, assessment measures, and student expectations. (Re)Evaluating program identity and defining a direction for the program are the most significant opportunities for improvement. Also, the program will add a data tracking system for candidate enrollment and retention. This data will ensure alignment and program cohesiveness across the scope and sequence.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)

Based on the above findings, students have a high success rate in the assessed learning objectives. As shown by the pass rate on the assessments, the student population meets the instructors' assessment criteria. Because this report carried over learning objectives from the previous report, the data suggests that the focus areas received proper attention. The success rates also show that the program is ready to identify new/modified learning objectives and assessment measures for the upcoming year.

- 2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**

Again, this report marks renewed attention on the Educational Technology program. Through document analysis and anecdotal stakeholder discussions, the data suggests a structural internal program audit to focus on two program areas: 1) identity and 2) direction. The findings-based plan (shown below) consists of three phases (LEARN, CONNECT, GROW) with actions intended to improve student learning and success. Educational Technology has a rich history as a program. As

the new director, I plan to honor the past while (re)evaluating the program identity and (re)defining the program direction forward with collaboration, clarity, alignment, cohesiveness, and quality across scope and sequence. The first step will be to reopen the discussion on the identity of the program. Questions might focus on, but not limited to: Who are the current students? What/Who is our audience? How do we innovate while maintaining quality instruction?

3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year

Educational Technology 2020-2021 Plan		
<i>Phase</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>Date(s)</i>
LEARN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOAS Report (due 10.6.20) • (Re)Establish an Educational Technology committee • Internal Audit (October-November) – review and revise learning objectives, assessments, and student expectations with the committee (1a, 1b, 1c) • Self-study (due 12.1.20) • Plan and prepare for Spring 	Fall 2020 (October-December)
CONNECT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contingent on the LEARN phase • Collect Data for 20-21 SOAS Report 	Spring 2021 (January-May)
GROW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contingent on the LEARN and CONNECT phases • Collect Data for 20-21 SOAS Report 	Summer 2021 (June-August)

4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders

Interested and invested stakeholders drive the program forward. After completing the AY19-20 SOAS Report, the Educational Technology Committee will be (re)evaluated. Existing committee members will be contacted to gauge interest in staying with the group and asked for a renewed commitment. At the same time, new membership will be extended to interested/committed faculty and staff. Information will be shared via a combination of university emails, Microsoft Teams, and Zoom meetings. Transparency and inclusion will be at the forefront of any major decision-making.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President’s Office and the Provost’s team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: MS Educational Technology	Overall Rating: Mature (2.94/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All assessment activities are aligned to standards and GSLOs. • Assessment measures are direct measures that incorporate high-level cognitive skills appropriately matched to the outcomes. Some outcomes are measured at multiple points in the curriculum. • Means for evaluating (rubrics, etc.) performance are made clear, and expected and actual results are shared in reference to these. Multiple cohort performances are described. • Decisions to assess learning outcomes over the course of two years allows for meaningful analysis of student performance over time and assuredness regarding the results. • With high student performance, action plans focus on using additional sources of data on the program to continue strong foundational traditions while updating the program to continue to meet diversifying needs of students and industry. A clear plan is established for gathering information and involving others in this process. • Clear information is provided about how others are involved/will be involved in sharing and using assessment results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be sure to include the program-specific learning outcomes as the primary listed outcomes in the table. Definitely retain the ISTE/AECT and GSLO aligned standards to show that connection as well. • One thing I noticed is that the expected performance level of 80% corresponds to “developing” on the rubric, which is below “meeting expectations” at 90%. Your data shows most students are achieving beyond the “developing” level. It may just be a language thing with the levels on the rubric, but I think at the graduate level in the types of courses you are using for assessment you likely want to see students “meeting expectations” at minimum (and in fact, most and sometimes all are meeting or exceeding).

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No (program) learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Please see reviewer notes for more details.