

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19** 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)** Yong Joon Park, yongjoon.park@indstate.edu

**Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>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.</b></p>
<p><b>ISTE Standard 1 Visionary Leadership</b> 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><b>AECT Standard 4 Professional Knowledge and Skills</b> Candidates design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-rich learning environments within a supportive community of practice.</p> <p><b>ISTE Standard 1 Visionary Leadership</b> Candidates inspire and participate in the development and</p>	<p>Students will develop and conduct an <i>Instructional Design Project</i> which requires students to design and develop one or more lessons or modules on a topic of strategic importance to the curriculum of the local school or workplace in the course <i>CIMT 620</i>.</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or Above</p>	<p>100% (8 out of 8 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better. The average score was 90/100 in the course <i>CIMT 620</i>.</p>	<p>In the previous year, the program has redesigned the Assessment Plan and Rubric by aligning both the 2012 ISTE Standards for the Preparation of Technology Coaches and 2012 AECT Standards. The program will be looking at the Assessment Plan (both the Student Outcomes and the indicators to determine student success) in an effort to ensure that the program will continue to meet the needs of students and the requirements of department, university, state, and CAEP.</p>

<p>implementation of a shared vision for the comprehensive integration of technology to promote excellence and support transformational change throughout the instructional environment.</p> <p><b>AECT Standard 4 Professional Knowledge and Skills</b> Candidates design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-rich learning environments within a supportive community of practice.</p>				
<p><b>ISTE Standard 2 Teaching, Learning, &amp; Assessments</b> 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><b>AECT 2 Content Pedagogy</b> Candidates develop as reflective practitioners able to demonstrate effective implementation of educational technologies and processes based on contemporary content and pedagogy.</p>	<p>Students will 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 the course <i>CIMT 630</i>.</p> <p>Students will create a strategic <i>School or Workplace Technology Plan</i> that explains how the local school or workplace will go about achieving strategic goals by using technology to provide instruction, collect data, and evaluate results in order to</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or Above</p>	<p>100% (12 out of 12 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better. The average score was 97.16/100 in the course <i>CIMT 630</i>.</p>	<p>In the previous year, the program has redesigned the Assessment Plan and Rubric by aligning both the 2012 ISTE Standards for the Preparation of Technology Coaches and 2012 AECT Standards. The program will be looking at the Assessment Plan (both the Student Outcomes and the indicators to determine student success) in an effort to ensure that the program will continue to meet the needs of students and the requirements of department, university, state, and CAEP.</p>

<p><b>Graduate Student Learning Goal 2</b> Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p>	<p>determine the extent to which standards have been met in the course <i>CIMT 640</i>.</p>			
<p><b>ISTE Standard 3 Digital-Age Learning Environments</b> Candidates create and support effective digital-age learning environments to maximize the learning of all students.</p> <p><b>AECT 3 Learning Environments</b> Candidates facilitate learning by creating, using, evaluating, and managing effective learning environments.</p> <p><b>Graduate Student Learning Goal 3</b> Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</p>	<p>Students will create a <i>Multimedia eLearning Environment</i> incorporating multiple types of technology tools for active and collaborative learning in the course <i>CIMT 543</i>.</p> <p>Students will develop and conduct an <i>Instructional Design Project</i> which requires students to design and develop one or more lessons or modules on a topic of strategic importance to the curriculum of the local school or workplace in the course <i>CIMT 620</i>.</p> <p>Students will 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</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or Above</p>	<p>100% (21 out of 21 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better. The average score was 88/100 in the course <i>CIMT 543</i>.</p> <p>100% (8 out of 8 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better. The average score was 97.16/100 in the course <i>CIMT 620</i>.</p> <p>100% (12 out of 12 – ISTE; AECT) students earned a score of 80/100 or better. The average score was 97.5/100 in the course <i>CIMT 630</i>.</p>	<p>In the previous year, the program has redesigned the Assessment Plan and Rubric by aligning both the 2012 ISTE Standards for the Preparation of Technology Coaches and 2012 AECT Standards. The program will be looking at the Assessment Plan (both the Student Outcomes and the indicators to determine student success) in an effort to ensure that the program will continue to meet the needs of students and the requirements of department, university, state, and CAEP.</p>

	characteristics of all students in the course <i>CIMT 630</i> .			
--	---	--	--	--

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):

- 1) Cohort Sizes = 11      2) Year-to-Year Retention = 63.64%      3) 5-Year Graduation Rate NA

**What worked well in supporting student success this year?**

For the most part, our students appear to understand and complete assignments/activities at a high level. We need to investigate whether the few who score between 70 and 80% had personal issues or curricular issues. If they were curricular issues, we need to make changes to the curriculum/coursework.

**What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?**

For the coming year, we will focus on sharing this data and the best way to make corrections for the coming year. The information will be shared during faculty meeting(s).

**Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)**

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email. It is not expected that every course in your curriculum correspond to a career readiness competency.

## **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?)**

1) The discoveries Assessment Plan and Rubric has enabled students to demonstrate the following 5 performances:

1. Multimedia eLearning Environment
2. Needs Assessment
3. Instructional Design
  
4. School or Workplace Technology Plan
  
5. National Standards Capstone e-Portfolio

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

Based on the assessment data, students have demonstrated the knowledge necessary to create, use, assess, and manage theoretical and practical applications of educational technologies and processes in real local school and workplace settings. Student work samples and self-reflection reports can be provided as evidence that learning is improving.

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

In the previous year, the program has redesigned the Assessment Plan and Rubric by aligning both the 2012 International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards for the Preparation of Technology Coaches and the 2012 Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) Standards. Students taking courses offered in the program may choose to follow either the ISTE or the AECT standards. This choice determines whether ISTE or AECT rubrics assess student progress toward fulfilling the academic performances that the program's Assessment Plan comprises. The program will be looking at the Assessment Plan (both the Student Outcomes and all relevant indicators to determine student success) in an effort to ensure that the program will continue to meet the needs of students and the requirements of department, university, state, and CAEP.

**4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

The information will be shared through course announcements, social media/email communications, website news, school meetings, social events, and professional development workshops with other stakeholders.

Dear Yong,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 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 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)

<b>Program: M.Ed. Ed Tech</b>	<b>Overall Rating: Mature (2.50/3.00)</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Comprehensive list of aligned standards for program learning.</li><li>• Assessment methods and courses are clearly noted and well-described as to how they meet the outcomes. A diverse array of student performances are captured for each outcome, giving faculty an opportunity to triangulate assumptions about performance.</li><li>• Clear information about expected and actual student outcomes.</li><li>• Good information is provided about changes to the program to align all the standards and future work to ensure alignment with CAEP. Plans to refine the outcomes and assessment plan will support these goals.</li><li>• Thoughtful note to investigate minimal instances of students not meeting expectations rather than to assume changes must be made before understanding the cause.</li><li>• Clear information is provided about sharing findings.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is difficult to tell if the learning outcomes specific to the program are listed in the outcomes section, if it is just the aligned standards that are listed, or if a set of the standards also serve as the program outcomes. It was noted that students could choose which standards to align their plan of study with, but there should be a standard set of outcomes for the program that can be listed here, too.</li><li>• Data is missing for CIMT 640 under ISTE Standard 2, et al.</li><li>• Consider providing information about how assignments were evaluated. For instance, if a rubric was used simply note/describe or attach the rubric.</li><li>• Consider describing why these outcomes were selected for assessment (e.g., part of a cycle, in response to prior year concerns/interventions, etc.). It will be helpful when looking back on this report in the future to provide context.</li></ul>

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped