

---

Educational Technology Leadership [EDTL]

Cycles included in report:  
Cycle #5 Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

Cycle: #5 Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

### 1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

50-99% Distance/Traditional

### 2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?

No

#### 2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

### 3 Example of Program Improvement

2015-2016:

The Educational Technology Leadership faculty members are involved in ongoing curriculum review of the program to ensure that candidates are well prepared as they enter their leadership roles in the workforce. Assessment results and other data such as course projects, reflection papers, and research papers have been analyzed by program faculty to identify patterns of strengths and weaknesses in the area of 1) content knowledge, 2) professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and 3) effects on student learning and on creating environments that support learning.

Overall candidates performed well on the assessments and are knowledgeable in the field of educational technology leadership. Although no major issues were noted, improvements and adjustments have been made in an effort to continue to grow and strengthen the program.

**Content Knowledge:** Several assessments and rubrics were revised to require candidates to make coursework relevant to their own professional experiences. The new format has proven to be a positive experience for the candidates as they are able to relate knowledge gained to a practical setting. Candidates have embraced the projects and have made significant contributions to their own workforce. Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of content, pedagogy, technology, management, and leadership while fostering continuous learning.

**Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions:** The current program now has practical experiences embedded in a number of assignments. Candidates are also encouraged to participate in professional development activities both as a presenter and a participant in order to stay abreast of emerging technological knowledge and skills.

**Focus on Student Learning and Creating Environments that Support Learning:** Means below the acceptable performance level were found in relation to strategic planning. It seems as though candidates are not fully confident in their ability to identify and lead groups of people in technology integration. As candidates become more immersed in collaboration with professionals in local schools and districts, it is anticipated that the leadership qualities and strategic planning opportunities will become more comprehensive and beneficial.

As program coursework continues to be revised and updated to remain current, faculty will make an effort to mentor candidates throughout the coursework in preparation for the culminating project in the capstone course. Throughout the program, faculty will mentor candidates and assist them in capitalizing on available research and experiences. It is anticipated that this collaboration could result in publications, presentations, and professional development opportunities for the candidate in addition to the comprehensive portfolio project.

2016-2017:

Improvements to rubrics over the past academic year have yielded more rigorous expectations of candidates. In an effort to establish the mentoring process throughout the program and assist candidates in having a program tailored to their needs, the program faculty members are continuing to work on mentoring candidates beginning early in their program.

Due to data on mentoring and professional development, moving forward, the faculty will work to provide more opportunities for candidates to explore, present, and report their research. Presentations to faculty on campus, involvement at the local Teaching and Technology Conference, and other opportunities will become an integrated part of the program.

2017-2018:

Educational Technology Leadership faculty are researching other successful technology programs in order to update curriculum to make the program more marketable.

2018-2019:

Educational Technology Leadership faculty had shared governance meetings with local district technology partners to begin revising, updating, and restructuring the Educational Technology Leadership Program.

### 4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:

The current program is embedding practical experiences into assignments. This has resulted in candidate participation in professional development activities both as a presenter and a participant in order to stay abreast of emerging technological knowledge and skills. Graduates of the program continue to be seen as presenters and attendees at local conferences and workshops including the Calcasieu Parish Teaching and Technology Workshop, the Louisiana Computer Using Educators Conference, and in parish wide professional development workshops indicating the life long learner mentality.

2017-2018:

Due to the lack of any candidates enrolled in the program, there were no highlights from the previous year. However, moving forward, the faculty will work hard to promote the program to increase enrollment.

2018-2019:

The number of candidates enrolled increased to one. However, the shared governance meetings with local districts has opened the door to higher expectations and revamping of the program. The revised program will be rolled out in the 2020-2021 catalog as changes will be made during the 19-20 AY.

### 5 Program Mission

The Master of Education in Educational Technology Leadership program strives to prepare candidates for leadership roles in improving teaching and learning through the application of educational technologies used in P-12 schools, higher education institutions, and other educational organizations. The program offers superior learning opportunities in educational technologies and leadership, scholarly activities to advance knowledge, and practice in the utilization of educational technologies. Based on the ISTE Technology Director Program Standards, the goals of the Educational Technology Leadership Program are to:

1. Improve higher order thinking skills
2. Prepare students for the global workforce
3. Design diverse online learning environments
4. Inspire digital age professional models for working, collaborating, and decision-making

### 6 Institutional Mission Reference

The Master of Education in Educational Technology Leadership supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of undergraduate students and services to the employers and communities in its region. The MED in Educational Technology Leadership program prepares students to fulfill their roles in the teaching profession as leaders in the school and community and contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana.



| Standard   | Component on Rubric | Mean | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
|--|---------------------|------|--------------------|-------|--|------|--------------------|-------|--|
| 5  | 5.1                 |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| Element 5.1<br>Digital Equity  |                     |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 5  | 5.21                |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 5  | 5.22                |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| Element 5.2<br>Policies for safe, healthy, legal and ethical use       |                     |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 5  | 5.3                 |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| Element 5.3<br>Programs for safe, healthy, legal and ethical use       |                     |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 5  | 5.4                 |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| Element 5.4<br>Diversity, Cultural Awareness, and Global Understanding |                     |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |

There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to report.

Courses

**EDTC614 Survey of Educational Telecommunications, Networks, and the Internet (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

Based on the Online Learning Blog Rubric, a mean score of 3.0 for each individual component on the rubric indicates acceptable performance. A mean score of 2.5 on each element would result in acceptable performance for the element. An overall mean score of 2.4 or above would indicate a score of 80% or better, which is an acceptable performance score for the standard.

Findings from this data show a mean of 2.5 or above for all elements assessed in the assignment. The professors will continue to explore various assignments and additional tools to assist candidates in understanding and being advocates for digital citizenship. This is a new assessment, so we will gather three years of data before setting benchmarks.

2016-2017:

Due to the low enrollment issues, moving forward, the analysis of data will include all course assessment data for candidates who are completing the program within the academic year.

2017-2018:

Professors will update assignments and topics covered to better meet the needs of the workforce. This course assessment will be part of the program redesign in the summer 2019.

2018-2019

There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to analyze.

Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.

Courses

**EDTC614 Survey of Educational Telecommunications, Networks, and the Internet (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**8 Assessment and Benchmark** EDTC 621 Term Paper

Assessment: Term Paper

Benchmark: Candidates will score 80% or higher to perform at a proficient level.

Courses

**EDTC621 Advanced Telecommunications and Distance Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

*Program Outcomes Links*

**Supporting Communication and Collaborati**

Candidates maintain in-depth knowledge of current technologies to assist in identifying, evaluating, and selecting tools and resources to support communication and collaboration and model their use through various methods of instruction to meet the needs and preference of digital-age learners.

*External Outcomes Links*

**8.1 Data**

|   |                     | Summer 2016<br>N=3 |                    |        |  | Summer 2017*<br>N=0 |                    |       |  |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|--|---------------------|--------------------|-------|--|
| Standard  | Component on Rubric | Mean               | Standard Deviation | Range  | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean                | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 2   | 2.1 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.7                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    |                     |                    |       |  |
| 2   | 2.1 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.7                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    |                     |                    |       |  |
| Element 2.1<br>Digital Tools and Resources                |                     | 2.7                | .52                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    |                     |                    |       |  |
| 2   | 2.2                 | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   |                     |                    |       |  |
| Element 2.2<br>Research-Based Learning Strategies         |                     | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   |                     |                    |       |  |
| 2   | 2.3                 | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   |                     |                    |       |  |
| Element 2.3<br>Assessment and Differentiation             |                     | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   |                     |                    |       |  |
| 3   | 3.3 <sup>1</sup>    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   |                     |                    |       |  |
| 3   | 3.3 <sup>2</sup>    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   |                     |                    |       |  |
| Element 3.3<br>Communication and Collaboration            |                     | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   |                     |                    |       |  |
| 3   | 3.4                 | 2.7                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    |                     |                    |       |  |
| Element 3.4<br>Current Research and Emerging Technologies |                     | 2.7                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    |                     |                    |       |  |

\*There were no Educational Technology Leadership Candidates enrolled in EDTC 621 during the Summer 2017 semester.

2018-2019:

There were no completers in the MED Educational Technology Leadership program in 2018-2019; therefore, there is no new data to report.

|   |                     | Summer 2020<br>N= |                    |       |  | Summer 2021<br>N= |                    |       |  |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--|
| Standard  | Component on Rubric | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 2   | 2.1 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.7               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 2   | 2.1 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.7               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 2.1<br>Digital Tools and Resources                |                     | 2.7               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 2   | 2.2                 | 3.0               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 2.2<br>Research-Based Learning Strategies         |                     | 3.0               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 2   | 2.3                 | 3.0               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 2.3<br>Assessment and Differentiation             |                     | 3.0               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 3   | 3.3 <sup>1</sup>    | 3.0               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 3   | 3.3 <sup>2</sup>    | 3.0               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 3.3<br>Communication and Collaboration            |                     | 3.0               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 3   | 3.4                 | 2.7               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 3.4<br>Current Research and Emerging Technologies |                     | 2.7               |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |

## Courses

**EDTC621 Advanced Telecommunications and Distance Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)****8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

## 2015-2016:

Based on the Distance Learning Term Paper Rubric, a score of 3.0 for each individual component indicates acceptable performance. A mean of 2.4 or above on the combined criterion for Element 2.1. Digital Tools and Resources and Element 3.3 Communication and Collaboration would result in an acceptable performance score for those elements. An overall mean score of 2.4 or above for each element indicates a score of 80% or better, which is an acceptable performance score for the standards addressed in the project.

The data below is based on three (n=3) candidates enrolled in EDTC 621: Advanced Telecommunications and Distance Learning during the summer 2016 semester. The candidates performed at or above the acceptable benchmark (=2.4) on 100% of the elements addressed in the rubric with means ranging from 2.7 to 3.0. The combined candidates scores indicate an acceptable performance of 95.3% when analyzing each of the components addressing Standard 2: Digital-Age Learning Culture and Standard 3: Excellence in Professional Practice. This is above the acceptable score of 80%. Individual overall scores for the grading criteria on the assessment related to the standards ranged from 85.7% to 100%.

Candidates scored above the mean on all of the elements assessed in the Distance Learning Term Paper. Although all three candidates scored above the acceptable performance score of 80%, one of the candidates had received scores of two (2) on the criterion addressing Element 2.1. Digital Tools and Resources. It was found that the candidate lacked in providing clear examples for diverse learning styles and creativity. Well-documented sources and resources may need additional instructional attention in the program and the course.

Program level decisions will be guided by the above candidates' performance to ensure that resources for diverse learning styles and creativity are addressed thoroughly and appropriately in the course. As more cycles of data are collected, the data will be reviewed and evaluated for any weaknesses in the assessment and/or project and areas for improvement. As additional data is collected, further analysis will assist in making program decisions to support candidate success.

This is a new assessment, so we will gather 3 years of data before setting benchmarks.

## 2016-2017:

Due to the low enrollment issues, moving forward, the analysis of data will include all course assessment data for candidates who are completing the program within the academic year.

## 2017-2018:

Professors will update assignments and topics covered to better meet the needs of the workforce. This course assessment will be part of the program redesign in the summer 2019.

## 2018-2019

There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to analyze.

Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.

## Courses

**EDTC621 Advanced Telecommunications and Distance Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)****9 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 625 Technology Plan**

## Assessment: Technology Plan

In EDTC 625: Technology Planning and Administration, candidates analyze the technology utilization and needs of a P-12 school setting of their choosing and approved by the instructor. Using the material presented throughout the course, including the readings and class discussions, candidates orchestrate and lead a planning process with the school's Technology Committee. They format the plan per a template provided with some elements likely being proposed or conceptual. For example, elements related to budget or survey data may not be available within the timeframe of this activity. For those elements, they are addressed broadly with as much detail as possible or a proposed timeframe in which they will be addressed with notations that details are limited and with a proposed timeline for gathering all pertinent details.

## Alignment of Assessment to Standards:

The technology plan assessment requires candidates to investigate a school within the P-12 setting. The investigation includes an audit of current technologies and their uses. With that knowledge, the candidate then works with the school leadership to organize a Technology Committee (or convene an existing committee) and lead an effort to draft a technology plan specific to the school in question.

In general, this substantive activity aligns with the breadth of Standard 1. Visionary Leadership and Standard 4. Systemic Improvement in that the candidate is assuming a leadership role in drafting a technology plan to expand and enhance school operations. Specifically, the candidate's performance is assessed on Element 1.1. Shared Vision, Element 1.2. Strategic Planning, and Element 4.2 Program Evaluation.

With support of the Technology Committee, the candidate coordinates the effort to draft the school's vision and goals for school-wide technology integration. In some instances, this involves creating a vision and goals; in other instances, the activity serves to refresh an existing vision and related goals (Element 1.1. Shared Vision). The candidate is required to conduct evaluations of current technology infrastructure and professional development programs and use the data to formulate enhanced technology integration plan (Element 4.2 Program Evaluation).

Once the vision has been identified, the candidate and the Technology Committee work to draft goals for the three planning focus areas of 1) technology integration, 2) professional development, and 3) community engagement. The focus area goals lead to identifying key individuals, both internal to the school and external stakeholders, who will be key personnel in supporting the goals and what each individual or group's role will be. Finally, candidates draft a budget for accomplishing the goals and seek out funding sources available (Element 1.2. Strategic Planning and Element 4.2 Program Evaluation).

Benchmark: Candidates will score a 2.0 or higher on each element in the rubric to meet the benchmark.

## Courses

**EDTC625 Technology Planning and Administration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)***Program Outcomes Links***Strategic Planning**

Candidates create a strategic vision based on professional development programs, technology infrastructure, and instructional technology interventions and then lead the design, development, implementation, communication, and evaluation of technology plans to support the vision.

*External Outcomes Links*

**9.1 Data**

Previous Data:

| Term      | Students with 80% |    | Benchmark met? |
|-----------|-------------------|----|----------------|
|           | %                 | #  |                |
| 2013-2014 | 84%               | 12 | Yes            |
| 2014-2015 | 40%               | 5  | No             |

|                                |                     | Spring 2016<br>N=3 |                    |        |  | Spring 2017<br>N=1 |                    |        |  |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------|--|
| Standard                       | Component on Rubric | Mean               | Standard Deviation | Range  | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean               | Standard Deviation | Range  | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 1                              | 1.1 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.7                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3.0    | 100%                                   |
| 1                              | 1.1 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.3                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 33%                                    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3.0    | 100%                                   |
| Element 1.1 Shared Vision      |                     | 2.5                | .55                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3.0    | 100%                                   |
| 1                              | 1.2 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.7                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 2.0                | 0                  | 2.0    | 100%                                   |
| 1                              | 1.2 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.3                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 33%                                    | 2.0                | 0                  | 2.0    | 100%                                   |
| 1                              | 1.2 <sup>3</sup>    | 2.0                | 1.0                | 3-1(2) | 67%                                    | 1.0                | 0                  | 1.0    | 0%                                     |
| Element 1.2 Strategic Planning |                     | 2.3                | .71                | 3-1(2) | 67%                                    | 1.67               | .47                | 1-2(1) | 67%                                    |
| 4                              | 4.2 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.7                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 2.0                | 0                  | 2.0    | 100%                                   |
| 4                              | 4.2 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.3                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 33%                                    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3.0    | 100%                                   |
| Element 4.2 Program Evaluation |                     | 2.5                | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 2.5                | .50                | 2-3    | 100%                                   |

2018-2019:

There were no completers in the MED Educational Technology Leadership program in 2018-2019; therefore, there is no new data to report.

|                                |                     | Spring 2020<br>N= |                    |       |  | Spring 2021<br>N= |                    |       |  |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--|
| Standard                       | Component on Rubric | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 1                              | 1.1 <sup>1</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 1                              | 1.1 <sup>2</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 1.1 Shared Vision      |                     |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 1                              | 1.2 <sup>1</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 1                              | 1.2 <sup>2</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 1                              | 1.2 <sup>3</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 1.2 Strategic Planning |                     |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 4                              | 4.2 <sup>1</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 4                              | 4.2 <sup>2</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 4.2 Program Evaluation |                     |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |

Courses

**EDTC625 Technology Planning and Administration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

Based on the Technology Plan Rubric, a mean score of 2.0 for each individual component on the rubric indicates acceptable performance. An overall mean score of 2.4 or above for each element indicates a score of 80% or better, which is an acceptable performance score for the standards addressed in the project.

The candidates performed at or above the acceptable benchmark (=2.4) on 67% of the elements addressed in the rubric with a mean score of 2.5; 33% of the candidates did not meet the desired mean of 2.4 (=2.3). Of the three (3) elements addressed, Element 1.2. Strategic Planning, (=2.3), was the only element that did not reach the desired mean of 2.4. The candidate's scores indicate an overall performance of 82.5% when analyzing each of the components related to Standard 1: Visionary Leadership and Standard 4: Systemic Improvement. This is above the "acceptable" score of 80%. Individual overall scores for the grading criteria on the assessment related to the standards ranged from 71.4% to 90.1%. One of the three candidates scored below the 80% threshold.

Since candidates scored below the mean for two of the three components in Element 1.2. Strategic Planning, well-designed opportunities need to be administered for candidates throughout the program and in this course to develop a better understanding of how to lead a collaborative effort to identify in detail the school's technology infrastructure, budgetary needs, suggested funding sources, and to enlist funding for those requests. Instructions for the budget and funding guidelines were revised based on the scores on this administration to provide clearer instructions of expectations on this element.

Project level decisions will be guided by the above candidates' performance to ensure that current expectations are clearly presented to candidates in current and future administrations of the project. As more cycles of data are collected, reviewed, and evaluated for any additional weaknesses in the assessment, program, and/or project, the results will be used to assist in making program decisions to support candidate success.

Although this is not a new assessment, we are representing information in a more detailed way. We will gather three years of data before setting new benchmarks.

2016-2017:

The candidate performed at or above the acceptable benchmark (=2.4) on the overall assignment with a mean score of 2.67). Of the three (3) elements addressed, Element 1.2. Strategic Planning, (=1.67), was the only element that did not reach the desired mean of 2.4. The candidate's scores indicate an overall mean performance score of 3.0 for the components related to Standard 1: Visionary Leadership and a mean of 2.5 for the components related to Standard 4: Systemic Improvement. This is above the "acceptable" score of 2.4

Since candidates scored below the mean for one of the three components in Element 1.2. Strategic Planning, well-designed opportunities need to be administered for candidates throughout the program and in this course to develop a better understanding of how to lead a collaborative effort to identify in detail the school's technology infrastructure, budgetary needs, suggested funding sources, and to enlist funding for those requests. Instructions for the budget and funding guidelines were revised based on the scores on this administration to provide clearer instructions of expectations on this element.

Project level decisions will be guided by the above candidates' performance to ensure that current expectations are clearly presented to candidates in current and future administrations of the project. Although the data sample is small, for the two cycles of data collected, Element 1.2 has shown the greatest challenge to candidates. Additional exemplars and more attention will be directed to this section to help clarify instructions and understanding of the expectations for this portion of the project. The instructor will also be cognizant of the challenges that this criteria presents and will offer additional assistance to those in need. The faculty will also revisit the project to ensure that the rubric and instructions given to candidates are appropriately aligned.

2017-2018:

Professors will update assignments and topics covered to better meet the needs of the workforce. This course assessment will be part of the program redesign in the summer 2019.

2018-2019

There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to analyze.

Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.

Courses

### **EDTC625 Technology Planning and Administration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

#### **10 Assessment and Benchmark** EDTC 629 Professional Development Workshop

Assessment: Professional Development Workshop

Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the four topics by creating a professional development workshop for instructional staff in a P-12 school of their choosing. Candidates complete ISTE's Lead & Transform Diagnostic Tool [1] to determine which three of ISTE's 14 Essential Conditions [2] are the most under-represented in the school or district. Each of the three conditions then becomes the topic of a workshop.

1. ISTE's Lead & Transform Diagnostic Tool can be found at <http://www.iste.org/standards/lead-transform-movement/diagnostic-tool>
2. ISTE's 14 Essential Conditions can be found at <http://www.iste.org/standards/essential-conditions>

Candidates study ISTE Standards for students and current research on professional development, andragogy, and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). They demonstrate their understanding of those four topics by creating three professional development workshops for instructional staff at a P-12 school of their choosing. Candidates complete ISTE's Lead & Transform Diagnostic Tool[1]to determine which three of ISTE's 14[2]are the most under-represented in the school or district. Each of the three conditions then becomes the topic of a workshop.

The broad focus of the workshops is two-fold. First, the workshops serve to extend participants' knowledge and skills for technology integration. Second, the workshops facilitate the formation of PLCs among the participants and leader.

To plan each workshop, candidates create instructional plans modeled off the EPP's standardized lesson/unit plan template. These plans include measurable objectives, specific procedures for content delivery, interactive and independent learning activities, learning assessments, and alignments of objectives, content, and assessments to ISTE Standards for Students and the appropriate Essential Conditions. Each workshop follows a modeling principle. Each focuses on a single subject area with multiple, topical mini-lesson examples within the subject area to ensure that workshop participants are provided with concrete, content-rich, technology-mediated strategies for embedding the ISTE skills within their lessons.

Technology-mediated instruction must be conspicuous within the workshops. Candidates may select one of two delivery options. They may design 1) three face-to-face workshops with interactive technology supplements or 2) two face-to-face workshops with at least limited technology supplements and one virtual workshop.

Alignment of Assessment to Standards:

The professional development project is used as the program's capstone planning assessment.

Candidate mastery of four elements (Element 2.4. Student Technology Standards, Element 2.5. Learning Communities, Element 3.1. Professional Learning Programs, and Element 3.2. Information and Communication Infrastructure) within two standards (Standard 2: Digital-Age Learning Culture and Standard 3: Excellence in Professional Practice) is evaluated within this assessment.

Embedded within each workshop are model mini-lessons and related activity and assessment examples aligned to the appropriate ISTE Student Standards. Participants are not only introduced to the ISTE Standards relevant to the exemplar lessons and content but also are provided with "take home" examples of ISTE -aligned activities and examples (Element 2.4. Student Technology Standards).

One of the assessment's two foci is PLCs. By using interactive activities in the workshops and model mini-lessons, candidates facilitate substantive collaboration among participants related to content, pedagogy, and technology (Element 2.5. Learning Communities, Element 3.1. Professional Learning Programs, and Element 3.2. Information and Communication Infrastructure).

[1] ISTE's Lead & Transform Diagnostic Tool can be found at <http://www.iste.org/standards/lead-transform-movement/diagnostic-tool>

[2] ISTE's 14 Essential Conditions can be found at <http://www.iste.org/standards/essential-conditions>

Benchmark: Candidates will score a 2.0 or above on each component to reach a satisfactory level.

Courses

### **EDTC629 Professional Development for K-12 Technology Integration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

*Program Outcomes Links*



**Instructional Design**

Candidates design, implement, assess, evaluate and support professional learning programs addressing technology standards for students through a scope and sequence of curriculum alignments developed and disseminated through models of local and global learning communities that support implementation within the realms of current infrastructure and policies.

External Outcomes Links

**10.1 Data**

Previous Data:

| Term      | Students with 80% | Class Average | Benchmark met? |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 2013-2014 | N/A               | N/A           | N/A            |
| 2014-2015 | 100%              | 89%           | Yes            |

EDTC 629: Professional Development for K-12 Technology Integration Revised Rubric:

| Standard                                     | Element on Rubric | Summer 2016<br>N=1 |                    |       |  | Fall 2016<br>N=2 |                    |         |  |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|--|------------------|--------------------|---------|--|
|  |                   | Mean               | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean             | Standard Deviation | Range   | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| Student Technology Standards                 | 2.4               | 3.0                | -                  | -     | 100%                                   | 2.5              | .50                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| Learning Communities                         | 2.5               | 3.0                | -                  | -     | 100%                                   | 2.5              | .50                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| Professional Learning Programs               | 3.1               | 3.0                | -                  | -     | 100%                                   | 3.0              | 0                  | 3.0     | 100%                                   |
| Information and Communication Infrastructure | 3.2               | 3.0                | -                  | -     | 100%                                   | 2.5              | .50                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |

\*Due to an n=1, there are no meaningful values to report for standard deviation and range for each element.

\*\* =2.0 is acceptable performance for individual elements on the rubric

2018-2019:

There were no completers in the MED Educational Technology Leadership program in 2018-2019; therefore, there is no new data to report.

| Standard                                     | Element on Rubric | Summer 2019<br>N= |                    |       |  | Fall 2019<br>N= |                    |       |  |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--|-----------------|--------------------|-------|--|
|  |                   | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean            | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| Student Technology Standards                 | 2.4               |                   |                    |       |  |                 |                    |       |  |
| Learning Communities                         | 2.5               |                   |                    |       |  |                 |                    |       |  |
| Professional Learning Programs               | 3.1               |                   |                    |       |  |                 |                    |       |  |
| Information and Communication Infrastructure | 3.2               |                   |                    |       |  |                 |                    |       |  |

Courses

**EDTC629 Professional Development for K-12 Technology Integration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

The data presented is based on one candidate (n=1) enrolled in EDTC 629: Professional Development for K-12 Technology Integration during the summer 2016 semester. The candidate performed at the acceptable performance level (=3.0) on each element related to the assessment. As shown in the table below, the candidate's scores indicate acceptable performance at 100% for the assessed elements related to Standard 2: Digital-Age Learning Culture and Standard 3: Excellence in Professional Practice.

Based on previous administrations of the Professional Development Project, revisions to the rubric were necessary in order to clearly indicate the expectations from the candidate. The descriptions of acceptable performance now clearly reflect a performance level that indicates the candidates have adequately met the expectations of the element. The rubric is now better aligned to the goals and anticipated outcomes of the project. Although this is not a new assessment, we are representing information in a more detailed way. We will gather 3 years of data before setting new benchmarks.

**2016-2017:**  
The data presented above is for the summer 2016 and fall 2016 semesters with a total of three candidates (n=3) enrolled in EDTC 629: Professional Development for K-12 Technology Integration. The candidates performed at the acceptable performance level (=2.0 or above) on each element related to the assessment. As shown in the table, the candidate's scores indicate acceptable performance at 100% for the assessed elements related to Standard 2: Digital-Age Learning Culture and Standard 3: Excellence in Professional Practice. The Professional Development project will be expanded to incorporate more extensive professional development opportunities to professors and candidates on campus enrolled in other educational programs.

**2017-2018:**  
Professors will update assignments and topics covered to better meet the needs of the workforce. This course assessment will be part of the program redesign in the summer 2019.

**2018-2019**  
There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to analyze. Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.

Courses

**EDTC629 Professional Development for K-12 Technology Integration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**11 Assessment and Benchmark** EDTC 636 Instructional Design

Assessment: Instructional Design Project

In EDTC 636: Organizational Change in Technology Integration, candidates study mentoring and organizational change and then design and conduct a customized mentoring experience. Each candidate identifies a colleague at his/her school poised to learn more about technology integration for instructional improvement. Once the colleague agrees to participate, the candidate conducts an informal assessment of the colleague's technology expertise and the extent of technology integration (technology-mediated instruction, personal productivity, assessment of student learning, etc.) in which the colleague engages at the time. The candidate then designs a four-week "curriculum" where the candidate provides one-on-one direct instruction to the colleague for at least three hours per week for a minimum of 12 hours total.

The "curriculum" is comprised of two major elements: 1) direct instruction and tutorials on a specific technology (hardware or application) and 2) technology-enhanced pedagogy for the specific technology. The candidate and colleague schedule weekly mentoring sessions, and the colleague uses the knowledge and skills acquired from the mentoring sessions to augment his/her lessons prior to the next mentoring session. At the conclusion of each lesson, the colleague's students are asked to complete a two-item questionnaire about the technology used during the lesson. The Mentoring Project Rubric is the assessment instrument used to evaluate the components.

Alignment of Assessment to Standards:

The mentoring project requires candidates to influence change and establish partnerships.

By designing a "curriculum" unique to the needs of a specific individual, candidates tailor the mentoring project content to that individual and include content to both extend that individual's technological knowledge and improve the learning experiences of his/her students through technology (Element 4.1. Innovation and Change).

The essence of the project is collaborating for improvement. The partnership between the candidate and colleague by simple virtue of the partnership results in greater student engagement and enhanced instructional content and activities (Element 4.4. Partnerships).

Benchmark: Candidates must score 80% or better to perform at an acceptable level.

Courses

**EDTC636 Organizational Change in Technology Integration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

*Program Outcomes Links*

**Collaboration**

Candidates develop partnerships and collaborate with school personnel to lead purposeful change, support the technology infrastructure, and implement technology resources that support teacher and student learning needs to advance district programs and goals.

*External Outcomes Links*

**11.1 Data**

|                                      |                     | Spring 2016<br>N=2 |                    |        |  | Spring 2017<br>N=1 |                    |         |  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|--|
| Standard                             | Component on Rubric | Mean               | Standard Deviation | Range  | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean               | Standard Deviation | Range   | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 4                                    | 4.1 <sup>1</sup>    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   | 1.0                | -                  | -       | 0%                                     |
| 4                                    | 4.1 <sup>2</sup>    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   | 2.0                | -                  | -       | 100%                                   |
| Element 4.1<br>Innovation and Change |                     | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   | 1.5                | .50                | 1.0-2.0 | 0%                                     |
| 4                                    | 4.4 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.5                | .71                | 3-2(1) | 50%                                    | 1.0                | -                  | -       | 0%                                     |
| 4                                    | 4.4 <sup>2</sup>    | 3.0                | 0                  | 3-3(0) | 100%                                   | 1.0                | -                  | -       | 0%                                     |
| Element 4.4<br>Partnerships          |                     | 2.75               | .35                | 3-2(1) | 100%                                   | 1.0                | 0                  | 1.0     | 0%                                     |

**2018-2019:**  
There were no completers in the MED Educational Technology Leadership program in 2018-2019; therefore, there is no new data to report.

|                                      |                     | Spring 2020<br>N= |                    |       |  | Spring 2021<br>N= |                    |       |  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--|
| Standard                             | Component on Rubric | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 4                                    | 4.1 <sup>1</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 4                                    | 4.1 <sup>2</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 4.1<br>Innovation and Change |                     |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 4                                    | 4.4 <sup>1</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| 4                                    | 4.4 <sup>2</sup>    |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |
| Element 4.4<br>Partnerships          |                     |                   |                    |       |  |                   |                    |       |  |

Courses

**EDTC636 Organizational Change in Technology Integration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

For the current rubric, a mean score of 2.0 for each individual component of the elements indicates acceptable performance for that component. A mean score of 2.5 for each element would result in an acceptable performance score. The table below indicates the mean, standard deviation, and range for each of the indicated components and elements as a whole.

The data presented is based on two candidates (n = 2) enrolled in EDTC 636: Organizational Change in Technology Integration during the spring 2016 semester. The candidates performed at the acceptable performance level (=3.0) on 75% of the individual criterion for each element. The candidates performed at or above the acceptable benchmark (=2.4) on 100% of the elements addressed in the rubric with means ranging from 2.75 to 3.0. The combined candidates' scores indicate an acceptable performance score of 96% when accounting for all of the components addressing Standard 4: Partnerships in the Mentor Project. This is above the "acceptable" performance score of 80%. Individual candidate scores on the combined elements related to the Mentor Project ranged from 92% to 100%.

Based on the data, component 4.4<sup>1</sup> of Element 4.4. Partnerships (=2.5) will be evaluated before the next administration of the project to ensure clear instructions and guidance for self-reflection that contains substance to assist the candidate in determining a model for future partnerships and collaborations in alignment with the school and district goals are given.

Due to a small sample size, program level decisions will be guided by the above candidates' performance. As more cycles of data are collected and a larger sample size is obtained, the data will be reviewed and evaluated for any weaknesses in the assessment, program, and/or project. The results will be used to ensure that current expectations are clearly presented to candidates in current and future administrations of the project. As additional data is collected, further analysis will assist in making program decisions to support candidate success.

2016-2017:

Although the spring 2017 administration of the assessment had an n value of 1, the scoring of the one person on the assignment does cause concern. The low scores in reference to 4.1 indicate that the candidates do not have a strong understanding when writing measurable learning goals with appropriate instruction and assessment activities. In addition, there is a need for additional instruction on how to provide student learning feedback.

The reflective portion of the assessment also scored below the benchmark. Further exploration into the assessment would be needed to determine whether the candidate's reflections were weak because of the weakness in the planning and execution of the project or due to a lack of completing the components.

The professors in the program will meet to discuss the current instruction being provided to candidates for the project and will ensure proper modeling, guidelines, scaffolding, and instruction are provided for the candidates.

2017-2018:

Professors will update assignments and topics covered to better meet the needs of the workforce. This course assessment will be part of the program redesign in the summer 2019.

2018-2019

There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to analyze.

Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.

Courses

**EDTC636 Organizational Change in Technology Integration (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**12 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 637 Case Studies**

Assessment: Case Study

The School Case Study assessment is used as the program's clinical practical assessment and takes place in EDTC 637: Technology Leadership in Schools. The assessment requires candidates to engage in professional, technology leadership-related activities. Candidates investigate a P-12 school setting and prepare a case study of the school that demonstrates broad technology leadership knowledge based upon the prerequisite activities embedded within it. Prior to beginning the investigation, candidates engage in one or more focused technology leadership activities. They are required to explore course readings from the text, journals, and trustworthy Web sources; engage in an email listserv or other professional social media avenues of their choosing related to technology in schools; and participate in professional events. The knowledge and resources they acquire from these experiences are included in the case studies to substantiate any recommendations they propose for the school's technology advancement.

This assessment is used as the program's clinical practice assessment because it requires candidates to engage in professional, technology leadership-related activities then investigate a P-12 school setting and prepare a case study of the school that demonstrates broad technology leadership knowledge with knowledge from their prerequisite activities embedded within it.

Prior to beginning the investigation, candidates engage in one or more focus technology leadership activities. They are required to explore course readings from the text, journals, and trustworthy Web sources; engage in an email listserv of their choosing related to technology in schools; and participate in professional events. The knowledge and resources they acquire from these experiences will be included in the case studies to substantiate any recommendations they propose for the school's technology advancement.

Once an approved school has been selected, the principal's written permission is secured, and the investigation begins. Candidates interview at least the principal, technology coordinator (or principal's designee), one teacher, and a non-teaching staff member. Because of time constraints and institutional human subject research guidelines, students are excluded from interviews. In addition to the interviews, candidates spend not less than 10 hours observing all operations of the school and how technology is used. An observational tool that outlines

the NETS-S, NETS-T, and NETS-A standards guides these observations. Candidates record anecdotal notes per standard as appropriate. Both the interviews and observations focus on school-wide technology use—not just classroom-based technology use. Once the investigation concludes, a case study report of the school is constructed.

The report includes, but is not limited to, 1) description of the school including general demographics of students, faculty, administrators, and non-teaching staff; 2) brief biographies of the individuals interviewed; 3) comprehensive summaries of the interviews; 4) comprehensive summary of field notes from observations; 5) summary of the school's technology strengths; and 6) recommendations for technology advancement. The report must follow APA writing and formatting guidelines.

**Alignment of Assessment to Standards:**

The case study assessment requires candidates to investigate a school within the P-12 setting. The investigation is, basically, an action research project that includes at least interviews and observations. With that knowledge, the candidate then constructs a comprehensive case study of the school with special attention to technology.

In general, this substantive assessment aligns with the breadth of Standard 1. Visionary Leadership in that candidates demonstrate technology leadership knowledge, skills, and dispositions via self-directed data collection regarding technology use. Beyond that, the assessment encompasses most elements within Standard 4. Systemic Improvement in that one goal of the assessment is to expose candidates to broad roles and issues regarding technology leadership in schools. Specific to the standards, candidate performance is assessed on Element 1.3. Advocacy, Element 4.3. Human Resource Management, and Element 4.5. Technology Infrastructure.

Through reading course content and engaging in listservs and professional events, candidates become knowledgeable of trends, policy, funding opportunities, networks, and other technology-related resources. They discuss these topics in course activities prior to the case study. These topics are required to be embedded within the case studies as recommendations for the school's technology advancement. This provides candidates opportunities to advocate for how the school's operations, including instruction, could be enhanced to meet student and community needs in a digital society (Element 1.3. Advocacy).

Candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge but also acquire it through this assessment. In their interviews of school principals and technology coordinators, candidates are expected to learn about the school's personnel protocols. In each interview, candidates must question the interviewees on how personnel are hired (or appointed), supervised, and evaluated. Additionally, they are expected to review and/or discuss position descriptions for all technology-related personnel at the school. This is intended to provide candidates insight into human resource management and its function in school operations and, specifically, in technology management. Details are presented in the case study and used in the study's recommendations (Element 4.3. Human Resource Management).

An artifact to review and topic of interview discussions is the school or district's technology plan. Candidates investigate the school's technology infrastructure via interviews and observations. They question interviewees on the plan's implementation, and they look for evidence of successful implementation and areas for improvement in their observations. Results of this are presented in the case study and used in the study's recommendations (Element 4.5. Technology Infrastructure).

Benchmark: Candidates must score 80% or better to perform at an acceptable level.

**Courses**

**EDTC637 Technology Leadership in Schools (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

*Program Outcomes Links*

**Management and Leadership**

Candidates assess the hiring, organizing, supervising, evaluation, and retaining process for highly qualified technology staff to advance and maintain the technology infrastructure and promote academic and operational guided by a comprehensive technology plan.

*External Outcomes Links*

**12.1 Data**

Previous Data:

| Term      | Students with 80% |    | Benchmark met? |
|-----------|-------------------|----|----------------|
|           | %                 | #  |                |
| 2013-2014 | 62%               | 13 | No             |
| 2014-2015 | 100%              | 1  | Yes            |

| Standard                              | Component on Rubric | Fall 2015<br>N=3 |                    |        |  | Fall 2016<br>N=1 |                    |         |  |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------|--|------------------|--------------------|---------|--|
|                                       |                     | Mean             | Standard Deviation | Range  | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean             | Standard Deviation | Range   | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 1                                     | 1.3                 | 2.7              | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 2.0              | -                  | -       | 100%                                   |
| Element 1.3 Advocacy                  |                     | 2.7              | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 2.0              | -                  | -       | 100%                                   |
| 4                                     | 4.3 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.7              | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 2.0              | -                  | -       | 100%                                   |
| 4                                     | 4.3 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.7              | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 1.0              | -                  | -       | 0%                                     |
| Element 4.3 Human Resource Management |                     | 2.7              | .10                | 3-2(1) | 100%                                   | 1.5              | .50                | 1.0-2.0 | 0%                                     |
| 4                                     | 4.5 <sup>1</sup>    | 2.7              | .58                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 3.0              | -                  | -       | 100%                                   |
| 4                                     | 4.5 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.3              | .58                | 3-2(1) | 33%                                    | 1.0              | -                  | -       | 0%                                     |
| Element 4.5 Technology Infrastructure |                     | 2.5              | .02                | 3-2(1) | 67%                                    | 2.0              | 1.0                | 1.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |

2018-2019:

There were no completers in the MED Educational Technology Leadership program in 2018-2019; therefore, there is no new data to report.

|  | Fall 2019<br>N= | Fall 2020<br>N= |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
|  |                 |                 |

| Standard                              | Component on Rubric | Mean | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores | Mean | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------|--------------------|-------|--|------|--------------------|-------|--|
| 1                                     | 1.3                 |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| Element 1.3 Advocacy                  |                     |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 4                                     | 4.3 <sup>1</sup>    |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 4                                     | 4.3 <sup>2</sup>    |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| Element 4.3 Human Resource Management |                     |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 4                                     | 4.5 <sup>1</sup>    |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| 4                                     | 4.5 <sup>2</sup>    |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |
| Element 4.5 Technology Infrastructure |                     |      |                    |       |  |      |                    |       |  |

Courses

**EDTC637 Technology Leadership in Schools (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:  
Based on the School Case Study Rubric, a mean score of 2.0 for each individual component on the rubric indicates acceptable performance. A mean score of 2.0 for Element 1.3 Advocacy would indicate acceptable performance since it is made up of only one criterion. A mean score of 2.5 or above for each criterion on Element 4.3. Human Resource Management and Element 4.5. Technology Infrastructure would result in acceptable performance for the element.

The data below is based on three candidates (n=3) enrolled in EDTC 637: Technology Leadership in Schools during the fall 2015 semester. The candidates performed at or above the acceptable benchmark (=2.5) on 100% of the elements addressed in the rubric with means ranging from 2.5-2.7. The combined candidates' scores indicate an acceptable performance score of 87% when accounting for all of the components addressing Standard 1: Visionary Leadership and Standard 4: Systemic Improvement on the School Case Study Project. This is above the "acceptable" performance score of 80%. Individual candidate scores on the combined elements related to the School Case Study ranged from 73%-93%. One candidate did not receive the minimum average score of 80%.

Since the original submission in fall 2014, the project has been revised to require practical experiences. Candidates are benefiting from the collaboration with the school personnel. The additional revisions to the project and rubric will require additional participation on the part of the candidate with feedback from the administration. It is anticipated that this opportunity will assist candidates in building confidence in their knowledge and recommendations as they move into roles of technology leadership. Program level decisions will be guided by the above candidates' performance. As more cycles of data are collected, the data will be reviewed and evaluated for any weaknesses in the assessment and/or project. These results will be used to ensure that current expectations are clearly presented to candidates in current and future administrations of the project. As additional data is collected, further analysis will assist in making program decisions to support candidate success.

2016-2017:  
The data for Fall 2016 is based on one candidate enrolled in the Educational Technology Leadership program. However, it can be noted that the candidate's found making recommendations for technology advancement to be challenging. The program faculty will work to provide more specific guidelines and will offer better and more frequent opportunities for candidates to practice these skills through case studies and other scenarios.

2017-2018:  
Professors will update assignments and topics covered to better meet the needs of the workforce. This course assessment will be part of the program redesign in the summer 2019.

2018-2019  
There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to analyze. Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.

Courses

**EDTC637 Technology Leadership in Schools (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

**13 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 639 Comprehensive Portfolio**

Assessment: Comprehensive Portfolio

The culminating experience for candidates in the Master of Education in Educational Technology Leadership program takes place in EDTC 639: Independent Research in Educational Technology and is the development of a research proposal, technology integration project, and presentation in what is known as the Comprehensive Portfolio. The research proposal is the written portion of the experience and requires candidates to address their understanding of specific content standards, how those standards could be applied in their own profession, and documented research supporting their choices. The candidates are also charged with identifying a technology project along with the rationale for the topic and a tentative plan of action for completing the project. The candidates plan a project with relevance to their particular field of interest, implement the project in a real-life setting, and present the project and rationale to the committee. During the presentation, the candidates explain how the standards are addressed in the project. The Comprehensive Portfolio Rubric is the assessment instrument used to evaluate the standard.

Alignment of Assessment to Standards:

The comprehensive portfolio presentation was cited for Standard 6: Content Knowledge and Professional Growth. The components of the presentation require candidates to demonstrate professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in content, pedagogical, and technological areas, as well as, leadership, management, and life-long learning. The following elements of Standard 6: Content Knowledge and Professional Growth are specifically identified in the rubric.

The current version of the Comprehensive Portfolio is a revision of the culminating portfolio that was used in the past. Prior to the spring 2014 semester, the portfolio project was designed to focus on the candidates' past work in the program. Candidates were asked to provide documentation of the projects they had completed in their program course requirements and reflect on each of those topics in a presentation to their committees. In the fall 2013 semester, the project was redesigned. The revision of the project was specifically intended to allow candidates to demonstrate their acquired knowledge, build upon that knowledge through the creation of a project relevant to their own occupational goals, and document their intentions for being a life-long learner. The revised version of the project brings to life the candidates' knowledge of technology and future plans for integrating technology into their own professional situations to achieve their technological goals.

The candidates are required to demonstrate their knowledge and application of current technologies through the Comprehensive Portfolio. Candidates identify and explain pedagogical choices based on the evaluation of requirements necessary for successful implementation of ISTE standards using techniques such as diverse and creative ways of teaching and learning. The performance of the candidates is assessed on Element 6.1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge. The technical choices for the project are determined through the candidates' evaluations of current on-site infrastructures and knowledge of current and emerging technology tools. The candidates' performance is assessed on Element 6.2. Technical Knowledge.

The candidates plan for the implementation of the project. Candidates create a leadership or management plan for the implementation of the project and then present the project in the real world setting. The plan is based on theories of leadership, management, and organizational change theory as applied to practice for implementing, sustaining, and managing the change process. The candidates' performance is assessed on Element 6.3. Leadership and Management Knowledge.

The project topic chosen by the candidates can be a new creation or a continuation, expansion, or revision to a project already in place. Candidates are specifically asked to relate their project interests to their professional practice and consider ways that the project could be expanded and/or revised in the future. Candidates are asked to relate their project interests to their professional practice and identify viable avenues to stay abreast of emerging technologies and technological advancements in their particular areas of interest. Candidates explain their experiences and participation in Personal Learning Communities (PLCs), and document professional development experiences of the past and plans for the future. The candidates' performance is assessed on Element 6.4. Continuous Learning. As candidates synthesize their program coursework, project discoveries, and research findings, they are asked to reflect on their current professional state and determine a plan to advance and improve. The candidates' performance is assessed on Element 6.5. Reflection.

Benchmark: Candidates must score 2.0 or better to perform at an acceptable level.

Courses

**EDTC639 Independent Research in Educational Technology (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)**

*Program Outcomes Links*

**Professional Knowledge**

Candidates demonstrate professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in content, pedagogical, and technological areas as well as adult learning, leadership, and management and are continuously deepening their knowledge and expertise.

*External Outcomes Links*

**13.1 Data**

EDTC 639: Independent Research in Educational Technology Revised Rubric:

|  |                     | Summer 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017*<br>N=3 |                    |         |  |
|--|---------------------|---|--------------------|---------|--|
| Standard   | Component on Rubric | Mean  | Standard Deviation | Range   | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
| 6  | 6.1 <sup>1</sup>    | 3.0   | 0                  | 3.0     | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.1 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.67  | .47                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| Element 6.1<br>Content and Pedagogical Knowledge   |                     | 2.83  | .37                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.2 <sup>1</sup>    | 3.0   | 0                  | 3.0     | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.2 <sup>2</sup>    | 2.67  | .47                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| Element 6.2<br>Technical Knowledge                 |                     | 2.83  | .37                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.3                 | 2.67  | .47                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| Element 6.3<br>Leadership and Management Knowledge |                     | 2.67  | .47                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.4 <sup>1</sup>    | 3.0   | 0                  | 3.0     | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.4 <sup>2</sup>    | 3.0   | 0                  | 3.0     | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.4 <sup>3</sup>    | 3.0   | 0                  | 3.0     | 100%                                   |
| Element 6.4<br>Continuous Learning                 |                     | 3.0   | 0                  | 3.0     | 100%                                   |
| 6  | 6.5                 | 2.67  | .47                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |
| Element 6.5<br>Refelction                          |                     | 2.67  | .47                | 2.0-3.0 | 100%                                   |

\*There was one Educational Technology Leadership candidate enrolled in EDTC 639 for each semester, so the data for the academic year is combined below.

\*\* =2.0 is acceptable performance for individual components on the rubric.

2018-2019:

There were no completers in the MED Educational Technology Leadership program in 2018-2019; therefore, there is no new data to report.

EDTC 639: Independent Research in Educational Technology Revised Rubric:

|          |                     | Summer 2019, Fall 2019, and Spring 2020<br>N= |                    |       |  |
|----------|---------------------|---|--------------------|-------|--|
| Standard | Component on Rubric | Mean  | Standard Deviation | Range | % of candidates with acceptable scores |
|          |                     |   |                    |       | % of                                   |

| Standard   | Component on Rubric | Mean | Standard Deviation | Range | candidates with acceptable scores |
|--|---------------------|------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|
| 6  | 6.1 <sup>1</sup>    |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.1 <sup>2</sup>    |      |                    |       |                                   |
| Element 6.1<br>Content and Pedagogical Knowledge   |                     |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.2 <sup>1</sup>    |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.2 <sup>2</sup>    |      |                    |       |                                   |
| Element 6.2<br>Technical Knowledge                 |                     |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.3                 |      |                    |       |                                   |
| Element 6.3<br>Leadership and Management Knowledge |                     |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.4 <sup>1</sup>    |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.4 <sup>2</sup>    |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.4 <sup>3</sup>    |      |                    |       |                                   |
| Element 6.4<br>Continuous Learning                 |                     |      |                    |       |                                   |
| 6  | 6.5                 |      |                    |       |                                   |
| Element 6.5<br>Reflection                          |                     |      |                    |       |                                   |

## Courses

**EDTC639 Independent Research in Educational Technology (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)****13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

## 2015-2016:

The first administration of the Comprehensive Portfolio project with the revised rubric was in the summer 2016 semester. The tables indicate the sample size, rubric scores, mean, standard deviation, range, and percentage of candidates with acceptable performance scores. For those elements that are assessed using more than one component on the rubric, each component is labeled with a superscript for identification purposes and clearer interpretation of data. The components of each element are also combined to give a score on the element itself. Together, all of the elements are used to analyze the candidates' performance in relation to the standard.

The data presented is based on one candidate (n=1) enrolled in EDTC 639: Independent Research in Educational Technology during the summer 2016 semester. The candidate performed at or above the acceptable benchmark (=2.5) on 80% of the elements addressed in the rubric with means ranging from 2.0-3.0. Of the five elements addressed, Element 6.3: Leadership and Management Knowledge, =2.0, was the only element that did not reach the desired element mean score of 2.5. The candidate's scores indicate an overall performance of 92.5% when analyzing each of the components addressing Standard 6: Content Knowledge and Professional Growth. This is above the "acceptable" score of 80%.

Findings from this data were taken into account and the components that scored below the mean of 2.5 were revisited. When reviewing the candidate's work, the Leadership and Management Knowledge score was a 2.0. It was found that the instructions indicated the students "May want to explain" how the implementation of the project was related to Leadership, Management and Organizational Change Theory. One may interpret this as an option and not a requirement. The faculty went back to the instructions and revised them to read that the candidate "Include an explanation" on how the implementation of the project related to Leadership, Management, and Organizational Change Theory. These changes will be used in the fall 2016 data cycle. In addition, the instructions and rubric were revised to entail more specific instructions indicating what the required components of the project are versus what is recommended. Suggestive words were also removed from the rubric to indicate specific requirements.

Program level decisions cannot be made based on one candidate's performance. As more cycles of data are collected, the data will be reviewed and evaluated for weaknesses in the program in relation to the standard and any areas for improvement.

## 2016-2017:

Based on the Comprehensive Portfolio Rubric, a mean score of 3.0 for each individual component on the rubric indicates acceptable performance. A mean score of 2.5 on each element would result in acceptable performance for the element. An overall mean score of 2.4 or above would indicate a score of 80% or better, which is an acceptable performance score for the standard.

Updates to the rubric were put into place for the fall 2016 and spring 2017 data cycles. These updates proved to have been necessary and showed improvement in candidate performance. Additionally, the benchmark was dropped down to a 2.0 for each element to create a baseline for data moving forward. It seems that the candidates thus far have done well and the benchmark will be moved up to a three for future data collections.

## 2017-2018:

Professors will update assignments and topics covered to better meet the needs of the workforce. This course assessment will be part of the program redesign in the summer 2019.

## 2018-2019

There were no completers in the 2018-2019 AY, therefore, there was no new data to analyze.

Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.

## Courses

**EDTC639 Independent Research in Educational Technology (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)****14 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment and Completer Numbers**

Assessment: Enrollment and Completer Numbers

Benchmark: The EPP has set a goal to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

#### 14.1 Data

MED Educational Technology Leadership - Enrollment and Completers:

| Academic Year | # of students officially enrolled in program | # of completers fall semester | # of completers spring semester | Total # of completers |
|---------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2014-2015     | 7  | 5                             | 1                               | 6                     |
| 2015-2016     | 4  | 1                             | 1                               | 2                     |
| 2016-2017     | 2  | 1                             | 1                               | 2                     |
| 2017-2018     | 0  | 0                             | 0                               | 0                     |
| 2018-2019     | 1  | 0                             | 0                               | 0                     |

##### 14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

- Identify the employer need for the MED of Education Technology Program.
- Identify potential student population for program enrollment.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Contacts with potential student population to encourage enrollment in the program
- Informational brochure explaining the benefits of the program.

2018-2019

Advanced programs began revisions in the summer 2019 and will continue throughout the 2019-2020 AY. A revised MED Educational Technology program will be fully implemented in the 2020-2021 AY. The EDTC faculty will continue to work with local district partners to determine projects, field experiences, and material appropriate to the current expectations in the field. These program revisions will give EDTC faculty the stepping stones to promote and recruit candidates into the program.



End of report