Instructional Technology [INTC]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

Program Name: Instructional Technology [INTC]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Distance only

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

2016-2017:
To help strengthen our candidate's lesson planning, data analysis of student achievement, and content knowledge, we have revamped the instructions and rubrics for these assessments including more rigorous expectations within the directions and/or more thorough, clear, and descriptive components with the rubric elements.

2017-2018:
- Convert the hybrid program into 100% online program.
- Completely renewed EDTC 628 Emerging Instructional Technologies course.

2018-2019:
The EDTC 602 course has been revised and updated to reflect more current practices with technology. Moving forward, all coursework will be evaluated and updated to reflect current technology use.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:
Dr. Yixin Zhang, program coordinator for the MS in Instructional Technology, attended several sessions in a recent distance education conference. He is working on converting the degree program into a 100% distance education program.

2017-2018:
- Convert the hybrid program into 100% online program
- Completely renewed EDTC 628 Emerging Instructional Technologies course.

2018-2019:
The Instructional Technology coursework will be undergoing major transformations. Two courses have been updated and revised and other courses in the program will follow suit. We will be promoting our program as current and essential to those wanting to be successful in the instructional technology field.

5 Program Mission

Based on the ISTE National Educational Standards - Teachers, the goals of Mater of Science of Instructional Technology are to:
1. Prepare students for the global workforce
2. Design diverse online learning environments
3. Inspire digital age professional models for working, collaborating, and decision-making

6 Institutional Mission Reference

The MS Instructional Technology program supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to serve 1. residents of southwest Louisiana who are seeking either a college degree or continuing professional education; and, 2. employers in the region, both public and private, school districts, health care providers, local governments, and private businesses; by providing Masters programs related to education, and support for area K-12 schools seeking college general

education courses for advanced students and assistance in ensuring that their graduates are college- and career-ready.

7 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 602 Final Multimedia Project

Assessment: Final Multimedia Project.
In EDTC 602 class, students develop hypermedia presentations to include title slide, bibliography and at least 12 content slides which contain text, graphics, audio, animation, and interaction somewhere within them. The product shows significant evidence of originality and inventiveness. The majority of the content and many of the ideas are fresh, original, inventive, and based upon logical conclusions and sound research. Subject knowledge is evident throughout. All information is clear, appropriate, and correct.

Benchmark: The instructor expects at least 87% of students score higher than 92% of total score on multimedia project.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was the instructor expects at least 85% of students score higher than 90% of the total score on multimedia project.

Course Links

EDTC602 [Design and Development of Multimedia for Instruction (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Technology Fluency [Program]
Candidates model digital age work and learning, demonstrate fluency in computer multimedia/hypermedia, and transfer current knowledge to new technologies and situations.

7.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students earning 80%	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	88%	Yes
2014-2015	82%	Yes
2015-2016	81%	Yes

Statistics

Term	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Summer 2019	Summer 2020
# Valid	12	23	14	5	4	
# Missing	0	0	0	0	0	
Mean	19.2500	14.9565	19.286	20.00	16.00	
Range			10.00	.00	10.00	
Std. Deviation	1.21543	7.30802	2.673	.00	2.45	
Minimum	17.00	.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	
Maximum	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	

Course Links

EDTC602 [Design and Development of Multimedia for Instruction (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Scores on this assessment are dropping, though we are still meeting the benchmark. Examination of specific scores on rubric items should yield further information about which area of the assignment needs development and attention.

2016-2017:

The instructor of this course examine the results from two semesters carefully. The mean score (14.9565) of spring 2017 decreased from mean score (19.2500) of fall 2016. Further investigation revealed that in the spring 2017, there were four students did not turn in their hypermedia assignment, which dramatically dropped the mean score (Standard deviation: 7.30802). The instructor determines to continue to use the same assessment, achievement level, and benchmark, but will make sure all students submit their hypermedia assignment to Moodle by deadline.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. From the mean scores of fall 2017 (19.2857) and spring 2018 (20.00), we can see that the proficiency was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The instructor expects at least 87% of students score higher than 92% of total score on multimedia project. Higher student performance through additional course instructional materials.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: The instructor plans to post more instructional materials in this course in Moodle. Also, the instructor will make sure the instructions are as clear as possible. Students' increased performance.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met. The instructor plans to evaluate and update the assignment as technology changes in the PK-12 classrooms.

Course Links

EDTC602 [Design and Development of Multimedia for Instruction (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

8 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 602 Reflection Paper

Assessment: Reflection Paper.
Candidates model digital age work and learning, demonstrate fluency in computer multimedia /hypermedia, and transfer current knowledge to new technologies and situations.

Benchmark: 95% of the students will score 100% of the total possible score.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 85% candidates score 100% on their reflection paper explaining how their course projects incorporate one or more of the principles and methods of effective uses for multimedia.

Course Links

EDTC602 [Design and Development of Multimedia for Instruction (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Technology Fluency [Program]
Candidates model digital age work and learning, demonstrate fluency in computer multimedia/hypermedia, and transfer current knowledge to new technologies and situations.

8.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students earning 85%	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	100%	Yes
2014-2015	70%	Yes
2015-2016	87%	Yes
2016-2017	88%	Yes
2017-2018	100%	Yes

	Students	

Academic Year	earning 85%		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2018-2019*	—	—	—
2019-2020			

*Assessment not collected.

Course Links

EDTC602 [Design and Development of Multimedia for Instruction (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Though there has been fluctuation, students continue to meet the benchmark for this assignment. For this assignment to be effective, the instructor must keep up with the current technology and its effective uses in teaching.

2016-2017:
All students write reflection paper explaining how their course projects incorporate one or more of the principles and methods of effective uses for multimedia. Professor will keep up current research of effective uses for multimedia.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. In fall 2017 (N = 14) and spring 2018 (N = 5), all students scored 100% of the total possible score.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 95% of the students will score 100% of the total possible score.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: The increased number of students scoring 100%. The instructor will provided additional instructional materials for students.

2018-2019:
This assessment was not collected in the 18-19 AY. The instructional technology faculty will meet to discuss whether or not it will be reinstated or if this assessment will change for the 19-20 AY.

Course Links

EDTC602 [Design and Development of Multimedia for Instruction (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

9 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 610 Subject Area Activities

Assessment: Subject Areas Activities.

Benchmark: Candidates will score an average of 87% or higher on the Subject Area Activities encompassing efficient usage of manipulating digital images.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 80% of candidates will score 85% or higher on Subject Area Activities encompassing efficient usage of manipulating digital images.
Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was a score of 80% on Subject Area Activities encompassing efficient usage of manipulating digital images.

Course Links

EDTC610 [Visual Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Instructional Design [Program]
Candidates design and develop instructional training materials to maximize content learning in context.

9.1 Data

Academic Year	Average Score	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	86%	Yes
2014-2015	81%	No
2015-2016	96%	Yes
2016-2017	85%	Yes
2017-2018	96%	Yes
2018-2019	86%	No
2019-2020		

Statistics

Academic Year	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
# Valid	6	7	
Mean	14.667	13.71	
Range	8.00	8.00	
Std. Deviation	3.266	3.90	
Minimum	8.00	8.00	
Maximum	16.00	16.00	

Course Links

EDTC610 [Visual Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
The average has fluctuated over the years. Next year, the benchmark will change to "80% of students will score 85% or higher" on this assignment in order to better capture how many students are not achieving the desired level of achievement.

2016-2017:
Students choose their subject area activities and incorporate their manipulating digital images with learning/teaching context. This exercise will remain.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates will score an average of 87% or higher on the Subject Area Activities encompassing efficient usage of manipulating digital images.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: This course was taught in the summer. The length of time is shorter than fall and spring semester. The instructor plans to give students longer time to work on this assignment.

2018-2019:
The benchmark (87%) was not met since the average score was calculated as 86%. The instructor plans to extend the time allowed to work on the activity to ensure that students understand the assignment and are able to complete the assignment adequately.

Course Links

EDTC610 [Visual Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

10 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 610 Final Synthesizing Paper

Assessment: Final Synthesizing Paper.

Benchmark: Candidates will score an average of 99% or higher on the Final Synthesizing Assessment.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 80% of candidates will score an average of 80% or higher on the Final Synthesizing Assessment.

Course Links

EDTC610 [Visual Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Instructional Design [Program]
Candidates design and develop instructional training materials to maximize content learning in context.

10.1 Data

Academic Year	Average Score	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	91%	Yes
2014-2015	95%	No
2015-2016	95%	Yes
2016-2017	80%	Yes
2017-2018	98%	Yes
2018-2019	89%	Yes
2019-2020		

Statistics

Academic Year	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
# Valid	6	7	
Mean	18.67	18.88	
Range	8.00	8.00	
Std. Deviation	3.266	3.02	
Minimum	12.00	12.00	
Maximum	20.00	20.00	

Course Links

EDTC610 [Visual Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Next year, the benchmark will change to "80% of students will score 80% or higher" on this assignment in order to better capture how many students are not achieving the desired level of achievement.

2016-2017:
Students choose their subject area activities and incorporate their manipulating digital images with learning/teaching context. This exercise will remain.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates will score an average of 99% or higher on the Final Synthesizing Assessment.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: The instructor plans to create “Cyber Café” place in Moodle to let students to share ideas.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met for this assessment. To continue improving student work, the instructor will create and post more learning materials in Moodle to assist students.

Course Links

EDTC610 [Visual Learning (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

11 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 611 Unit Quizzes

Assessment: Unit Quizzes.

Benchmark: 70% of candidates will earn a score of 75% or higher on the unit quizzes.

Course Links

EDTC611 [Learning and Cognition (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Cognition and Learning [Program]
Candidates promote interdisciplinary advances in theory and research of cognition and learning, and incorporate digital tools and resources to enhance training efficiency.

11.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students earning 75%	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	77%	Yes
2014-2015	79%	Yes
2015-2016	71%	Yes
2016-2017	75%	Yes
2017-2018	N/A*	N/A

*The course has not been offered since fall 2016.

Academic Year	Students earning 75%		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2018-2019	16/19	84%	Yes
2019-2020			

Course Links

EDTC611 [Learning and Cognition (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016;
Students do well on these quizzes, however, data reporting has not always been uniform. The way it was reported in 2015-2016 will be the method used going forward.

2016-2017:
Students will still be required to study theory of learning and cognition encompassing behaviorism, cognitive architecture, and complex cognition.

2017-2018:
The course has not been offered since fall 2016, therefore there was no new data to report or analyze.

2018-2019:
16/19 of the candidates averaged a score of 75% or above on the 7 unit quizzes. Moving forward, the instructor will determine whether or not the current methods of assessment are optimal and will make the necessary changes.

Course Links

EDTC611 [Learning and Cognition (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

12 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 611 Presentation

Assessment: Presentation.
Synthesizing PowerPoint presentation on theory of cognition and learning in instructional/teaching settings.

Benchmark: 80% of the candidates will achieve a score of 85% or higher on the presentation.

Course Links

EDTC611 [Learning and Cognition (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Cognition and Learning [Program]
Candidates promote interdisciplinary advances in theory and research of cognition and learning, and incorporate digital tools and resources to enhance training efficiency.

12.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students earning 85%	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	95%	Yes
2014-2015	92%	Yes
2015-2016	86%	Yes
2016-2017	100%	Yes
2017-2018	N/A*	N/A

*The last time the course was offered was fall 2016.

Academic Year	Students earning 85%		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2018-2019	7/12	58%	No
2019-2020			

Course Links

EDTC611 [Learning and Cognition (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Students do well on these quizzes, however, data reporting has not always been uniform. The way it was reported in 2015-2016 will be the method used going forward.

2016-2017:
The instructor will continue to give synthesizing presentation assignment.

2017-2018:
The course has not been offered since fall 2016, therefore, there is not new data to report or analyze.

2018-2019:
The candidates did not meet benchmark. Therefore, the instructor will re-evaluate the instruction for the lessons and whether or not the assessments are appropriate for the learning outcomes being assessed.

Course Links

EDTC611 [Learning and Cognition (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

13 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 614 Web 2.0 Tool Presentation

Assessment: Web 2.0 Tool Presentation.

Benchmark: 82% of the candidates will earn 82% or higher on this assignment.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 80% of the candidates will earn 80% or higher on this assignment.

Course Links

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

Outcome Links

Cognition and Learning [Program]
Candidates promote interdisciplinary advances in theory and research of cognition and learning, and incorporate digital tools and resources to enhance training efficiency.

13.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students earning 80%	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	100%	Yes
2014-2015	N/A	N/A
2015-2016	80%	Yes

2017-2018:

Preparation	4
Skillful use of technology	4
The technology lesson proceeded smoothly and engaged the students	3
Communication	3
Use of Screencast Tool	4

2019-2020:

Preparation	
Skillful use of technology	
The technology lesson proceeded smoothly and engaged the students	

Communication	
Use of Screencast Tool	

Statistics

Academic Year	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
# Valid	3	—	
Mean	25.00	—	
Range	.00	—	
Std. Deviation	.00	—	
Minimum	25.00	—	
Maximum	25.00	—	

Course Links

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

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
A new benchmark will be implemented next academic year: 80% of students will earn 80% or higher on this assignment.

2016-2017:
All of the students completing Web 2.0 presentation demonstrating competencies in the use of modern technologies. Professors will continue to include emerging technologies into the course that are to be implemented in the final web site.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.
Plan for Continuous Improvement: 82% of the candidates will earn 82% or higher on this assignment.
Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Spend more time and opportunities to practice skills to ensure that students demonstrate mastery with the Web 2.0 tool.

2018-2019:
This course was not offered in the 18-19 AY year, therefore, there was no additional data to review.

Course Links

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

14 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 617 Essay on Training Theory

Assessment: Essay on Training Theory.
Students write an essay demonstrating understanding of training theory considerations for technology-based instruction.

Benchmark: 100% of the candidates will score 87% or above on their Instructional Essay/Design project.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 100% of the candidates will score 85% or above on their essay/design project.

Course Links

EDTC617 [Educational Technology Research and Assessment: Instructional Media Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Instructional Design [Program]
Candidates design and develop instructional training materials to maximize content learning in context.

14.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students earning 85%	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	100%	Yes
2014-2015	100%	Yes
2015-2016	78%	No

2017-2018:

	#	4
Identifying the need for Instruction	Mean	3.75
	Range	1.00
Designing the Instruction: Sequencing	Mean	4.00
	Range	0.00
Designing the Instruction: Strategies	Mean	3.75
	Range	0.00
Designing the Instructional Message	Mean	4.00
	Range	0.00
Designing Considerations for Technology-Based Instruction	Mean	3.75
	Range	1.00
The Many Faces of Evaluation	Mean	4.00
	Range	0.00

2018-2019:

	#	3
Identifying the need for Instruction	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Designing the Instruction: Sequencing	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Designing the Instruction: Strategies	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Designing the Instructional Message	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Designing Considerations for Technology-Based Instruction	Mean	6.67
	Range	10
The Many Faces of Evaluation	Mean	10.00
	Range	0

Course Links

EDTC617 [Educational Technology Research and Assessment: Instructional Media Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Students do well on this assignment, however, data reporting has not always been uniform. The way it was reported in 2015-2016 will be the method used going forward.

2016-2017:
Students will be still assigned essay assignment to demonstrating understanding of training material design considerations for technology-based instruction. Students need more help will be invited to work in Education Lab under guidance of the instructor.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 100% of the candidates will score 87% or above on their Instructional Essay/Design project.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Essay on Training Theory will incorporated into Instructional Design project.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met and 100% of the candidates scored above 80% on the assignment. Moving forward, the instructor plans to incorporate the Training Theory Essay into an Instructional Design Project.

Course Links

EDTC617 [Educational Technology Research and Assessment: Instructional Media Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

15 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 617 Developing Instructional Materials

Assessment: Developing Instructional Materials.
Students design and develop instructional materials incorporating instructional design principles.

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will score 75% or above on this assignment.

Course Links

EDTC617 [Educational Technology Research and Assessment: Instructional Media Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Instructional Design [Program]
Candidates design and develop instructional training materials to maximize content learning in context.

15.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students earning 75%	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	N/A	N/A
2014-2015	100%	Yes
2015-2016	89%	No
2016-2017	100%	Yes
2017-2018	N/A*	N/A

*There was no data presented by the instructor for this assessment.

Academic Year	Students earning 75%		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2018-2019	5/5	100%	Yes

2019-2020			

Course Links

EDTC617 [Educational Technology Research and Assessment: Instructional Media Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Through the years, quite a few students missed the required portion of this project. Instructions have been revised to guide students through this assignment in a more detailed way.

2016-2017:
The instructor revised and refined the instruction in Moodle to guide students to improve this assignment.

2017-2018:
There was no data reported, therefore, data was not available to be analyzed.

2018-2019:
Candidates scored 100% in all categories assessed: Instructional, Technology, Research, Equitable, Case Study, Network, and Web Lesson. The instructor plans to give students more time to work on the Web Lesson Assignment.

Course Links

EDTC617 [Educational Technology Research and Assessment: Instructional Media Design (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

16 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 628 Creating Applications

Assessment: Creating Applications.
Students will create modern computer multimedia applications to be used in education, business, government, and health organizations. Candidates model digital age work and learning, demonstrate fluency in computer multimedia/hypermedia, and transfer current knowledge to new technologies and situations.

Benchmark: 92% of the candidates will score 85% on the overall percentage of creating applications.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was at least 90% of the candidates in this course will obtain expected field experience using emerging technologies to create applications in education, business, government, or health.

Course Links

EDTC628 [Emerging Instructional Technologies (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Technology Fluency [Program]
Candidates model digital age work and learning, demonstrate fluency in computer multimedia/hypermedia, and transfer current knowledge to new technologies and situations.

16.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students obtaining experience	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	91%	Yes
2014-2015	100%	Yes
2015-2016	67%	No

2016-2017	100%	Yes

2017-2018:

	#	7
Web Presentation	Mean	10.00
	Range	0.00
Website 1	Mean	8.75
	Range	10.00
Website 2	Mean	9.14
	Range	6.00
Bubblus	Mean	10.00
	Range	0.00
Wizer	Mean	8.57
	Range	10.00
Sway	Mean	10.00
	Range	0.00
ScreenCast	Mean	10.00
	Range	0.00
Literature	Mean	8.57
	Range	10.00
Hot Potatoes	Mean	6.86
	Range	10.00
Question Writer	Mean	7.14
	Range	10.00
Edmodo 1	Mean	10.00
	Range	0.00
Edmodo 2	Mean	10.00
	Range	0.00

2018-2019:

	#	1
Web Presentation	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Website 1	Mean	9.00
	Range	0
Website 2	Mean	2.00
	Range	0
Bubblus	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Wizer	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Sway	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
	Mean	10.00

ScreenCast	Range	0
Literature	Mean	8.00
	Range	0
Question Writer	Mean	6.00
	Range	0
Edmodo 1	Mean	10.00
	Range	0
Edmodo 2	Mean	10.00
	Range	0

Course Links

EDTC628 [Emerging Instructional Technologies (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
This assignment is normally successful, but there was a significant drop in achievement in 2015-2016. The instructor plans to add individual discussion with each student to ensure each student understands and meet required expectations in this course.

2016-2017:
The instructor continues to use formative assessments to monitor students' final projects using emerging technology.
The instructor added individual discussion with each student to ensure each student understands and meet required expectations in this course.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 92% of the candidates will score 85% on the overall percentage of creating applications.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: A revised teaching method will be adopted for the course. The instructor plans to create collaborative learning groups. Students with different learning styles would learn better when they share ideas and learn emerging technologies together.

2018-2019:
The benchmark was met. A revised teaching method will be adopted for this course. The instructor plans to create collaborative learning groups. Students with different learning styles would learn better when they share ideas and learn emerging technologies together.

Course Links

EDTC628 [Emerging Instructional Technologies (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

17 Assessment and Benchmark EDTC 639 Final Comprehensive Project

Assessment: Final Comprehensive Project
The final comprehensive project demonstrates transference of knowledge acquired in the program.

Benchmark: 100% of the candidates will score a 2.5 or above in each category of the Final Comprehensive Project in EDTC 639.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 100% of the candidates will score a 2 or above in each category of the Final Comprehensive Project in EDTC 639.

Course Links

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

Outcome Links

Cognition and Learning [Program]
Candidates promote interdisciplinary advances in theory and research of cognition and learning, and incorporate digital tools and resources to enhance training efficiency.

17.1 Data

Academic Year	% of students with a score 2	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	100%	Yes
2014-2015	N/A	N/A
2015-2016	100%	Yes

		2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
	#		1	2	
Proposal: Requirements	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.50	
	Range		4.00	3-4	
Proposal: Mechanics	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.00	
	Range		4.00	3.00	
Requirements	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		4.00	4.00	
Organization	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		4.00	4.00	
Originality	Mean	3.00	3.00	3.50	
	Range		3.00	3-4	
Attractiveness	Mean	1.00	3.00	3.00	
	Range		3.00	3.00	
Use of Graphics	Mean	2.00	3.00	3.50	
	Range		3.00	3-4	
Permissions	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		4.00	4.00	
Functionality	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		4.00	4.00	
Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Mean	3.00	4.00	3.50	
	Range		4.00	3-4	
Technical Knowledge	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		4.00	4.00	
Leadership and Management Knowledge	Mean	2.00	4.00	3.00	
	Range		4.00	2-4	
Continuous Learning	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		4.00	4.00	
Reflection	Mean	3.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		4.00	4.00	

Mechanics	Mean	2.00	4.00	3.00	
	Range		4.00	3.00	

Course Links

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

17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Students do well on this project. In the future, elements of the rubric will be used to report on this assessment to pinpoint areas of this assignment that may need attention.

2016-2017:
All of the students completing the course designed and presented a project that was comprehensive and applicable to the student's professional aspirations. Professors will continue to monitor emerging technologies and expectations of students to ensure that these projects are appropriate.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: 100% of the candidates will score a 2.5 or above in each category of the Final Comprehensive Project in EDTC 639.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Increase the number and methods of communication with students in addition to face-to-face meeting. The instructor will also take advantage of various technologies to communicate with students.

2018-2019:
Both candidates in the 18-19 AY score proficient on the Final Comprehensive Project Assessment. Moving into the 19-20 and 20-21 AY, the program coursework will be revised and EDTC 639 will lean toward more of an action research project for the final project. This will likely go into effect beginning in the 20-21 AY, but instructors will be working on revising the project in the upcoming year.

Course Links

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

18 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment and Completers

Assessment: Enrollment and Retention.

Benchmark: To increase enrollment to 10 students (8%).

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was to increase enrollment by 7%, set by the EPP, across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

18.1 Data

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program	# of completers fall semester	# of completers spring semester	Total # of completers
2014-2015	22	3	4	7
2015-2016	17	5	1	6
2016-2017	9	2	2	4
2017-2018	8	2	1	3
2018-2019	5	1	1	2
2019-2020				

18.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal is to increase enrollment to 10 students (8%).

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Contact 100% of the graduate student applicants to McNeese State University who indicate “undecided major” to provide information about the MS Instructional Technology.
- Contact graduating seniors with GPA of >2.74 in General Studies to recruit them into the program.
- The program coordinator will also look at the area of southeast Texas.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. There was a 38% decrease from the 2017-2018 AY to the 2018-2019 AY. The number of completers also decreased 33%.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The goal for 2019-2020 will be to achieve at least a 7% increase in the number of candidates enrolled in the MS Instructional Technology program.

Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
The program coordinator will attend at least three conferences, workshops, or other opportunity within the academic year to recruit candidates into the program.

End of report