

M.Ed. in Educational Technology Leadership**Division or Department: School of Education****Prepared by: Dustin Hebert****Date: June 6, 2019****Approved by: Kim McAlister****Date: June 12, 2019**

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission. The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is a committed and diverse community of scholars, educators, students, and future leaders working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. The College produces graduates with the capabilities and confidence to be productive members of society equipped with the skill sets necessary to promote economic and social development thereby improving the overall quality of life in the region. The College offers a wide variety of exemplary undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare candidates for career success across the spectrum of professional roles and settings. These programs include teacher education, leadership, and counseling; health and human performance; psychology and addiction studies; social work; and military science. Candidates are taught to become adaptive critical thinkers and problem solvers in diverse scenarios capable of leveraging new technologies to enrich lifelong learning. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive role models in their communities and leaders in the nation's military.

School of Education Mission. The School of Education offers exemplary programs that prepare candidates for career success in a variety of professional roles and settings. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive models in their communities and organizations. This mission is fulfilled through academic programs based on theory, research, and best practice. Further, all graduates learn to value and work with diverse populations and to incorporate technologies that enrich learning and professional endeavors.

Program Mission Statement: The M.Ed. ETEC program seeks to enhance professionals' skills in digital tools for personal and professional productivity in education and other professional disciplines.

Methodology:

Data are collected from key assessments in courses identified for each SLO. The assessments are administered as capstone assessments in the courses, and all are evaluated with analytic rubrics. Results are reviewed annually using descriptive statistics, comparisons across administration cycles, and, anecdotally, student feedback.

Student Learning Outcomes:

SLO 1

Course Map: EDUC 5850

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge (SPA #1)	Candidates will demonstrate technology literacy skills, technology advocacy, and leadership in planning and delivering professional development appropriate for unique populations.

Measure 1.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Project Study

How was the assessment developed?

The assessment is aligned to the Graduate School’s paper-in-lieu-of-thesis guidelines as well as criteria specific to ISTE standards, data analysis, and project-based learning.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The assessment criteria are aligned to the frameworks used to develop the assessment requirements. Performance indicators are qualitative and progressive across the rating scale.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?

Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

85% (n=6) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 5 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year’s averages.

Finding:

2018-2019: 71% of candidates met the benchmark.

Analysis:

In 2017-2018, the target was 85% of candidates meet benchmark. Based on the analysis of these results in 2018-2019, additional APA style, writing tips, and grammar support were provided to candidates. However, patterns of consistent errors in candidate work were identified, which revealed that candidates did not take advantage of the additional resources nor did they, overall, integrate corrections from draft assignments into their final assignments on which these data are based.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results in 2018-2019, in 2019-2020 additional assignments will be added to EDUC 5850 that focus on APA style, writing, and grammar, which are the areas where candidates have for two years earned the lowest performance ratings. Since ratings on “content” items are consistently at benchmark, data do not indicate adjustments to those criteria are necessary. For 2019-2020, assignments based on the additional resources will be included into the course so that candidates are held accountable for reviewing those resources and so that performance on these assignments can be compared to final project rubric ratings to determine on which topics candidates struggle the most of APA style, writing, and grammar. Analyses of those data will determine next steps.

SLO 2

Course Map: ETEC 6010

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice (SPA #4)	Candidates will design and implement a virtual learning experience and assess participant learning in that experience.

Measure 2.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Virtual Digital Citizenship Seminar

How was the assessment developed?

The assessment was developed to align with ISTE Technology Director Standard 5. Candidates demonstrate content knowledge of digital citizenship and gain practical experience in online course design and delivery by completing the Digital Citizenship Seminar. The seminar is an online course designed by candidates and hosted in Eliademy or another platform of the candidate’s choosing. Candidates solicit individuals to serve as “students” in the seminar; these “students” may be P-12 students or adults depending on the seminar’s intended audience. Candidates’ digital citizenship content knowledge is evaluated based on the content presented in the seminar, and their pedagogical knowledge is evaluated against the Quality Matters criteria for online course design and delivery.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards? Each candidate's seminar follows a standard framework of four units, and each unit must include a presentation of content, at least one interactive activity, and at least one assessment. The seminar content is created by the candidate and is unique to a school or district. While the content is unique to the setting, each unit's broad topic is standard. Those are: 1) overview of digital citizenship (Standard 5: Digital Citizenship); 2) digital equity (Element 5.1: Digital Equity); 3) safe, healthy, legal, and ethical technology use (Element 5.2: Policies for Safe, Healthy, Legal, and Ethical Use; Element 5.3: Programs for Safe, Healthy, Legal, and Ethical Use); and 4) diversity, cultural understanding, and global awareness (Element 5.4: Diversity, Cultural Understanding, and Global Awareness). Specific sub-topics are provided for each (see seminar outline below).

Content for each unit includes at least one candidate-created video lesson/lecture, one Web site, and one additional digital resource that extends that unit's content. Activities must reinforce the content, and assessments must provide meaningful feedback for seminar participants.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured? The assessment criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to ISTE Technology Director Standard 5 performance expectations.

Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how? 80% (n=7) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

Finding:

2018-2019: 91% (n=9) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis:

In 2017-2018, the target was 80% of candidates meet benchmark. Based on an analysis of those results in 2018-2019, assessment requirements were refined to ensure clarity of criteria and indicators. The percentage of candidates meeting benchmark increased from 80% to 91%.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, in 2019-2020 faculty will ensure that evaluations are critical and comprehensive to avoid grading inflation given the noticeable increase from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 in the percentage of candidates meeting benchmark.

SLO 3

Course Map: ETEC 6010

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics.	Candidates will model skills and characteristics appropriate for individuals in formal or informal leadership roles.

Measure 3.1. (Direct - Skills, Dispositions)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Mentor Evaluation

How was the assessment developed?

The mentor evaluation is aligned to departmental goals, course outcomes, and ISTE and InTASC standards linked to course outcomes. It was developed by faculty using existing tools as models.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

The evaluation’s alignment to departmental goals, ISTE standards, and InTASC standards provides evidence for meeting the said goals and standards.

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?

The evaluation criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to departmental goals, ISTE standards, and InTASC standards.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

100% of candidates will earn minimum ratings of 2 on all items.

Finding:

2018-2019: 100% (n=9) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis:

In 2017-2018, the target was 100% of candidates meet benchmark. Based on an analysis of those results in 2018-2019, procedures for mentor evaluations were changed to include formative and summative evaluations rather than only summative. As a result, 100% (n=9) of candidates met the benchmark.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results the trend data from this assessment are not actionable, which resulted in a decision to change the assessment tool. For 2019-2020, a new protocol for mentor evaluations will be implemented to require multiple evaluations instead of just mid-term and final to show greater dispersion of ratings and more actionable findings.

SLO 4

Course Map: ETEC 5760

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline (SPA #3)	Candidates will design virtual learning experiences that yield multimedia content presentations and interactive learning activities.

Measure 4.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Interactive Multimedia Website

How was the assessment developed?

The Instructional Multimedia Website is the capstone assessment of ETEC 5760. In the Website, candidates demonstrate their mastery of digital tools/resources, digital-age learning strategies, educational technology/technology integration knowledge, and reflection on practice.

The Website serves as technology-mediated instructional tool where a target audience and instructional problem or opportunity are identified. The candidate, considering the unique needs of the target audience, then creates and organizes content and learning activities using the Web platform he/she has selected. Students then use/work through the Website and provide feedback via survey on the Website once they complete the tasks embedded within it. Candidates then review that feedback and student performance on activities within the Website and prepare an analysis report of the Website’s implementation and student feedback. Within the analysis, candidates identify what decisions they made on revising the Website content or activities based on student feedback and performance.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?

Candidates use their knowledge of research-based pedagogy, digital tools, students, and the learning environment to select appropriate Web platforms for the Websites they create. They further demonstrate their mastery of instructional design principles for digital-age learning by designing the content and activities of the Website in alignment with those principles and reasonable expectations of students (Element 2.1: Digital Tools and Resources; Element 2.2: Research-Based Learning Strategies).

Through the selection/creation of digital content and tools, candidates provide evidence of their knowledge of technology content and best practices in pedagogy for technology-mediated learning. The learning experiences they create through the Websites show their capacities for fostering innovation and creativity in digital-age learners (Element 6.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge)

Promoting self-reflection and use of data are emphasized in this assessment. Candidates are required to create mechanisms to collect student performance data on Website activities and feedback on the learning experience via the Website. Candidates then analyze the performance data and student feedback and report a synopsis of that analysis with plans for revising the Website content and/or activities aligned to student performance and feedback (Element 6.4: Continuous Learning; Element 6.5: Reflection).

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?

The assessment criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to ISTE Technology Director standards as noted in the analysis.

Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?

80% (n=8) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 3 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

Finding:

2018-2019: 60% (n=6) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis:

In 2017-2018, the target was 80% of candidates meet benchmark. Based on an analysis of those results in 2018-2019, the course instructor assignment was changed so that an instructor with greater multimedia expertise taught the course and clarity was added to the assessment instructions. The 2018-2019 results remain below benchmark, but three of the four candidates who did not meet benchmark did not complete the assessment. Thus, the finding is not an accurate representation of candidate performance but an omission of performance. Excluding those three, the finding is 90% (n=9) of candidates met benchmark.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

Recommendation. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, in 2019-2020, emphasis will be placed on completing the assessment. Faculty will consider placing course-level weight on the assessment like requiring completion of the assessment to earn a grade in the course. This additional accountability may ensure that all candidates complete the assessment so that data could be collected.

SLO 5

Course Map: ETEC 5780

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline (SPA #3)	Candidates will conduct investigations relevant to technology needs and uses in particular professional settings then present findings and recommendations for advancing technology in those settings.

Measure 5.1. (Direct - Knowledge)

Address the following questions for assessment:

What artifact is used to provide evidence?

Technology Plan

How was the assessment developed?

Candidates analyze the technology utilization and needs in an approved school setting. Using the material presented throughout the course, including the readings and class discussions, they 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.

How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified 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 (Element 1.2: Strategic Planning).

In general, this substantive activity aligns with the three elements of Standard 1:

Visionary Leadership in that the candidate is assuming a leadership role in drafting a technology plan to expand and enhance school operations (Element 1.1: Shared Vision; Element 1.2: Strategic Planning).

With support of the school’s 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; Element 4.4: Partnerships).

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 process 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. Specific needs—hardware, software, networking, support, etc.—are then identified based on goals and data sources. Finally, candidates draft a budget for accomplishing the goals and seek out funding sources available (Element 4.5: Technology Infrastructure; Element 6.2: Technical Knowledge).

Examples of how advocacy networks and resources influenced the work are integrated throughout all sections (Element 1.3: Advocacy).

How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?
The assessment criteria and indicators have construct validity because items were aligned directly to ISTE Technology Director standards as noted in the analysis.

Research-based analyses of quality were not conducted; however, such analyses are planned for the upcoming academic year as part of CAEP evidence quality requirements.

What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?
80% (n=12) of candidates will earn minimum benchmark ratings of 10 on each criterion based on performance expectations compared to prior year's averages.

Finding:

2018-2019: 80% (n=12) of candidates met benchmark.

Analysis:

In 2017-2018, the target was 80% of candidates meet benchmark. Based on an analysis of those results in 2018-2019, the course instructor ensured that assessment criteria and instructions remained clear and that candidates had opportunities to pose clarifying questions as needed through an online Q&A forum to which all candidates had access. While the benchmark was met in 2018-2019, the finding was not 100% (n=15) because three candidates did not complete the assessment.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

Recommendation. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, in 2019-2020, emphasis will be placed on completing the assessment. Faculty will consider placing course-level weight on the assessment like requiring completion of the assessment to earn a grade in the course. This additional accountability may ensure that all candidates complete the assessment so that data could be collected.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results:

- SLO 1
 - Additional APA style, writing tips, and grammar support were provided to candidates; however, patterns of consistent errors in candidate work were identified, which revealed that candidates did not take advantage of the additional resources nor did they, overall, integrate corrections from draft assignments into their final assignments on which these data are based.
- SLO 2
 - Assessment requirements were refined to ensure clarity of criteria and indicators.
- SLO 3
 - Procedures for mentor evaluations were changed to include formative and summative evaluations rather than only summative.
- SLO 4
 - The course instructor assignment was changed so that an instructor with greater multimedia expertise taught the course and clarity was added to the assessment instruction.
- SLO 5
 - The course instructor ensured that assessment criteria and instructions remained clear and that candidates had opportunities to pose clarifying questions as needed through an online Q&A forum to which all candidates had access.
- Overall
 - Candidates are exhibiting knowledge and application of the breadth of each ISTE standard/element.
 - Data show that candidates struggle with 1) scholarly writing and 2) APA formatting.
 - Data show that some candidates are simply not submitting key assessments for evaluation.

Plan of Action Moving Forward:

In 2019-2020, additional supports will be embedded into EDUC 5850 to address the obvious, consistent struggles candidates have with scholarly writing and APA formatting. Faculty will also examine how to add greater accountability to key assessments to ensure that all candidates complete the assessments. The lack of submissions during 2018-2019 was a new, unexpected occurrence, so accountability measures will be implemented in 2019-2020.