

# **2007-2008 Annual Program Review Report**

## **Curriculum and Instruction – Instructional Technology**

### **Reviewers**

Dr. Donald Luck - SoE APSU

Dr. Anne Wall - SoE APSU

Dr. Joe Jerles - SoE APSU

### **I. Assessment of Candidates**

Assessment of the candidates comes from evaluation of the portfolio done by the completers of the instructional technology program and from a survey of school principals concerning all professional personnel having graduated from APSU in the last five years.

#### **Portfolio Evaluation**

A review of the portfolio evaluation scores shows the largest majority of scores falling in the Meets Standard range. Students did very well in Standards 6, social, ethical, legal and human issues surrounding technology and Standard 7 dealing with policy, plans and procedures.

#### **Professional Personnel Evaluation Survey**

The Professional Personnel Evaluation survey of area principals showed strong performance by the professionals graduating from APSU. When asked "What suggestions do you have to improve the instructional technology program at APSU?" the following responses were elicited.

- Embed in their units. Students actively engaged in the technology
- The teachers we have currently seem to be above average with integrative technology for instructional use. Whatever you are doing seems to be working.
- Train them in using the model classroom equipment that CMCSS uses.
- Keep up with developing technologies. Students should be able to teach their peers how to utilize technology in the classroom.
- Improve advance notice of technological requirements
- I have one teacher from your program and I was shocked that she didn't have more knowledge/experience with be technology items like, Smart Boards, E-Beams, Quizdoms, and other technology. She does have a great attitude and willingness to learn, so I've loved having her on staff.

Reading through these you can see that most deal with teachers use of technology, not specifically with students trained in the instructional technology program. It appears that there is a lack of understanding of the role of the instructional technologist among the principals surveyed. A need exists to define the role of principals including the expertise instructional technologist should possess and what they can do for a school.

#### **Actions**

1. Information concerning the capabilities and role of the instructional technologist must be disseminated especially to school administrators

## **II. Assessment of Program Operations**

### **Program Numbers**

There had been a consistent, relatively small number of students entering the program with 10 students completing Milestone I from Fall 2005 through Fall 2006 semesters. That number increased to 20 for the period beginning in Spring 2007 through Fall 2008. The program went online in Fall of 2006 and growth may be caused by that change. Also, much of this growth may be contributed to the work of the School of Education's graduate coordinator through his work advertising all advanced programs including the instructional technology program.

This increase in numbers is causing problems.

1. Communicating with students becomes more difficult
2. In technical classes requirements for specific, often expensive, software limits entry into specific courses. The program has 15 loaner computers with all needed software but with the increasing numbers this will soon not be enough.
3. Online classes are beginning to reach the maximum number of students. Limitations on the number of professors available will limit the number of classes available

### **Graduate Follow-up Survey**

The overall satisfaction level with the program by graduates returning the survey was a three on a three-point scale. No specific area ranked lower than 2.6 on the three-point scale. Unfortunately return of the surveys was very low and the results are in question because of that low return.

### **Internal Review**

A review by professors in the instructional technology program revealed a dissatisfaction with the standards currently being used. After a review of standards for instructional technology accepted by NCATE, a decision was made to switch standards for the program from ISTE Standards for Technology Facilitators to the AECT Standard for the Accreditation of Initial Preparation Programs for School Media and Educational Technology Specialists (SMETS). A new portfolio and rubric has been developed based on these standards and students currently in the program have been given the option of retaining the ISTE standards or moving to the AECT standards.

### **Actions**

1. Develop better means of communicating with online students.
2. Evaluate the changing of technical course software to open source alternatives
3. Determine, based on continuing demand, if the need exists to open multiple sessions of courses or continue limiting the number of students in a cohort.
4. Evaluate the number of Program Change requests from students. Students seem to be changing courses on their programs to graduate as soon as possible. If more students enroll more elective courses can be offered during the same semester providing a broader range of specialization for the students.

### **III. Assessment System**

Further information is needed in the following areas:

1. A larger number of returns from graduates with experience in the field are needed.
2. Information from supervisors of graduates who understand the role of the instructional technologist is needed.