M.Ed. in Educational Technology 2018-2019

Program Goals

The goal of the Educational Technology M.Ed. program is to prepare knowledgeable and innovative leaders in instructional design, distance education, training and development, education, and instructional technology who can contribute to society as professional educational technologists in the areas of business, education, government, and the health professions. To accomplish the aforementioned goal and ensure alignment with nationally accepted standards of professional practice, the 2012 AECT Standards for Professional Education Programs were integrated into the program, and are used to measure student learning outcomes. These standards include learning outcomes in the following areas:

A. **Content Knowledge -** Candidates demonstrate the knowledge necessary to create, use, assess, and manage theoretical and practical applications of educational technologies and processes.
B. **Content Pedagogy -** Candidates develop as reflective practitioners able to demonstrate effective implementation of educational technologies and processes based on contemporary content and pedagogy.
C. **Learning Environments -** Candidates facilitate learning by creating, using, evaluating, and managing effective learning environments.
D. **Professional Knowledge and Skills -** Candidates design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-rich learning environments within a supportive community of practice.
E. **Research -** Candidates explore, evaluate, synthesize, and apply methods of inquiry to enhance learning and improve performance.

In addition to each of the five key standards listed above, indicators are provided that cut across multiple standards. These indicators include creating, using, assessing/evaluating, managing, ethics, diversity of learners, collaborative practice, leadership, reflection on practice, theoretical foundations, and methods.

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment of learning outcomes occurred via benchmark assignments incorporated into each of the eight required ETEC courses, and a culminating ePortfolio project submitted at the end of a student's program of study. Benchmark assignments were mapped to specific national standards (AECT, 2012), and the culminating ePortfolio was a comprehensive evaluation that directly assessed student achievement on all of the national standards.

Aggregate benchmark scores and ePortfolio evaluation scores from summer 2018 through spring 2019 were gathered May 2019 by the Program Coordinator (see Table 1). Benchmark assignment scores above 85% were deemed acceptable, and students were required to score "Meets Standards" on each component of the ePortfolio to pass this degree requirement.

Results indicated that students performed at or above acceptable levels on all benchmark assignments. For the ePortfolio 17 of 17 students successfully passed the requirement. The rubric

for the ePortfolio utilizes a "Meets Standards" (2); "Minor Revisions" (1); or "Major Revisions" (0) scale. For the purpose of this evaluation the rankings were converted to a numerical score and the student scores were averaged for each of the sub-standards. **Students were allowed to submit one revision of the portfolio to address deficiencies**. **Scores listed in Table 1 are first submission scores**.

Benchmark assessments from coursework which addressed the specific sub-standards which have mean scores below 85% will serve as guidelines for potential revisions to the curriculum for the 2019-2020 cycle. For the ePortfolio, areas which had a score average below 1.5 (on the 2 point scale) will serve as guidelines for potential curriculum revision. The goal of this targeted intervention is to attempt to more effectively address these competencies during coursework to prepare students for the cumulative ePortfolio. Table 1 demonstrates the benchmark average scores for 2018-2019.

Table 1. Average Scores on Benchmark Assignments and Culminating ePortfolio Summer 2018 thru Spring 2019

AECT Standard		2018-2019 Benchmark Avg.	2019-2019 ePortfolio Avg. (N=17) 2 pt. scale
Standard 1: Content Knowledge			**1.6 (average score)***
	1.1	93.6%	1.6
	1.2	85.7%	1.7
	1.3	91%	1.5
	1.4	94.1%	1.5
	1.5	100%	1.5
Standard 2: Content Pedagogy			**1.6 (average of scores)***
	2.1	98.2%	1.6
	2.2	93.3%	1.5
	2.3	96.3%	1.6
	2.4	94.1%	1.7
	2.5	N/A	1.8
Standard 3: Learning Environments			**1.6 (average of scores)***
	3.1	93.6%	1.6
	3.2	91%	1.4
	3.3	85.1%	1.7
	3.4	94.1%	1.4
	3.5	100%	1.7
	3.6	N/A	1.7
Standard 4: Professional Knowledge and Skills			**1.7 (average of scores)***
	4.1	93.3%	1.8
	4.2	94.5%	1.7
	4.3	93.2%	**
	4.4	86.7%	1.4
	4.5	85.7%	1.8
Standard 5: Research			**1.5 (average of scores)***
	5.1	91.5%	1.4
	5.2	92.4%	1.4
	5.3	92.8%	1.6

	5.4	94.1%	1.5
AECT Standard		2017-2018 Benchmark Avg.	2017-2018 ePortfolio Avg. (N=12)*
Standard 1: Content Knowledge			**80%**
	1.1	87%	78%
	1.2	93%	83%
	1.3	88%	83%
	1.4	94%	79%
	1.5	93%	79%
Standard 2: Content Pedagogy			**79%**
	2.1	89%	81%
	2.2	86%	75%
	2.3	92%	81%
	2.4	93%	81%
	2.5	91%	77%
Standard 3: Learning Environments			**81%**
	3.1	87%	77%
	3.2	93%	82%
	3.3	94%	83%
	3.4	93%	83%
	3.5	92%	85%
	3.6	95%	80%
Standard 4: Professional Knowledge and Skills			**80%**
	4.1	88%	84%
	4.2	92%	81%
	4.3	85%	**
	4.4	87%	80%
	4.5	93%	76%
Standard 5: Research			**80%**
	5.1	83%	81%
	5.2	83%	82%
	5.3	85%	74%
	5.4	93%	83%

*Indicates initial average scores on the first submission. Students are allowed one revision of the portfolio after faculty feedback. Pass rate for 2018-2019 for students was 100%.

**Indicates standard that is met by the production of the ePortfolio so this standard is not evaluated by the rubric

Changes to the degree/program made or planned on the basis of the assessment and analysis

Based on the results we will examine the ePortfolio process to determine if areas of performance with mean scores below 1.5 were due to instruction methods or scoring criterion of the ePortfolio or whether learning gaps exist. Also, an inquiry regarding potential changes in the content of courses outside of our department (as noted in the Standard 5 Research standards) will be

investigated. Additionally, there were two sub-standards that were not assessed during this cycle due to curriculum/assignment changes in which benchmark assessments were not tagged in our Blackboard system for the collection of data. We will be re-evaluating to identify assignments and/or retag those not identified in Blackboard to ensure data is obtained for all sub-standards.

We are also in the process of receiving data from a market analysis from Global Campus for the process of program recruiting. The results may lead to changes in course titles and re-alignment of content to meet market demands.

The Arkansas Department of Education has just recently approved an additional area of certification for K-12 Online Teaching. We are in the process of preparing a proposal for the coursework in our Graduate Certificate to be aligned to the criterion which would allow students with an initial area of teacher licensure to receive certification. If approved this option would take effect fall 2020 and may require some revision of coursework to meet State guidelines.

Changes to the assessment process made or planned

Based on these results we do not plan any changes to the assessment process for the next cycle other than re-evaluating our assessment alignment with the redesign of courses to ensure we have a benchmark assessment throughout the curriculum that assesses each sub-standard.