

**University of Alaska Southeast
School of Education
Annual Assessment Report
Academic Year 2006-2007**

Educational Technology

**Marsha A. Gladhart
September 22, 2007**

Section One: Description of the assessment plan (be brief). This should include, at least, the standards and the assessments used. You should also include any special factors that impacted the assessment plan.

Portfolio scores: Candidates' scores on their Professional Portfolio are aligned with SOE goals and entered into the Education database. The ED Tech coordinator monitors these scores to determine areas of weakness and strength. An ED Tech Advisory Committee has met yearly to look at candidates' scores and determine needed changes in the program. Content of courses are modified to better prepare the candidates for the Professional Portfolio and to ensure that the program meets the SOE goals.

Gate Reports: With goals and expected performances identified and monitored, the ED Tech Program uses multiple assessments of candidate proficiency. Advanced candidates receive feedback at admission (Gate 1), midpoint (Gate 2), and exit (Gate 3). Each summer or fall candidates receive a progress report based on their progress through the three gates. I use the gate reports to give me an overall picture of candidate performance. Without access to the gate reports after my administrative assistant's departure, I have not been able to access the reports until this week.

Graduate Survey: In addition to candidate assessments prior to program completion, the ED Tech Program also assesses graduates through a follow-up survey. In past years, the results of the CTE First and Third Year Survey for Advanced Programs have been used to create improvement plans for the ED Tech Program. The response to this survey has been so limited that last year I created an independent online survey that I distributed again to 2007 graduates (see attached). This survey is based on the SOE goals and also provides feedback on course delivery. Informal surveys are also used when issues arise that need student input. I received only 1 response from this year's graduates making the data fairly useless.

Course Evaluations: The Program Coordinator also collects course evaluations from all ED Tech courses and uses those to work with adjuncts and faculty to improve course content and delivery. These course evaluations have also been used to determine a need to change adjunct instructors.

Section Two: Results of assessments during this year. This will be primarily aggregated data around the gates; however, there may be other assessments that need to be included in here related to specific courses, etc.

Portfolio: Since the Master's portfolio is a major assessment piece in our program, The Portfolio scores as reported from the education database show that portfolio scores have been acceptable to optional for all graduates.

Course Evaluations:

Course evaluations show that all instructors, adjunct and full time, received satisfactory evaluations. Comments by the candidates completing ED 673 indicated that the networking course needed updating and revision. A new instructor is being sought to teach this course and major revisions are planned to make the course more practical. The new Leadership course has been very well received.

Gate Reports: The Ed Tech program had 16 new admissions during the 2006-2007. The ED Tech Program had 9 candidates complete the Graduate Certificate in 2006-2007. This is the first year we have been able to track candidates who complete the requirements for their Alaska State endorsement in educational Technology. The MEd Program had 6 graduates in 2006-2007. The gate reports indicate that all students met the gate criteria on at least an acceptable level in all areas (content knowledge, dispositions, pedagogical and professional pedagogical, and student learning) and a majority of the students received Optimal ratings.

Graduate Survey: The survey of program completers collected data from 5 (out of 15 possible) program completers (both Graduate Certificate and MEd candidates) for 2006-2007. (see attached) Only one responder was a MEd graduate: the other 4 were Graduate Certificate completers. The feedback from this survey indicates that three areas may need improvement: Goal 1: The UAS ED Tech Program helped you articulate, maintain, and develop a philosophy of education that you also demonstrate in practice. Goal 2: The UAS Ed Tech Program helped understand how human development affects learning and apply that understanding to practice, and Goal 7: The UAS Ed Tech Program helped you work as partners with parents, families, and community. Analysis of the individual responses shows that only one respondent rated these levels as needing improvement so there is no general agreement among the four respondents that these areas need improvement.

The instruction evaluation section and the comments section of this survey showed that the instruction in the program exceeded expectations for all but one student who judged the instruction as meeting expectations.

Section Three: Modifications to the curriculum based on the assessments

As a result of our program assessment and course evaluations, we determined that ED 628 (the entry course for our program and a required technology course for the Reading and ECE MEd programs) was not focused enough on technology integration. The adjunct instructor and I continue to work on the content of this course to focus more on technology integration. Student feedback for the new instructor of this course is satisfactory in all areas and very positive in some areas.

To improve candidate preparation for the final portfolio and reduce frustration level with the ePortfolio tool, candidates are being exposed to the ePortfolio tool early and throughout the program. In addition, the APA Concise Handbook is now a required textbook for all ED Tech courses which has had a significant impact on student success and lessened frustration in drafting their graduate portfolio.

Last year I implemented one assignment in ED 635 to address cultural differences. The content and quality of candidates' responses to this assignment has improved during the second year of implementation. I'm very pleased with the success of this assignment and was pleasantly surprised when the first program completer survey was returned with a rating of Exceeds Expectation for both of these areas.

Section Four: Modifications to the assessment plan for next year.

I continue to hope SOE will be able to create an exit survey and follow up for all advanced programs that I can use. If not, I will continue to use the program completer survey that I implemented last year and hope for the best. I will communicate the results of the program completer survey to the instructors for their consideration. Since some of the candidates have not gone through the complete MEd curriculum, I'm wondering if having completed the final courses required for the MEd would have made a difference in their responses. With more data to work with, this might be a consideration but with 4 responses, the data is too weak to drive major changes in the program.

The dispositions assessment tool currently being used is not satisfactory as it is. I tried a new approach used by other programs in asking students to evaluate their dispositions themselves. The process was unwieldy and really didn't provide the kind of data I wanted to track. I'm still not happy with the results so I have created a new online survey (see attached) that will be piloted with ED 635 enrollees (approximately midway through the program) to both Graduate Certificate and MEd candidates this fall. Hopefully, this survey will provide some data I can use in my program assessment and an opportunity for candidates to reflect on their professional dispositions.

Educational Technology, University of Alaska Southeast
2006-07 Annual Report on Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
 Marsha Gladhart, Assessment Coordinator
 October 2007

Mission Statement

The Educational Technology Program at UAS provides students with knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to successfully complete a Graduate Certificate which leads to an Alaska State Endorsement in Educational Technology or a Master of Education in Educational Technology Degree. Specifically, the Educational Technology Program at UAS is intended to:

- prepare educators to manage, implement, and integrate educational technology in a standards-based learning environment.
- develop leaders in educational technology that understand and act on research-based practices and implementation that lead to improved student learning.
- provide an academically challenging career advancement opportunity for Alaskan educators who need the flexibility of a distance program.

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Methods

Learning Outcomes:	Assessment Method(s): Describe how student outcomes are assessed per plan
Graduate Certificate and MEd	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates articulate, maintain, and develop a philosophy of education that they also demonstrate in practice. 	ED 628 Backward Design Unit ED 635 Written Assignment on emerging technologies ED 698 Graduate Portfolio
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates understand how human development affects learning and apply that understanding to practice. 	ED 626 Classroom Research action research project ED 698 Graduate Portfolio
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates differentiate instruction with respect for individual and cultural characteristics. 	ED 628 Backward Design Unit ED 635 Written assignment on assistive technology ED 635 Online discussion and research of culturally responsive technology ED 698 Graduate Portfolio
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates possess current academic content knowledge. 	ED 632 Primary Sources Assignment ED 633 Integrated Project ED 634 Multimedia Project ED 635 Professional Development Assignment ED 626 Action Research Project ED 698 Graduate Portfolio
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates facilitate student learning by using assessment to guide planning, instruction, and modification of teaching practice. 	ED 628 Backward Design Unit ED 632 WebQuest ED 670 Technology Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates create and manage a stimulating, inclusive, and safe learning community in which students take intellectual risks and work independently and collaboratively. 	ED 673 Networking Logical NW Map, BackUp Plan, and Acceptable Use Policy ED 670 Technology Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates work as partners with parents, families, and community. 	ED 632 Online Communication assignment ED 670 Needs assessment assignment for tech plan project ED 668 Online discussion on community partnerships

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates develop and maintain professional, moral, and ethical attitudes, behaviors, relationships, and habits of mind. 	ED 635 Written assignment on unintended consequences of technology and discussions on ethical issues ED 632 AUP ED 670 Technology plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates use technology effectively, creatively, and wisely. 	ED 698 Graduate Portfolio All ED Tech Course assignments are based on this goal.

Data Collection and Analysis

- Collect and evaluate artifacts from ED 635
- Disposition survey based on SOE Advanced Program Disposition Rubric
- Course evaluations
- Completer's survey
- Ongoing monitoring of Grade Point Average of admitted candidates
- Scores from graduate portfolio rubric as aligned to ISTE Technology Leadership standards

Key Findings (2006-07):

- Artifacts collected from ED 635 show students are meeting the dispositions as identified in the SOE Advanced Program Disposition Rubric
- Course evaluations and student feedback via email show that ED 673 Networking needs to be updated and revised
- Course evaluations and faculty feedback indicate that the content and assignments in ED 628 has been revised to be more inclusive of technology integration.
- Completer survey indicates that in one student's view the program has excelled in helping candidates differentiate instruction and facilitating student learning by using assessments to guide instruction which is an improvement over last year's results.
- Completer's survey shows that the program is viewed as meeting all 9 SOE Objectives by 4 out of the 5 respondents with 3 areas pinpointed for needed improvement by one respondent.
- One student was placed on academic probation and has not continued the program.
- Scores on graduate portfolio show all students met the criteria in all areas on their final evaluation.

Program Changes Based on Assessment Results

- New instructor is being sought for ED 673 Networking and content will be revised to include more up-to-date content and broader issues for technology coordinators.
- Instructor for ED 628 has continued to revise assignments to include a stronger technology integration component. Faculty from feeding programs for that course will meet with the instructor via WebMeet to discuss changes in the course.
- Program review will be continued to reassess the validity of performance assessments in each course and to ascertain that all program goals are still being covered. Specific attention will be paid to the 3 areas identified by one program completer as needing improvement.

Assessment Plan Changes Based on Assessment Results

- Evaluation of dispositions for advanced program continues to be unsatisfactory. A new online survey has been developed and will be piloted Fall 2007 in ED 635 (an approximate midpoint in the program).
- The data collected from program completers continues to be a problem. Hopefully, this is an issue that will be addressed by SOE programs in the coming year.