



**PREPARING
EXEMPLARY
PRACTITIONERS** | FIELD-BASED
INQUIRY
PROFESSIONAL
EXCELLENCE
BETTERMENT
OF SOCIETY
Adaptive • Proactive • Decisive • Leading • Reflective • Inquisitive
Knowledgeable • Collaborative • Empathetic • Culturally Sensitive

PROGRAM DATA REPORT

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY ED.S.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

SUMMER AND FALL 2013; SPRING 2014

PREPARED BY

STEPHANIE SIEGEL, ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SPECIALIST

Program Admissions/Production Information

Admissions and Active Majors*

| Active Majors Admitted 3+ Years Ago (2010-2011 or prior) | Active Majors Admitted 2 Years Ago (2011-2012) | Active Majors Admitted 1 Year Ago (2012-2013) | Current Active Majors 2013-2014 |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 3 | 19 | 94 | 196 |


*Banner Report ED2505

Completers*

| Admissions | Completers | Active Majors |
|------------|------------|---------------|
| 30 | 69 | 79 |


* Banner Report ED2465

Race-Active Majors (N=196)*




* Banner Report ED2505

Gender-Active Majors (N=196)*



*Banner Report 2505

Credit Hour Production- All MEDT Graduate Courses (N=5349)*



* Banner Report ED2270

Assessment Results

Learning Outcomes Report*

Mean scores are reported for each assessment used for each specified criterion.

| Disposition 1 Rubric (Discontinued) assessed in MEDT 6463 and MEDT 8463 | |
|--|------------------------|
| ➤ Outcome 3 Candidates demonstrate professional dispositions and ethics | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2012-2013 (N=1) |
| Collaboration | 4 |
| Communication | 4 |
| Diversity | 4 |
| Professional Ethics | 4 |

| Initial SWOT Rubric assessed in MEDT 8463 and MEDT 8464 | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ➤ Outcome 1 Candidates demonstrate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills | | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2011-2012 (N=12) | 2012-2013 (N=15) |
| Strengths | 3 | 3 |
| Weaknesses | 3 | 3 |
| Opportunities | 3 | 3 |
| Threats | 3 | 3 |
| Goals | 2.75 | 3 |

| MEDT IT Professional Standards Rubric assessed in the IT Ed.S. Portfolio | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Outcome 1 Candidates demonstrate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills ➤ Outcome 2 Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate learning opportunities for all students ➤ Outcome 3 Candidates demonstrate professional dispositions and ethics ➤ Outcome 4 Candidates demonstrate ability to serve needs of diverse populations including special needs | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2012-2013 (N=137) |
| Professional Standards Matrix: The table for the Professional Standards Matrix has been completed and uploaded. | 3.86 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Artifact Identification: At least 2 artifacts are included for each standard with the following information: artifact titles, 3 - 5 sentence description, file names, course taken, and aligned Conceptual Framework descriptors. | 3.9 |
| Artifact File Uploads: All artifact files are uploaded. | 3.96 |
| Reflective Narrative File Uploads: All reflective narrative files are uploaded. | 3.95 |
| Standards and Conceptual Framework Alignment: The standards and conceptual framework descriptors are aligned accurately with the artifacts. | 3.88 |
| Reflective Narrative: Each reflective narrative is approximately 100 words. The reflection includes a rationale for selection of the artifact. The narrative makes a clear connection to the relevant standards and Conceptual Framework descriptors. | 3.87 |

| MEDT IT Evaluation Plan Rubric assessed in the IT Ed.S. Portfolio | |
|---|--------------------------|
| ➤ Outcome 2 Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate learning opportunities for all students | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2012-2013 (N=137) |
| Introduction: The introduction provides a context for the evaluation. Background information describes the organization that is being evaluated. Evaluation clients and stakeholders are identified. | 3.2 |
| Purpose: The purpose of the evaluation is explained. Indication that evaluation is formative or summative (or both) is included. An explanation is included that shows how the evaluation is relevant to impact on the learning environment and/or student learning. Potential decisions that may result from the evaluation are described (e.g., discontinue a program). | 3.42 |
| Evaluation Questions: Objectives relevant to the evaluation are listed. Evaluation questions are listed. The evaluation questions show a direct relationship to the objectives. | 3.24 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Methods: Evaluation methods are described and include the following items. Participants are described. Design and Procedures are described. The Design and Procedures show a direct relationship to the evaluation questions. Instruments are described (developed or adopted instruments). The instruments show a direct relationship to the evaluation questions. | 2.84 |
| Data Analysis: Plans for data analysis are described in relation to the evaluation design and data collection instruments. | 2.55 |
| Conclusion: Plans for reporting results are described (e.g., written report to client, presentation at faculty meeting, other). | 3.56 |
| References: Relevant references are listed (no minimum or maximum requirement). Decide what is relevant. | 3.47 |
| Appendix for Instruments: A copy of each instrument is included. (In the case of instruments such as school district benchmarks that cannot be published, just indicate that in your plan.) Information sought with the instruments shows a direct relationship to the evaluation questions. Construction of each instrument is high quality. | 2.72 |

| MEDT SLM/IT Ed.S. Impact on Student Learning Rubric assessed in MEDT 7487 and MEDT 8484 | |
|---|------------------------|
| ➤ Outcome 2 Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate learning opportunities for all students | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2012-2013 (N=2) |
| Design for Instruction and Assessment | 3 |
| Analysis of Student Learning | 3 |
| Reflection on Student Learning | 4 |

| Instructional Planning Skills Rubric assessed in the IT Ed.S. Portfolio for MEDT 7464 | |
|---|-------------------------|
| ➤ Outcome 1 Candidates demonstrate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills | |
| ➤ Outcome 2 Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate learning opportunities for all students | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2013-2014 (N=38) |
| 1. Analysis ☐ Conducts learner, task, and context analyses and provides detailed information. | 3.63 |

| | |
|--|------|
| 2. Design ☐ Designs technology-enhanced instruction that meets the needs of the target audience. | 3.71 |
| 3. Development ☐ Develops and produces high-quality instructional materials. | 3.97 |

| Quality of Service Rubric assessed in the IT Ed.S. Portfolio for MEDT 7464 | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Outcome 1 Candidates demonstrate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills ➤ Outcome 2 Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate learning opportunities for all students | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2013-2014 (N=35) |
| 1. Accommodation: willingness to respond to client/supervisor needs with a positive demeanor. | 3.97 |
| 2. Communication: ability to actively listen to client/supervisor and gather information along with ability to illustrate ideas and rationales that are helpful in meeting stakeholders' needs. | 4 |
| 3. Expertise: demonstrates competence in designing, developing, and evaluating products and processes to meet stakeholders' needs. | 3.94 |

| Quality of Service Rubric assessed in the IT Ed.S. Portfolio for MEDT 7490 | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Outcome 1 Candidates demonstrate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills ➤ Outcome 2 Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate learning opportunities for all students | |
| Rubric Criteria | 2013-2014 (N=11) |
| 1. Accommodation: willingness to respond to client/supervisor needs with a positive demeanor. | 4 |
| 2. Communication: ability to actively listen to client/supervisor and gather information along with ability to illustrate ideas and rationales that are helpful in meeting stakeholders' needs. | 4 |
| 3. Expertise: demonstrates competence in designing, developing, and evaluating products and processes to meet stakeholders' needs. | 3.91 |

* Tk20 Report: West Georgia COE Standards Report

Dispositions Rubric Results (MEDT External Client Responses Only)

MEDT 7464 (IT) Dispositions Rubric (N=28)

| | % Unacceptable | % Developing | % Proficient | % Exemplary | Mean |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| Professionalism: Time and Quality Management | 0% | 0% | 3.57% | 96.43% | 3.96 |
| Professionalism: Professional Demeanor | 0% | 0% | 3.57% | 96.43% | 3.96 |
| Professionalism: Responsive and Adaptive | 0% | 0% | 35.71% | 64.29% | 3.64 |
| Professionalism: Ethical and Honest | 0% | 0% | 10.71% | 89.29% | 3.89 |
| Communication: Verbal Communication | 0% | 0% | 25.93% | 74.07% | 3.74 |
| Communication: Written Communication | 0% | 0% | 17.86% | 82.14% | 3.82 |
| Belief that All can Learn: Respects Individual Differences | 0% | 0% | 3.57% | 96.43% | 3.96 |
| Fairness: Equity in all Settings | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 4.0 |
| Collaboration: Interactions with Others | 0% | 0% | 7.14% | 92.86% | 3.93 |
| Total/Percentage | 0% | 0% | 12% | 88% | |

MEDT 7490 (IT) Dispositions Rubric (N=11)

| | % Unacceptable | % Developing | % Proficient | % Exemplary | Mean |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| Professionalism: Time and Quality Management | 0% | 0% | 9.09% | 90.91% | 3.91 |
| Professionalism: Professional Demeanor | 0% | 0% | 9.09% | 90.91% | 3.91 |
| Professionalism: Responsive and Adaptive | 0% | 0% | 9.09% | 90.91% | 3.91 |
| Professionalism: Ethical and Honest | 0% | 0% | 9.09% | 90.91% | 3.91 |
| Communication: Verbal Communication | 0% | 0% | 18.18% | 81.82% | 3.82 |
| Communication: Written Communication | 0% | 0% | 18.18% | 81.82% | 3.82 |
| Belief that All can Learn: Respects Individual Differences | 0% | 0% | 9.09% | 90.91% | 3.91 |
| Fairness: Equity in all Settings | 0% | 0% | 18.18% | 81.82% | 3.82 |
| Collaboration: Interactions with Others | 0% | 0% | 9.09% | 90.91% | 3.91 |
| Total/Percentage | 0% | 0% | 12.12% | 87.88% | |

* Portfolios 070: Aggregate Report on Portfolio Assessments by Program

Diversity Rubric Results (MEDT External Client Responses Only)*

MEDT 7464 (IT) Diversity Rubric (N=28)

| | % Unacceptable | % Developing | % Proficient | % Exemplary | Mean |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| 1. Age/Grade Level Diversity: Designs instructional materials appropriate for students' age and developmental level. | 0% | 0% | 3.57% | 96.43% | 3.96 |
| 2. English Language Learners: Designs instructional materials appropriate for the learning and social emotional needs of English Language Learners and their families. | 0% | 0% | 11.54% | 88.46% | 3.88 |
| 3. Special Needs: Designs instructional materials appropriate for the learning and social emotional needs of students with special needs and their families. | 0% | 0% | 11.11% | 88.89% | 3.89 |
| 4. Demographic (Race/Ethnicity) Diversity: Designs instructional materials inclusive of cultural context. | 0% | 0% | 3.57% | 96.43% | 3.96 |
| Total/Percentage | 0% | 0% | 7.34% | 92.66% | |

MEDT 7490 (IT) Diversity Rubric (N=7)

| | % Unacceptable | % Developing | % Proficient | % Exemplary | Mean |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| 1. Age/Grade Level Diversity: Designs instructional materials appropriate for students' age and developmental level. | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 4 |
| 2. English Language Learners: Designs instructional materials appropriate for the learning and social emotional needs of English Language Learners and their families. | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 4 |
| 3. Special Needs: Designs instructional materials appropriate for the learning and social emotional needs of students with special needs and their families. | 0% | 0% | 25% | 75% | 3.75 |
| 4. Demographic (Race/Ethnicity) Diversity: Designs instructional materials inclusive of cultural context. | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 4 |
| Total/Percentage | 0% | 0% | 4.35% | 95.65% | |

* Portfolios 070: Aggregate Report on Portfolio Assessments by Program