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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Goals

G 1: Student presentations
Increase the number of students presenting at regional and national conferences.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
Students acquire knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 1: AIL 601 Final Project
Knowledge of key learning theories in the AIL 601 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

M 2: AIL 602 Final Project
Ability to apply instructional design theory in the AIL 602 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

SLO 2: Skills & Abilities
Students acquire the ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 3: Scholarly Publications
Scholarly papers at a professional or academic conference.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
25% or more of Ph.D. students who have passed comprehensive examinations will present papers or publish articles

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Article publication
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Mentor students who presented papers at conferences to revise those papers and submit them to journals.
M 4: Portfolio Results
The Portfolio, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

SLO 3: Understand and Assess Research Methods
Students are able to understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 5: Methods of Inquiry
Ability to select methods of inquiry appropriate to a chosen problem statement on the AIL 689 Research Question Assignment, as assessed by the program rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Focused studies
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Students need to understand how to focus their proposed study.

M 6: Dissertation Proposal
The dissertation proposal, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

SLO 4: Design & Conduct a Research Study
Students have the ability to design and conduct a research study.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 7: Pilot Study
The AIL 689 Pilot Study to design a research study, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

M 8: Dissertation Defense
The dissertation defense, as assessed by the program rubric.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Improve and Sustain Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 9: Scholarly Conferences
Academic papers at scholarly conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
20% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

M 10: Student Satisfaction
Annual survey of students to identify program issues.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Students should express broad satisfaction with all elements of the program.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We are awaiting the results of a current student survey to be administered in December 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Student survey
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The College of Education will survey its current students in December 2013.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

OthOtcn 6: Program Outcome: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 11: Program Completion
Program completion

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
75% of graduating students should complete the program in under 6 years

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

M 12: Rate of Attrition
The rate of attrition.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
The rate of attrition will be less than 35%

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

OthOtcn 7: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Graduates and Constituencies
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 13: Exit Interview
The exit interview

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Alumni survey
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 14: Alumni Survey
The survey of former graduates will demonstrate a strong positive estimation of the program and its impact on their careers.

Source ofEvidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

TBD

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Graduates Survey
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Alumni survey
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Exit Interview | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Graduates and Constituencies
Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean's Office
Additional Resources: None

Article publication
Mentor students who presented papers at conferences to revise those papers and submit them to journals.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Scholarly Publications | Outcome/Objective: Skills & Abilities
Implementation Description: Department head will work with faculty to encourage this mentoring.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty members in program.
Additional Resources: None

Focused studies
Students need to understand how to focus their proposed study.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Methods of Inquiry | Outcome/Objective: Understand and Assess Research Methods
Implementation Description: The instructors for AIL 689 will develop approaches to assist students in the challenging task of creating a study that is neither too broad nor too narrow.
Responsible Person/Group: AIL 689 instructors
Additional Resources: None

Grades Survey
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Graduates and Constituencies
Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean's Office
Additional Resources: None

Student survey
The College of Education will survey its current students in December 2013.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Student Satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Improve and Sustain Program Quality
Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean's Office
Additional Resources: None
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes--as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
Students acquire knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 1: AIL 601 Final Project
Knowledge of key learning theories in the AIL 601 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Ninety percent of the students scored 4 or higher on their knowledge of key learning theories for the AIL 601 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric. Most of the students are demonstrating knowledge of key learning theories.

M 2: AIL 602 Final Project
Ability to apply instructional design theory in the AIL 602 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students scored 4 or higher on their ability to apply instructional design theory for the AIL 602 Final Project.

SLO 2: Skills & Abilities
Students acquire the ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 3: Scholarly Publications
Scholarly papers at a professional or academic conference.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
25% or more of Ph.D. students who have passed comprehensive examinations will present papers or publish articles.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
One-third of the doctoral Ph.D. students who passed comprehensive examinations presented papers; none published articles.

M 4: Portfolio Results
The Portfolio, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Four students submitted their portfolios. The average of their evaluations are: Language 4.1 Argument 3.91 Literature 4 Organization 3.95

SLO 3: Understand and Assess Research Methods
Students are able to understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature.

**Connected Document**
Curriculum Maps

**Related Measures**

### M 5: Methods of Inquiry
Ability to select methods of inquiry appropriate to a chosen problem statement on the AIL 689 Research Question Assignment, as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
All students scored 4 or higher (on the program rubric) on the AIL 689 (the pilot study course for the program) Research Question Assignment for their ability to select methods of inquiry appropriate to a chosen problem. They continue to tend to select problems that are too broad.

### M 6: Dissertation Proposal
The dissertation proposal, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
All of the students passed their proposal presentation; not surprisingly, some students had to make changes to their initial proposal.

### SLO 4: Design & Conduct a Research Study
Students have the ability to design and conduct a research study.

**Connected Document**
Curriculum Maps

**Related Measures**

### M 7: Pilot Study
The AIL 689 Pilot Study to design a research study, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
All of the students in AIL, a pilot study course, scored 4 or higher on the program rubric.

### M 8: Dissertation Defense
The dissertation defense, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Five students defended their dissertations. Students showed improvement in their scholarly writing from the proposal presentation to the dissertation defense as evidenced by providing more clearly defined conceptual/theoretical frameworks and more appropriately chosen research designs. Program rubric results:
Language 3.7 Argument 3.8 Literature 4.4 Organization 4.0

### Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Improve and Sustain Program Quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

**Connected Document**
Curriculum Maps

**Related Measures**

### M 9: Scholarly Conferences
Academic papers at scholarly conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
20% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fifteen students presented papers at scholarly conferences, and four of those presented at two or more conferences. Eight of the students had passed their comprehensive examinations.

### M 10: Student Satisfaction
Annual meeting with students to discuss program issues.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
Students should express broad satisfaction with all elements of the program.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
We are awaiting the results of a current student survey to be administered in December 2013.

**OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

*Connected Document*
Curriculum Maps

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Program Completion**
Program completion

*Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other*

*Target:*
75% of graduating students should complete the program in under 6 years

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*
2012-2013 graduates on average took just under 5 years to graduate, with one receiving a one-semester extension.

**M 12: Rate of Attrition**
The rate of attrition.

*Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other*

*Target:*
The rate of attrition will be less than 35%

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*
Two of eight students admitted in 2007-2008 have left the program, a 25% attrition rate.

**OthOtcm 7: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Graduates and Constituencies**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

*Connected Document*
Curriculum Maps

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Exit Interview**
The exit interview

*Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers*

*Target:*
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle*
We are awaiting the results of a graduates survey to be administered in December 2013.

**M 14: Alumni Survey**
The survey of former graduates will demonstrate a strong positive estimation of the program and its impact on their careers.

*Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements*

*Target:*
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle*
We are awaiting the results of an alumni and alumnae survey to be administered in December 2013.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
Students acquire knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 1: AIL 601 Final Project
Knowledge of key learning theories in the AIL 601 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of students scored 4 or higher on their knowledge of key learning theories for the AIL 601 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric. Students are demonstrating knowledge of key learning theories guiding the field of instructional technology in their final projects.

M 2: AIL 602 Final Project
Ability to apply instructional design theory in the AIL 602 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of students scored 4 or higher on their ability to apply instructional design theory for the AIL 602 Final Project, as assessed by the program rubric. Students are demonstrating knowledge of instructional design theory in the completion of their class project, a written report with five components representing the five phases of the instructional design process.

SLO 2: Skills & Abilities
Students acquire the ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of a scholarly research.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 3: Scholarly Publications
Scholarly papers at a professional or academic conference.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
20% or more of students who have passed comprehensive examinations

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met
7 students presented 9 academic papers and published one article in the 2011-2012 academic year. This includes **% of those who have passed comprehensive examinations.

While many students are presenting, some students are not presenting at all. This indicates that some students are not using these outlets to demonstrate their ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework. Other students have submitted publications to journals, although they are finding it difficult to get accepted.

M 4: Portfolio Results
The Portfolio, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target: 80% or more of students will score 3

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met

Three students submitted portfolios this academic year. Their evaluations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While students are passing the portfolio activity, they are not reaching the highest levels of excellence. Of some concern is the portion of the portfolio where students articulate their philosophy of instructional technology and demonstrate knowledge of literature.

SLO 3: Understand and Assess Research Methods

Students are able to understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 5: Methods of Inquiry
Ability to select methods of inquiry appropriate to a chosen problem statement on the AIL 689 Research Question Assignment, as assessed by the program rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of students scored 4 or higher on the AIL 689 Research Question Assignment for their ability to select methods of inquiry appropriate to a chosen problem statement, as assessed by the program rubric. Students struggle with problem definition and determining appropriate research methods at the beginning of the course. They tend to select problems that are too broad. With instructor assistance and following class procedures, most students are able to clearly define a problem and select appropriate research methods.

M 6: Dissertation Proposal
The dissertation proposal, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of students successfully passed their proposal defense, although some students had to make substantial changes to their initial proposal. Problem selection, sound scholarly writing and intelligent organization are areas that challenge students most in proposal development and defense. These weaknesses manifest themselves in the form of poorly defined conceptual/theoretical frameworks and inappropriate research designs. The average responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Knowledge of Literature</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Scholarly Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO 4: Design & Conduct a Research Study

Students have the ability to design and conduct a research study.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 7: Pilot Study
The AIL 689 Pilot Study to design a research study, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 4 or higher

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of students scored 4 or higher for the AIL 689 Pilot Study to design a research study, as assessed by the program rubric. Although students are able to complete a research study and develop a manuscript, they struggle with data analysis, scholarly writing and APA format.

M 8: Dissertation Defense
The dissertation defense, as assessed by the program rubric.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Three students successfully defended their dissertations, although some received less than a 4 certain sections of the the rubric. Students improve in their scholarly writing organization skills from the proposal defense to the dissertation defense as evidenced by providing more clearly defined conceptual/theoretical frameworks and more appropriately chosen research designs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Improve and Sustain Program Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 9: Scholarly Conferences
Academic papers at scholarly conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
20% of PhD students who have passed comprehensive examinations

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Students presented nine conference papers in 2011-2012, including two of the eight students who have passed comprehensive examinations; 25%. There was one publication.

M 10: Student Satisfaction
Annual meeting with students to discuss program issues.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Students should express broad satisfaction with all elements of the program.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Discussion at the annual student orientation reveals strong and positive responses from students on the quality of the program. They are happy with the curriculum, instruction, and peer relationships.

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Optimal Program Enrollments and Degree Completion
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 11: Program Completion
Program completion

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
75% of graduating students should complete the program in under 6 years

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Analysis of graduating class demonstrates an average time to completion of degree as 4.2 years for 3 students

All completed in under 6 years.

M 12: Rate of Attrition
The rate of attrition.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
The rate of attrition will be less than 35%

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Four of 12 students admitted in 2006-2007 have dropped out of the program. This is an attrition rate of 33%

OthOtcm 7: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Graduates and Constituencies
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Connected Document
Curriculum Maps

Related Measures

M 13: Exit Interview
The exit interview

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
None of the graduating students responded to the request to complete the exit survey.

**M 14: Alumni Survey**

The survey of former graduates will demonstrate a strong positive estimation of the program and its impact on their careers.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**

80% of responses will be positive across the various survey items

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This survey will be conducted at the beginning of the fall semester.
### Curriculum Map I (Student Learning Outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.</td>
<td>Ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of scholarly research.</td>
<td>Understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature.</td>
<td>Ability to design and conduct a research study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Course 1       | AIL 601                | X                                                                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                        |
|                | AIL 602                | X                                                                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                        |
| Course 3       | AIL 604                |                                                                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                        |
|                | AIL 605                |                                                                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                        |
|                | AIL 606                | X                                                                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                        |
| Course 7       | AIL 690                |                                                                                        | X                                                                                       |                                                                                        |
|                | CAT 689                | X                                                                                       | X                                                                                       |                                                                                        |
| Course 9       | BER 540                |                                                                                        | X                                                                                       | X                                                                                       |
## Curriculum Map II (Assessment Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field of instructional technology.</td>
<td>Ability to articulate and defend a conceptual framework within the context of scholarly research.</td>
<td>Understand and critically assess research methods employed in scholarly literature.</td>
<td>Ability to design and conduct a research study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIL 601</strong></td>
<td><strong>AIL 602</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAT 689</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Project on Learning Theory</td>
<td>Final Project using Instructional Design Theory</td>
<td>Academic presentations and scholarly papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly Work</th>
<th>Comprehensive Examinations</th>
<th>The Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Exercise</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>The Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty evaluate student work on four criteria, according to the rubric below.

(1) organization, accuracy and comprehensiveness,
(2) consistency with the concepts and ideas found in the current literature,
(3) the production of a logical, valid, and persuasive argument, and
(4) the demonstration of scholarly writing.

The point scale used to evaluate student responses on these four categories:

5 = Excellent answer, all points of the question are answered fully with comprehensive documentation. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear and concise.

4 = Good answer, well above average, all points of the question are answered with documentation that generally supports the answer. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear and concise. Errors in minor details of answers are tolerated.

3 = Answer is adequate, all points of the question are treated but at a minimal level and with sketchy documentation. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear. Minor errors are tolerated.

2 = Answer is inadequate, fewer than on half of the points called for by the question are answered and documentation is either lacking or is erroneous. Portions of the information are invalid and not pertinent. Organization lacks a logical flow and language is vague. Major points made in the answer are in error.

1 = Answer is less than would be expected from a competent graduate student. Documentation is absent and most of the information is incorrect. The answer does not address the question, lacks logical flow and indicates a deficiency in verbal skills.

0 = N/A The answer is inadequate, does not address the question and is incorrect.