

2006-2007 COEAS Annual Program Review (APR) Report

Instructional Design & Technology
Advanced Master of Science Program

COEAS Assessment Retreat
University of Memphis Millington Center
May 10, 2007

Instructional Design and Technology Masters of Science Degree Program

List of Annual Program Review participants:

Trey Martindale
Lee Allen
Michael Grant
Clif Mims
Deborah Lowther

Section I - Assessment of Candidate Proficiencies

1.1 - What do the summarized key assessment, exit survey, and graduate follow-up survey data sets show about candidate performance on each standard that was assessed? Please address each program standard separately by providing a brief analysis of the data findings; and an interpretation of how those data provide evidence for meeting the standards.

Summary: As seen in the following table, the MS IDT data representing Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 performance assessments yielded positive results. The overall mean assessment scores ranged from 1.47 to 1.86, with the overall mean score for IDT being 1.69. Only two standards were 1.50 or below, Standard 2 and 7. Six standards were 1.75 or above. Note that within each key assessment there are several items (sub-components) that are aligned with each professional standard. Overall, the candidates consistently exceeded the International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction (IBSTPI) standards for professionals in instructional design and technology.

PROGRAM OUTCOME STANDARDS FOR CANDIDATES	MEAN ASSESSMENT SCORES	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
1. Communicate effectively in visual, oral and written form.	1.77	This standard is addressed in all seven key assessments, with five assessment items recorded within the reporting period. All candidates exceeded expectations in all assessments except message design, which has a mean score of 1.5.
2. Apply current research and theory to the practice of instructional design.	1.50	This standard is addressed in two key assessments, with one assessment item recorded within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower in describing learning theory.

PROGRAM OUTCOME STANDARDS FOR CANDIDATES	MEAN ASSESSMENT SCORES	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
3. Update and improve one's knowledge, skills and attitudes pertaining to instructional design and related fields.	1.81	This standard is addressed in six key assessments, with nine assessment items recorded within the reporting period. Candidates exceeded expectations in almost all assessments.
4. Apply fundamental research skills to instructional design projects.	Not Available	This standard is addressed in one key assessment, with no assessment items recorded within the reporting period. The course with the key assessment was not taught during the reporting period.
5. Develop instructional materials.	1.76	This standard is addressed in five key assessments, with nine assessment items recorded within the reporting period. Candidates exceeded expectations in almost all assessments. Candidates had slightly lower scores in screen design, organization, and navigation.
6. Design instruction that reflects an understanding of the diversity of learners and groups of learners.	1.75	This standard is addressed in five key assessments, with five assessment items recorded within the reporting period. Candidates exceeded expectations in almost all assessments. Candidates had slightly lower scores in writing an analysis report.
7. Evaluate and assess instruction and its impact.	1.47	This standard is addressed in four key assessments, with six assessment items recorded within the reporting period. Candidates exceeded or met expectations in all assessments. Candidates had lower scores in developing assessment.
8. Plan and manage instructional design projects.	1.71	This standard is addressed in three key assessments, with three assessment items recorded within the reporting period. Candidates exceeded or met expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on product planning.

PROGRAM OUTCOME STANDARDS FOR CANDIDATES	MEAN ASSESSMENT SCORES	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
9. Promote collaboration, partnerships and relationships among the participants in a design project.	Not Available	This standard is addressed in one key assessment, with no assessment items recorded within the reporting period, as the course was not taught.
10. Provide for the effective implementation of instructional products and programs.	1.71	This standard is addressed in three key assessments, with three assessment items recorded within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on design product requirements.
11. Identify and resolve ethical and legal implications of design in the work place.	Not Available	This standard is addressed in two key assessments, with four assessment items. No items were recorded within the reporting period as these courses were not taught.
12. Conduct a needs assessment.	1.86	This standard is addressed in three key assessments and three assessment items. Three items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on writing the analysis report.
13. Design a curriculum or program.	1.75	This standard is addressed in two key assessments and three assessment items. Three items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on design product planning and content.
14. Select and use a variety of techniques for determining instructional content.	1.67	This standard is addressed in four key assessments and five assessment items. Five items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on content analysis, writing objectives, and motivational design.

PROGRAM OUTCOME STANDARDS FOR CANDIDATES	MEAN ASSESSMENT SCORES	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
15. Identify and describe target population characteristics.	1.69	This standard is addressed in four key assessments and four assessment items. Four items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on the analysis report and describing the target audience.
16. Analyze the characteristics of the environment.	1.69	This standard is addressed in four key assessments and four assessment items. Four items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on the analysis report and describing instructional strategies.
17. Analyze the characteristics of existing and emerging technologies and their use in an instructional environment.	1.69	This standard is addressed in four key assessments and four assessment items. Four items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on task analysis and instructional strategies.
18. Select, modify, or create a design and development model appropriate for a given project. (all students)	1.6	This standard is addressed in three key assessments and three assessment items. Three items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on instructional strategies and explaining learning theory.
19. Select and use a variety of techniques to define and sequence the instructional content and strategies.	1.62	This standard is addressed in four key assessments and four assessment items. Four items were assessed within the reporting period. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all assessments. Candidates scored slightly lower on instructional strategies, writing objectives, and motivational design principles.

PROGRAM OUTCOME STANDARDS FOR CANDIDATES	MEAN ASSESSMENT SCORES	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
Overall Mean Assessment Score	1.70	

1.2 - What specific short-term actions will be taken during the 2007-08 academic year in order to improve candidate performance? What are the long-term action implications? Please specify tasks and timelines for planned actions.

During the 2007-2008 academic year the IDT program faculty will review these assessment data and examine areas in which candidates appeared to have difficulty meeting assessment criteria. This review will occur in November 2007. The individual instructors will revise their instruction in areas where the assessment indicate candidates score lower than “exceeding expectations”. This will occur in December 2007 and January 2008. The faculty will also review areas where candidates are consistently exceeding expectations and document the instructional practices in these highly rated assessments. These reviews of instructional practice will occur in January 2008.

In the long-term, the IDT faculty will evaluate this process of review and revision of instruction and course content, and make this process part of the annual program revision system.

Section II - Assessment of Program Operations

2.1 - What do enrollment, exit survey, and graduate follow-up survey data sets show about the operations and quality of your program?

The IDT program does not currently conduct formal exit or graduate follow-up surveys. Because the program is relatively small, the faculty receive feedback from recent graduates via informal interaction and correspondence. The faculty maintains contact with graduates, current students, and interested community representatives through an electronic mailing list and interactive web presence.

2.2 - What specific short-term actions will be taken during the 2007-08 academic year in order to improve program operations and quality? What are the long-term action implications? Please specify tasks and timelines for planned actions.

SHORT-TERM ACTIONS	TIMELINE
1. Develop graduate exit survey to evaluate program effectiveness	November 2007
2. Develop graduate and alumni field survey to measure appropriateness of IDT graduate preparation for professional success	January 2008

SHORT-TERM ACTIONS	TIMELINE
3. Compile complete data on program graduates, contact information, and professional employment status	October 2007 to January 2008
4. Recruit an active and highly qualified advisory board of professionals to advise the program on curricular and professional issues	February 2008
5. Establish roles, procedures and expectations for the IDT advisory board	January 2008
6. Establish professional partnerships with corporate entities to create more opportunities for graduate student assistantships and co-operative work arrangements	February-March 2008

Over the long term these actions will enable the IDT program to be more responsive to needs of recent graduates. The program faculty will also be more aware of issues and changing dynamics in the workplace related to instructional design and technology. Potential employers will be more engaged with the program faculty and students. There will be increased opportunities to recruit highly qualified students for the IDT graduate programs.

Section III - Assessment System

3.1 - What changes need to be made in your program's candidate assessments and scoring guides or assessments of program operations during the 2007-08 academic year in order to provide more meaningful and useful data?

The IDT students are consistently scoring very high on the key assessments. This is in part due to the high quality of students admitted, and the instructional quality in individual courses. The IDT faculty will evaluate modifying the key assessment rubrics so they align more closely with the COEAS assessment system (meaning the 0, 1, 2 system of scoring performance).

3.2 – Overall, how can the College of Education Assessment System be changed to provide more meaningful and useful evidence regarding candidate performance and program operations?

It is possible that COEAS needs to allow for more finely-grained assessment than 0, 1, or 2 as assessment scores. A broader range of scores would increase variability, which would make for a richer data set from which to generalize across assessments and programs. In terms of program operations, the possibility of allowing advisory boards to formally assess programs would provide another type of feedback beyond assessing student performance.