Program Performance Review
Chair & Program Faculty Response

Date of Review: February 2025
Name/s of Reviewers: Christopher Newman, Joelle Prate, Kendall Hartley

---

To: Dean Kirtman
From: EDEL Chair (Michelle Brye) and MS Ed Tech Faculty (Loretta Donovan, Tim Green, Erin Besser)
Subject: MS Ed Tech PPR External Report
Date: February 18, 2025

EDEL Chair and Program coordinators' Response

The Internal PPR report and the External PPR report demonstrate that **the program performed exceedingly well in all areas**.

The external reviewers determined the MS in Educational Technology to be a **high-quality, well-run program** with strong faculty leadership, innovative curriculum, and a deep commitment to student success. The external reviewers, however, determined that **administrative support, faculty workload, and program sustainability** need to be addressed for continued program success and growth.

By securing **consistent advising support, clarifying financial resources, planning for faculty transitions (e.g., possible retirement), and enhancing student perceptions of culturally relevant teaching**, the program can **sustain its excellence while preparing for long-term expansion (i.e., possible EdD in Educational Technology).**

The table below shows the reviewers' responses and recommendations.

We appreciate the positive feedback and consideration of potential challenges to each section of the self-study. We agree with the challenges and are hopeful that our program design and dedication to continued program improvement will address these challenges if/when they arise. We are especially appreciative of the closing comments:

*We appreciate the opportunity to learn more about your program. We bring a variety of perspectives to the review but are in agreement that this is a high-quality program that is providing a great service to the university, college, and, most notably, the program participants. The faculty are to be applauded for their commitment to providing an engaging, deliberate, and well-planned collection of opportunities for participants. It can be difficult to find the right balance of rigor and time expectations in degree programs designed for working professionals. This program has leveraged technology, planning, and continuo*us improvement to attain that balance.

We determined there were **three primary recommendations** provided by the external review team. These were:
- **priority given to hire a tenure track faculty** in the near future (sections iv, vi, vii);
- **greater transparency and autonomy** for how the MS in Educational Technology program student online course fees can be and are applied directly to support the program (sections i, v, vi, vii); and
- **sustained support for program coordination** (sections iv, v, vi) that includes tasks such as--but not limited to--the advisement of students, recruitment of potential students, development and maintenance of the program student community (including alumni), on-going program evaluation (including the update of course content, course design and delivery)

We consider the **recommendations provided by the review teams to be valid**; hence, **our response** is essentially that we are in agreement with the recommendations. We hope the program can continue to be supported by the College and University to ensure we maintain the quality and reputation of the MS in Educational Technology.

I would like to thank the program coordinators for preparing the PPR report and the members of external and internal PPR committees for their work in identifying the program's strength and areas of possible growth.

I have addressed the items listed in the MS Ed Tech PPR external report in a column on the table below. As you can see from my comments in the table below, I am in agreement with the program coordinator's response.

Thank you again and look forward to following up with you on this report.

External review team's recommendations	Program Chair's Response
1.Department/ **Program Mission, Goals and Environment** **Recommendations:** It is reasonable for program participants to see direct benefits from student fees. This topic will be addressed in more detail in subsequent sections of the report.	I agree that the program participants (Ed Tech) students see direct benefits from the online student fees. These fees should be shared with the Ed Tech faculty.
II.Department/Program Description and Analysis **Recommendations:** Continual review and updates are central to the continued implementation and success of educational technology graduate programs. The program faculty have demonstrated this capacity and should be supported in the need for continued improvement.	I agree with supporting Ed Tech faculty in support for continued improvement. Part of this work can be done doing work group time in faculty meetings and graduate faculty meetings.
III.Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes **Recommendations:** If 100% of students earned full points on the signature assignments but still reported feeling less strongly that the program provided opportunities to practice culturally and linguistically relevant teaching strategies through an anti-racist lens, then it may be worth revisiting these assignments. From everything I can see, the assignments do target these strategies, so perhaps just being more explicit, using common	The Ed Tech faculty will continue to evaluate assignments and make sure they use explicit language/descriptions to help student understanding. Good idea to have an alumni survey to get data to consider when making program decisions.

language/descriptions, and making connections would be helpful to improve student perception. It may be impactful to send alumni surveys to gain a better understanding of job placement and leadership roles held by program graduates. Given how many great things are known about alumni through informal means, it may be impactful to have concrete data to point to for internal program consideration and potentially for marketing purposes.	
IV. Faculty **Recommendations:** Culturally relevant applications of course materials were noted as a challenge both in the faculty members' research and within student surveys. Given the feedback from students, the department should prioritize hiring someone who specializes in culturally relevant practices within the educational technology space. The review committee believes this program is under-resourced relative to the enrollment trends. More administrative support should be provided.	I would very much like to hire a faculty member who specializes in culturally relevant practices in educational technology. I would also like to have administrative assistance to help the Ed tech program. Perhaps we can consider using online course fees to pay for this support.
V. Student Support and Advising **Recommendations:** The present arrangement for Dr. Donovan's release should be evaluated. Relying on the award every year	I agree and would like to use online course fees to support Dr. Donovan's role as Ed Tech program advisor.

presents a challenge and potentially destabilizing factor if the award were not to be offered or if her application was denied. It would be wise to consider a more permanent solution for the program's advisor to have a stable arrangement for release time to perform this task.	
VI. Resources and Facilities **Recommendations:** More clarity is needed on the utilization of online course fees. Additionally, a clear and reasonable plan for how these funds are used would be helpful. The review committees could not determine how these funds are allocated. At the beginning of the fiscal year and/or within the budgeting process, the program/department should account for all software/platforms that faculty members need to achieve the intended student engagement in this fully online master's program. The program should provide all necessary tools for faculty.	I would be happy to share the online course fees budget with the ed tech faculty so they can suggest more effective ways of spending these resources. I agree that the department should provide faculty the tools they need to provide effective online instruction. Again, perhaps online course fees can help support these efforts.
VII.Long-term Plans **Recommendations:** The program is anticipating turnover in program faculty in the near medium term. The preparation for these changes is notable and worthy of continued attention. The program has been quite successful, and a continuation of success depends upon a thoughtful transition plan. Unfortunately, it is common in academe for programs to be dependent on specific	I agree with adding a new Ed Tech faculty member, especially, if we are looking to create a doctoral program in Ed Tech. I would like to provide support for an administrative staff member to support Ed Tech by using online course fees.

individuals and historical memory. Incorporating plans to replace faculty or, minimally, not run at a staffing deficit is important. Adding an additional program faculty member in the near term would be prudent. A consistent mechanism for administrative support for a program of this size is critical. The outside member of the review team notes that it would be common for a program of this size to have a combination of administrative staff (~ .33 FTE of a shared administrative assistant) and course reassignment (~ one course per year) as support for a program of this size.	