Department of Elementary and Bilingual Education

California State University, Fullerton

Program Performance Review

2023-2024 Cycle

MS in Educational Technology

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Submitted by Loretta Donovan, Tim Green, Erin Besser

November 7, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM MISSION, GOALS, AND ENVIRONMENT

A. Mission and Goals of the Unit

Briefly describe the mission and goals and identify any changes since the last program review. Review the goals in relation to the University's mission, goals, and strategies.

In 2024, CSUF presented the University Strategic Plan. In this plan, the mission is stated as:

> *Cal State Fullerton transforms lives through innovative and quality education, research, and creative activities. We inspire all members of the Titan community to engage in their lifelong pursuit of critical inquiry and social justice; to become catalysts for equity and inclusivity; and to advance the intellectual, cultural, and economic growth of Orange County and beyond.*

In line with the CSUF Mission, the CSUF MS in Educational Technology degree is an online graduate program and a professional community committed to developing educators capable of transforming student lives through **innovation and applied research**. The fully online, 30-semester unit program has been in its current form since 2017 when it was elevated from an MS in Education with a Concentration in Educational Technology to an MS in Educational Technology. We are currently aligned with the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Educator (E) and Coach (C) standards. The program was the first Master's degree (in the US and internationally) with the ISTE-C Seal of Alignment (effective 2015-2017 and 2018-2020). Additionally, in 2022, the program was approved as an ISTE-Educator certification preparation program, which allows graduates of the program to apply for the highly valued ISTE-E certification without having to pay ISTE for a training program.

In 2021, the MS Ed Tech program developed the following vision, mission, and program outcomes. These are the first iteration of these goals. They were developed to align with the College of Education JEIE principles and conceptual framework outcomes, the ISTE Standards, and the Equity Literate Educator Abilities. The program vision clearly aligns to the University Strategic plan (updated 2024).

MS in Educational Technology Program Vision:

> *We believe that technology is a vehicle to provide **equitable and inclusive learning experiences for all learners.** Together with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) practices, technology allows educators to **meet the diverse learning needs of their diverse learners**. Through a **lens of digital inclusion**, development of multimedia, design of learning experiences that promote contemporary skills, and data-driven decision-making, **educators are positioned to be change agents in an ever-changing, diverse, and digital world.***

MS in Educational Technology Program Mission Statement:

> *The CSUF MS in Educational Technology online graduate program is committed to developing educators capable of **transforming student lives through innovation and applied research.***

MS Educational Technology Program Outcomes:

The MS in Educational Technology program outcomes mesh the ISTE Standards for Coaches and Educators (https://www.iste.org/standards), the Equity Institute Equity Literate Educator Abilities (https://www.equityliteracy.org/), and the College of Education Framework Outcomes.

1. Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will establish relationships with other educators (ISTE-C: Collaborator) to gain an understanding of the role technology plays in the larger learning community (Equity Ability-Recognize)
2. Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will inspire and support other educators to use technology to promote equity and inclusion in digital learning contexts. (ISTE-C: Change Agent)
3. Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will use data to make informed decisions about technology-related practices (ISTE-C: Data Driven Decisions Maker) to ensure equity and inclusive digital learning materials and contexts (Equity Ability- Recognize and Respond)
4. Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will design digital learning experiences that meet the unique needs of diverse learners (ISTE-C: Learning Designer)
5. Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will establish digital equity and inclusion goals related to their teaching practice and reflect on this practice (ISTE-C: Connected Learner)
6. Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will become confident and proactive leaders (Equity Ability- Sustain) of educational technology within schools and communities. (ISTE-C Professional Learning Facilitator)
7. Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will use their role as a technology leader to model digital citizenship and to advocate against inequitable digital access, use, and contexts. (ISTE-C Professional Learning Facilitator; ISTE-C Connected Learner, Equity Ability - Cultivate and Redress)

Similar to the CSUF 2024 Strategic Plan mission and vision, the MS in Ed Tech program focuses on **innovation, change, and cultivating leaders in local and global communities**. Although the program's vision, mission, and outcomes were developed prior to the 2024 strategic plan, they have a clear alignment with Goal 1, objective 1.2 (equitable learning experiences).

B. Changes and Trends in Discipline

Briefly describe changes and trends in the discipline and the response of the unit to such changes. Identify the external factors that impact the program (e.g., community/regional needs, placement, and graduate/professional school).

- Trends in the discipline, such as the focus on AI in education, led us to create an AI scope and sequence for candidates to receive exposure, experience, and opportunities to evaluate the potential of AI in K12 education. AI in the program scope and sequence documents this.
- We would like to note that the program structure did not change as a result of the shift to Emergency Remote Teaching in 2020; however, some resources were added to support educators who were trying to navigate teaching remotely. These have since been removed as they are no longer needed.
- With shifting enrollment numbers each Fall and Spring (that we have been documenting since 2010), we have recruited three adjunct faculty who engage in program professional development and program improvement meetings. A Canvas Community for MS Ed Tech Faculty ensures consistency and support for all who teach in the program.

- With the increase in candidates, there was a need to develop a 'one-stop shop' for candidates to make sure they are successful from the beginning to the end of the program. We have three to five cohorts running at any one time, which can range from 100 to 200 students. We created a Canvas Community for our candidates that includes a program orientation, college and university resources, registration and textbook information, Canvas tutorials, important forms, commencement information, and program policies (honesty, AI). This community is added to by the three tenure-track faculty but is predominantly managed by Dr. Donovan (primary advisor).

C. Priorities

Identify the unit's priorities for the next three (short term) and seven years (long term)

Short-term Priorities

We have several short-term priorities that stem from maintaining our reputation as a nationally recognized MS in Educational Technology Program. Our priorities are to:

- Continue to maintain enrollment of at least two Fall cohorts and one Spring starting cohort.
- Secure funding through dedicated MS Ed Tech online course fees and college funding to support and enhance our current recruitment efforts.
- Continue to have a presence at local and regional technology events such as CUE, OCCUE, and ISTE conferences.
- Continue to develop student community within the program through hosting events (these were discontinued due to COVID and due to excessive travel requirements and paperwork required for events to be approved and funded)
- Continue to stay current with technology and innovation trends as a program through professional development, research, and conference attendance
- Continue to engage in faculty professional development to maintain currency in effective pedagogy, including JEIE.
- Continue to build community within the faculty by co-publishing at least one journal article or co-presenting one conference presentation each academic year.

Long-term Priorities

- With pending faculty retirements, one long-term goal is to recruit and hire at least two new Ed Tech faculty within the next 7 years. This will be necessary to sustain the current rigor and size of the program.
- As a program, we generate considerable funds from online course fees. These are rarely spent on our MS Ed Tech students. We would appreciate being able to spend these funds on MS in Ed Tech students. Our goal with this is to provide equitable opportunities for all students. We would like to:
    - Provide Wakelet accounts to all candidates
    - Provide webinars on academic writing offered by a professional editor
    - Provide support for conference attendance for candidates who are presenting
    - Provide opportunities for candidates to connect with each other in person. We had a yearly event prior to COVID.

- Explore the feasibility of creating a combined MS Ed Tech and Multiple Subject Credential program.

D. Special Session

Candidates complete two courses (EDEL 522 and EDEL 536) during the summer as part of their study plan. These are offered in summer because this is when our candidates have more time to dedicate. More importantly, we offer them in the summer to candidates to ensure that they can receive financial aid. Additionally, having the summer courses allows candidates to complete the degree in 16 months, which keeps the program competitive with other programs and aligns with the CSUF strategic plan (Goal 1. Obj 1: flexible pathways for learners).

II. DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

A. Curricular Changes

Identify substantial curricular changes in existing programs and new programs (degrees, majors, minors) developed since the last program review. Have any programs been discontinued?

No changes to the program have been made. The 10 courses are the same courses that were approved when we moved from MS in Education to MS in Educational Technology in 2017.

The MS in Educational Technology is, however, in a continuous cycle of program improvement. As a cohesive group of three tenure-track full-time faculty, we meet regularly to review program data, program courses, and coursework to stay aligned with current trends and issues in education. To ensure we are being purposeful and basing changes on data, we have engaged in several research projects to support program improvement. Some examples include:

1. A college exit survey was used to conduct a self-study. As a result of the self-study, we added resources, were more purposeful in modeling inclusive practices (based on our own learning through PD) and created a scope and sequence of equity principles.

    Donovan, L., Green, T.D., Besser, E., & Gonzalez, E. (2021). The whole is greater than the sum of the parts: **A self-study of equity and inclusion in online teacher education.** *Studying Teacher Education. 2021,*1-25 DOI: 10.1080/17425964.2021.1897975

    Abstract:

    This self-study examines the intersectionality of online teaching, inclusive teaching practices, and culturally responsive teaching in an online graduate teacher education program. Inspired by student perceptions of the promotion of equity and inclusion in the online program, our critical friends group engaged in ongoing reflection and discourse about our current practice as teacher educators and as a program. At the onset of the self-study, we believed that our practices were promoting inclusivity and equity for our students. We discovered, however, that despite our intentional efforts to model and promote these, we each had room to improve our practice. As a result, we engaged in professional development to better equip ourselves to model and promote equity and inclusion in our online teacher education program. We found that there is considerable overlap in research-based effective practices for online teaching, culturally responsive teaching, and inclusive teaching. We have provided recommendations for

teacher educators to consider as they design for and model the intersectionality of equity and inclusion in their practice.

2. A team-created survey was used to explore elements of the MS Ed Tech program that represent culturally relevant pedagogy and practices of the program.

   Green, T., Hoffmann, M., Donovan, L., & Phuntsog, N. (2017). **Cultural Communication Characteristics** and Student Connectedness in an Online Environment: Perceptions and Preferences of Online Graduate Students*. International Journal of E-learning and Distance Education 32* (2). Retrieved from http://www.ijede.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/1033/1664

   Abstract:

   This multi-year exploratory research examined the perceptions of connectedness of students enrolled in an online cohort-based Master's program in educational technology. The research specifically examined the level of connectedness the graduate students from low-context and high-context cultures felt towards their peers, the professors, and the program. Participants (n = 50) were surveyed on their perceptions of connectedness and what elements of the program and course design led to their level of connectedness. Fourteen participants agreed to follow-up interviews. The data were used to compare how students who identified as low-context culture differed in their perceptions of connectedness to students who identified as high-context culture. The findings suggest that no matter what cultural identification students indicated, the feelings of connectedness toward peers, the professors, and the program were strong. Participants indicated feeling most connected to program professors, primarily due to the intensity and methods of communication. Findings indicate other program and course design elements that led to student connectedness. Implications for online course and program design are discussed.

3. A reflective study grounded in change theory and Kong's (2023) AI literacy framework, guided a paper (under review as of November, 2024/submitting of this report) that describes our purposeful approach to AI integration in the program. This study highlights the importance of applying change theory to innovation adoption and shows how the MS Ed Tech Program addresses the 4 AI literacy dimensions (social, cognitive, metacognitive, affective) and allowed us to support our teacher candidates from being nervous about the use of AI to being advocates

Additionally, each semester, course content is updated to better reflect the needs of the candidates. Some examples include:

- More explicit inclusion of resources and learning activities specific to JEIE in all courses.
- Shift from requiring Twitter/X engagement to general Social Media presence due to some students being uncomfortable with new policies when Twitter became X
- Updated coursework to reflect updated ISTE Coach Standards
- Integration of AI scope and sequence to embed AI throughout all courses
- Scope and sequence for accessibility (digital inclusion) in response to the involvement of the university ATI instructional materials committee. In addition, a Wakelet space

with multiple collections was created that allows us to update resources in one place. The Wakelet is linked to at least one course per semester.

- Update pedagogy in response to faculty earning the ISTE Educator Certification
- Integration of an AI assistant for FAQ and student support in select courses.

B. Structure of the Degree Program

Describe the structure of the degree program (e.g., identify required courses, how many units of electives, expected modalities of courses in the program) and identify the logic underlying the organization of the requirements and alignment of the requirements with the department resources. In particular, please discuss how the curriculum and/or programming reflects the University's commitment.

The MS in Educational Technology Program is a 4 semester (including summer) cohort program. The program includes ten 3-unit courses for a total of 30 units. All courses are offered asynchronously online. Faculty typically teach the same courses from semester to semester to draw on individual expertise and to ensure candidates have a variety of instructors and instructor perspectives during their time in the program. Candidates join the program in Spring or Fall semesters. Candidates progress through the program in the same order as a cohort (typically, 25-30 candidates). Each semester, we have one or two who opt to take 'the slow path' (fewer courses per semester). Table 1 shows the typical completion path.

Table 1. Program Structure

First semester	EDEL 511: Survey of Educational Research (16 weeks)	EDEL 523: Issues and Trends in Distance Education (First eight weeks)	EDEL 515: Problem-solving and technology in Schools (Second eight weeks)
Second semester	EDEL 529: Learning Theory (16 weeks)	EDEL 518A: Issues in Instructional Design of Software for Use in Schools (First eight weeks)	EDEL 518B: Multimedia Development and Instruction in the Classroom (Second eight weeks)
Summer	EDEL 522: Web Design and Instruction in Schools (First five weeks)	EDEL 536: Curriculum Theory and Development (Second five weeks)	
Final Semester	EDEL 590: Technology Professional Development in Schools (16 weeks)	EDEL 594: Final Project (16 weeks)	

Candidates who opt for the slower path complete the following study plan:

Table 2. Slower Path to Completion

First semester	EDEL 523 (First eight weeks), EDEL 515 (Second eight weeks)
Second semester	EDEL 511 (16 weeks), EDEL 529 (16 weeks)
Summer	EDEL 536 and EDEL 522 (5 weeks - consecutively)
Fourth Semester	EDEL 518A (First eight weeks), EDEL 518B (Second eight weeks)
Final Semester	EDEL 590 and EDEL 594 (both 16 weeks)

The curriculum in the program is designed to flow in a way that connects courses being taken in the same semester and prepares students for the next semester. All courses in the program prepare candidates for the final semester. The two courses in the final semester have a shared project: the Technology Professional Development Plan (TPDP). Sections of this project are completed in EDEL 590: Technology Professional Development, and other sections are completed in EDEL 594: Culminating Project. It should be noted that EDEL 594 also includes the development of a digital portfolio for the ISTE Coach standards.

Table 3 shows how the final two courses share the TPDP.

Table 3: Technology Professional Development Plan

	Start/Due	Feedback and Graded by
Introduction: *purpose* *school description*	Week 3/ Week 4	590 instructor
Needs Analysis	Week 4/ Week 8	590 instructor
Literature Review	Week 7/ Week 9	594 instructor
TPDP Development: *Project Goals & Objectives* *Evaluation* *Timeline and Budget* *Two-hour Synchronous PD*	 Week 8/ Week 10 Week 10/ Week 10 Week 10/ Week 11 Week 9/ Week 13	 594 instructor 594 instructor 594 instructor 590 instructor

session and Reflection *Wakelet Resources*	Week 10-14	590 instructor
Reflection of TPDP	Week 14	594 instructor

As a Master's program, each course has a writing proficiency requirement. We created a scope and sequence for this to ensure candidates experience a range of professional writing. These are listed in the order in which candidates complete and submit them.

- EDEL 523 - collaborative presentation of research on a topic of choosing related to issues and trends in distance education.
- EDEL 515 - annotations of literature
- EDEL 511 - formerly the course to meet the university writing requirements. APA formatted review of literature
- EDEL 518A - collaborative review of literature (wiki style) on a topic related to instructional design
- EDEL 518B - peer editing and revising the work of others from 518A
- EDEL 529 - collaborative APA formatted paper to support Action Research
- EDEL 522 - annotated bibliography on technology professional development
- EDEL 536 - application of research reading on developing a scope and sequence for a curriculum plan.
- EDEL 590 - application of research reading in a grant or conference proposal
- EDEL 594- APA formatted paper to support the TPDP

This cohesive writing and course assignment approach that includes a program scope and sequence of JEIE resources supports the university's commitment to DEI and in particular, the college JEIE principles. Integration, modelling, and promotion of JEIE principles are sequenced to not be redundant but to dig deeper each semester. For example, in the first semester, candidates are introduced to the concept of JEIE and look at issues of diversity in distance education (EDEL 523). In EDEL 515, they look at how we can address issues of diversity through Universal Design for Learning. Moving into the second semester, candidates begin to move into advocating for equity and collaboratively create a presentation to help a new teacher understand diversity in education and how to address issues of diversity, including gender, race, SES, culture, and so forth (EDEL 529). They explore issues of diversity and inclusion in their own classrooms through action research (EDEL 29). In the summer, candidates are exposed to digital inclusion and apply inclusive design principles to websites, and advocate for digital inclusion by creating materials to share with colleagues to ensure everyone is considering digital inclusion (EDEL 522). In the final semester, they plan, implement, and evaluate professional development to promote equitable uses of technology by others at their school site (EDEL 590). They draft proposals for funding to promote more equitable access to technology for all their learners as well (EDEL590).

In essence, candidates progress along the Reach, Teach, and Impact continuum of the College framework and the Equity Literate Educator Abilities to Recognize bias and inequity, Respond to bias and inequity, Redress bias and inequity, Cultivate equitable, anti-oppressive ideologies, and sustain bias-free and equitable learning environments continuum as they move through the courses.

C. Student Demand for Unit Offerings

Using data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to discuss student demand for the unit's offerings. Discuss topics such as over/under enrollment (applications, admissions, and enrollments), retention, graduation rates for majors (FTF and transfer), and time to degree. Address equity gaps in retention and graduation rates.

This is our first program review. See Appendix B for historical data regarding enrollment. We have been a vibrant program for the past 15 years. Each Spring we start with 25-30 candidates (35 in Spring 25) and 50-100 candidates in Fall. We saw a drop in applications during the shift to remote teaching. Other drops are consistent with college and discipline dips in enrolment nationwide. It should be noted that our enrolment has remained strong when other programs in the college are not starting a cohort. Each semester we have approximately 10% attrition from application to enrolment. From asking applicants who withdraw, although not documented, we know that this is for reasons such as changed/new/loss of teaching position, personal reasons, financial reasons.

D. Enrollment Trends

Discuss the unit's enrollment trends since the last program review based on enrollment targets (FTES), faculty allocation, and student-faculty ratios. For graduate programs, comment on whether there is sufficient enrollment to constitute a community of scholars to conduct the program

As program coordinators, we have been actively engaged in recruitment, the application process, and the onboarding process. We have been collecting our own admissions data since Fall 2008. Below is data from the past 10 years of candidates who registered for the first semester courses. Note that we have students who take courses on 'the slower path' so these numbers represent how many students registered for one or more of the three first semester courses. This may be different to 'actual accepted' (Table 8 of Appendix B). We also have students return from leaves of absence or repeat courses. More recently, our Fall numbers are not as strong as we have had. Anecdotally, from asking candidates, we have found that many are accepted elsewhere before being accepted at CSUF or delayed by financial aid decisions or both. Others are flagged as non-residents despite being residents. This prevents them from registering in time because the process of being recategorized happens after the registration deadlines. Others, although accepted, do not enroll in the program because of personal reasons (e.g., lost job, family emergency).

Table 4. Registration for first semester courses

Fall 24		46
Spring 24		24
Fall 23		53
Spring 23		24
Fall 22		72
Spring 22		25
Fall 21		54
Spring 21		25
Fall 20		84
Spring 20		29
Fall 19		65
Spring 19		29
Fall 18		86
Spring 18		18
Fall 17		89
Spring 17		37
Fall 16		88
Spring 16		24
Fall 15		86

E. Curricular Change Plans

Describe any plans for curricular changes in the short (three-year) and long (seven-year) term, such as expansions, contractions, or discontinuances.

There are no plans to change the curriculum of the program. The program has national recognition for being in its current form. The only curricular changes are listed above in II A- curricular changes. As faculty, it is our responsibility to stay current and to adjust course content as needed each semester. There are no plans for contractions or discontinuances.

We would like to explore the potential of offering the MS Ed Tech as a Combined MS Ed Tech and Multiple Subject Credential.

F. Special Session

Include information on any Special Sessions self-support programs the department/program offers.

The program does not have any self-support programs during special sessions.

III. DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The review should address how the program ensures high-quality learning using relevant indicators and analyses, and how these analyses can facilitate continuous improvement.

Please provide information on the following aspects, and if applicable, please include relevant documents in the appendices.

A. Assessment Plan

Describe the department/program assessment plan (e.g., general approach, timetable, etc.) and structure (e.g., committee, coordinator, etc.), and if applicable, how the plan and/or structure have changed since the last PPR.

As a college, we have a well-developed assessment plan. This includes midpoint and exit surveys and the submission of signature assignments each semester. Faculty report scores of the signature assignments to the college Data Analyst, Grace Nguyen. In turn, Grace provides summaries of data to the faculty. The surveys are:

1. Diversity survey: Identifies the diversity of the student population with whom that candidates work
2. Midpoint survey: Provides feedback to the COE on the course of study mid-way through program
3. Exit survey: Provides feedback to the COE program as candidates exit
4. End of Program survey: Provides program feedback to the department as candidates complete the program

Timeline for survey completion:

- The entrance survey – taken at the beginning of the program
- The exit survey-taken at end of program in EDEL 594
- The end of the program survey-taken at end of program in EDEL 594

Candidates are prompted to complete surveys by e-mail notification from the College of Education Assessment Office (coeassess@fullerton.edu). The Department End of Program survey is distributed through EDEL 594.

Data for the following signature assignments are collected. These assignments are graded by instructors using a rubric and scores reported to the College Assessment Analyst (Grace Nguyen). Please note that there is one or two specific criteria of the rubric (listed below) that is relevant to the outcome. This specific data is reported to Grace.

Reach

- critical examination of explicit bias - Software Critique in EDEL 518A

Teach

- culturally relevant strategies - UDL Lesson Plan in EDEL 515 and Case Study in EDEL 529
- linguistically relevant strategies - UDL Lesson Plan in EDEL 515 and Case Study in EDEL 529

Impact

- supporting students, teachers and leaders as citizens in a highly diverse, global, interconnected, and digital world - TPDP in EDEL 594 and Grant/conference proposal in EDEL 590

In addition to these college surveys, the MS Ed Tech faculty designed their own surveys to explore professional growth during the program. We ask candidates to complete a pre survey and a post survey

that ask the same questions. Questions are specific to our program outcomes. This survey data is analyzed each year by the three-tenure track faculty and used for program improvement. Some examples are provided in section II.a of this document

B. Student Learning Outcomes

For each degree program, provide the student learning outcomes (SLOs); describe the methods, direct or indirect, used to measure student learning; and summarize the assessment results of the SLOs.

MS Educational Technology Program Outcomes

The MS in Educational Technology program outcomes mesh the ISTE Standards for Coaches and Educators (https://www.iste.org/standards), the Equity Institute Equity Literate Educator Abilities (https://www.equityliteracy.org/), and the College of Education Framework Outcomes.

Reach

- Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will establish relationships with other educators (ISTE-C: Collaborator) to gain an understanding of the role technology plays in the larger learning community (Equity Ability-Recognize)
- Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will inspire and support other educators to use technology to promote equity and inclusion in digital learning contexts. (ISTE-C: Change Agent)

Teach

- Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will use data to make informed decisions about technology-related practices (ISTE-C: Data Driven Decisions Maker) to ensure equity and inclusive digital learning materials and contexts (Equity Ability- Recognize and Respond)
- Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will design digital learning experiences that meet the unique needs of diverse learners (ISTE-C: Learning Designer)
- Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will establish digital equity and inclusion goals related to their teaching practice and reflect on this practice (ISTE-C: Connected Learner)

Impact

- Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will become confident and proactive leaders (Equity Ability- Sustain) of educational technology within schools and communities. (ISTE-C Professional Learning Facilitator)
- Graduates of the MS in Educational Technology program will use their role as a technology leader to model digital citizenship and to advocate against inequitable digital access, use, and contexts. (ISTE-C Professional Learning Facilitator; ISTE-C Connected Learner, Equity Ability - Cultivate and Redress)

These outcomes are measured through college and program surveys (described above). The matrix located at Ed Tech Alignment shows the relationships between college, program, ISTE, Equity Literate Educator Abilities. This table also includes the signature assignment for each outcome.

All course assignments in the MS Ed Tech Program have rubrics that are used to score candidate submissions. These are consistent across courses if appropriate (such as the writing rubric). Candidates are provided rubrics at the same time they are provided course assignment directions. Candidates have opportunities for peer feedback integral to course work and for several assignments, are also provided formative feedback prior to submitting for summative feedback.

Summarized Assessment Results

The Exit survey data for the last several years has shown a trend of graduates 100% agreeing or strongly agreeing to all survey items. In this section, we will only discuss the most recent assessment data - Fall 2023 and Spring 2024.

The Fall 2023 exit data represents a 68% response rate representing the responses of 39 program graduates. For all questions on the survey, data show that 100% of responders agree or strongly agree to all questions. All respondents replied yes to recommending the program to colleagues with rationales including comments such as:

> *"I came in wanting to know how to use technology more effectively in my class, but am leaving with a better focus on diversity and design that will allow me to help others."*
>
> *"This program is practical and relevant to all teachers!"*

Graduates overwhelmingly considered the program design and the professors as the strongest aspects of the program. Examples of this are represented in comments such as:

> *"The cohort model, it was really nice being able to work with similar people throughout the entire course of the program-made for a great support system throughout. I also appreciated all the professor's time and effort into the communication they had with us and really were genuine about contacting them with any questions."*
>
> *"The instructors. Having instructors that are always actively involved and supportive makes a huge difference. Every instructor in the program was. I could reach out to anyone for questions and support."*

Analysis of quantitative exit survey data shows that although all responses indicated 100% agree or strongly agree, there were a few areas that indicate we could improve.

These are predominantly related to questions in the section of "My program demonstrated and provided opportunities to practice linguistically and culturally relevant teaching strategies through an anti-racist lens". These items were more in a 60/40 strongly agree/agree ratio compared to the rest of the survey which was in the 80-90/20-10 ratio.

Spring 2024 exit data represents a 48% response rate representing the responses of 11 program graduates. This data also showed that for all questions on the survey, 100% of responders agree or strongly agree to all questions. All respondents replied yes to recommending the program to colleagues with comments that discussed relevance and applicability of the coursework to the teaching environment. Similarly, strengths of the program echo those of the Fall23 respondents with comments about program design and faculty.

Quantitative data for Spring 24 followed a similar trend as that for Fall 23, with 100% strongly agree/agree and a trend of more strongly agree responses than agree. Also similar to Fall 23, the data for the program demonstrating and providing opportunities to practice culturally and linguistically relevant teaching strategies through an anti-racist lens showed this as an area that is less strong than others in the program.

Signature assignment data

Reach

- critical examination of explicit bias - Software Critique in EDEL 518A

Teach

- culturally and linguistically relevant strategies - UDL Lesson Plan in EDEL 515 and Case Study in EDEL 529

Impact

- supporting students, teachers and leaders as citizens in a highly diverse, global, interconnected, and digital world - TPDP in EDEL 594 and Grant/conference proposal in EDEL 590

The signature assignment data is in contrast to the exit survey data and shows that **100% of students earned full points for specific criteria on the assignment rubrics.** We should note that given the project-based assessment strategies multiple feedback rounds are embedded into the assignment completion process.

C. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program

Describe whether and how assessment results have been used to improve teaching and learning practices, inform faculty professional development, and/or overall departmental effectiveness. Please cite specific examples.

As noted, each semester, we conduct our own surveys in addition to assessment committee surveys. We meet as a faculty to discuss data, update courses and program policies, and develop goals.

To address this, we conducted a self-study that allowed us to reflect and more importantly act on areas of improvement. As a result of the self-study, we added resources, were more purposeful in modeling inclusive practices (based on our own learning through PD) and created a scope and sequence of equity principles.

Donovan, L., Green, T.D., Besser, E., & Gonzalez, E. (2021). The whole is greater than the sum of the parts: **A self-study of equity and inclusion in online teacher education.** *Studying Teacher Education. 2021,*1-25 DOI: 10.1080/17425964.2021.1897975

Other research conducted on equity and inclusion in the program. A survey was provided to all candidates in the program to guide changes on cultural awareness and critical pedagogy.

Green, T., Hoffmann, M., Donovan, L., & Phuntsog, N. (2017). **Cultural Communication Characteristics** and Student Connectedness in an Online Environment: Perceptions and Preferences of Online

Graduate Students. *International Journal of E-learning and Distance Education 32* (2). Retrieved from http://www.ijede.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/1033/1664

The MS in Educational Technology exit quantitative data for **Spring 2022** indicated that 100% Strongly Agree or Agree on all questions except for 2.1-2.16, which was 81% Strongly Agree or Agree.

Based on the data, we had the following goal:

> *We will strive to provide our students with additional opportunities to engage in examining how equity and inclusion (specifically related to the use of technology) can be addressed in a wide variety of learning environments.*

We added literature (e.g. in EDEL 523 https://www.hanoverresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Equity-in-Education_Research-Brief_FINAL.pdf) and discussion to each class to support learners in understanding equity gaps and begin to think about concrete strategies to bridge them.

Exit data we received in **Fall 23** indicated that although 100% agree and strongly agree for all items, an area for improvement focused on systems of oppression. To address this, we added literature (e.g., https://www.forbes.com/sites/janicegassam/2020/02/17/4-ways-to-deconstruct-systems-of-oppression/?sh=28c6286c62da) and discussions to support student understanding of ways to deconstruct systems of oppression. This was not an area of improvement for Spring 24.

As a faculty, analysis of data over the years has led to a range of **professional development**. We have all completed the Equity Pedagogy Modules offered by CSUF, we engaged in MOOCS from Cornell and Columbia Universities, and we completed online modules offered by Paul Gorski's Equity Literate Educator Trainings. We have been active in seeking out trainings about digital inclusion and completed AIM modules, Inclusive certificates I and II, OER Ambassador, Impact certificate, esports and education conferences (2024 & 2021), AI workshop series, SDSU microcredential, WAC AI trainings, UDL workshop, Faculty Teaching & Learning certificate, Google Educator 1 & 2 certificate, and Coursera Cal Arts graphic design courses.

D. Other Quality Indicators

Describe other quality indicators identified by the department/program as evidence of student learning and effectiveness/success other than student learning outcomes (e.g., number of students attending graduate or professional school, job placement rates, community engagement/leadership).

Officially, the MS Ed Tech Program does not collect this information. We do, however, have a strong alumni community. We maintain communication with alumni long after they have graduated. Anecdotally, over the last 5 years, at least one of our graduates has pursued a doctorate each year. In 2024, three of our graduates have applied and been accepted to doctoral programs. Examples of schools attended by our graduates to pursue doctoral programs are Chapman University, Indiana University, Johns Hopkins University, and University of Redlands. In addition, anecdotally, at least one of our graduates is moved to a district or county level leadership in Technology Positions per year. Others have entered higher education technology leadership (e.g., LMS coordinators, faculty) and corporate technology companies (e.g., Google).

E. Course Modalities

Many departments/programs offer courses and programs via technology (e.g., online) or at off-campus sites and in compressed schedules. How are these courses identified, and how is student learning assessed in these formats/modalities?

Four of the ten courses are offered in mini sessions (8 weeks instead of 16) and two are offered as single session summer (5 weeks). All courses in the MS in Educational Technology are offered online. Student learning is assessed in a range of formats, including projects, discussions, a digital portfolio, and presentations. Rubrics are provided to guide evaluation and maintain consistency across instructors.

IV. FACULTY

A. Faculty Updates and Tenure Density

Describe changes since the last program review in the full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) allocated to the department or program. Include information on tenured and tenure track faculty lines (e.g., new hires, retirements, FERP's, resignations) and how these changes may have affected the program's or department's academic offerings and the department's long-term goals. Describe tenure density in the program/department and the distribution among academic rank (assistant, associate, professor) [see instructions, Appendix C]. Attach faculty vitae (see Appendix D).

The MS Ed Tech Program is supported by three full-time tenured faculty. The last hire for the MS in Ed Tech program was in 2020 with Dr. Besser (Associate Professor as of the 23/24 academic year). Drs. Donovan and Green, both full professors, have consistently had full course loads in the program since 2011.

In addition, one adjunct faculty, Dr. Stephanie Campbell has taught in the program for 11 years. This is her primary employment. Other adjunct faculty who have been consistent with the program are Dr. Jenith Mishne (10 years) and Dr. Hue-An Wren (9 years). Dr. Mishne is the Director of Technology at Newport Mesa Unified School District. Dr. Wren returned to the classroom (2024) in Garden Grove School District after serving as a Technology Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) for over 10 years.

B. Faculty Position Priorities

Describe priorities for faculty positions. Explain how these priorities and future hiring plans relate to relevant changes in the discipline; student enrollment and demographics; the career objectives of students; the planning of the University; and regional, national, or global developments.

As described in the goals, the MS in Ed Tech will need to prioritize the hiring of 2 faculty within the next 7 years, due to faculty retirement. Priority will be for faculty with experience in online teaching, online course development, school and district partnerships. Faculty will need an earned doctorate in educational technology and teaching experience as required by the department.

C. Roles of Faculty

Describe the role of tenure line faculty, lecturers, and graduate/student assistants in the program/department's curriculum and academic offerings. Indicate the number and percentage of

courses taught by part-time faculty teaching assistants. Identify any parts of the curriculum that are solely or primarily the responsibility of part-time faculty or teaching assistants.

Until Fall 2024, Dr. Donovan and Dr. Green are considered program coordinators and taught their full load (4 courses) in the program each semester. Dr. Besser also taught her full load in the program.

The program is not allocated any student assistants or additional support. Dr. Donovan applies for and has been granted a 3 unit release each Spring for outstanding service to students for her role in recruiting, onboarding, and advising all candidates in the program.

In the Fall of 2024, Dr. Besser taught 3 of her 12 units in the Multiple Subject Credential Program. Including Fall 2024 and moving forward, Dr. Donovan was released from 3 units to coordinate the College Teacher Induction program.

The table 5 shows the courses typically taught by faculty.

Table 5. Courses Taught by Faculty

Semester 1	Semester 2	Summer	Semester 4
EDEL 511 Campbell EDEL 515 Besser EDEL 523 Donovan	EDEL 518A Besser EDEL 518B Besser, Green, Mishne EDEL 529 Campbell, Donovan	EDEL 522 Donovan, Besser EDEL 536 Besser, Green	EDEL 590 Donovan, Mishne, Wren EDEL 594 Green, Mishne, Campbell

Table 6 shows the number of Tenured to Adjunct faculty for the past five years.

Table 6. Tenured to Adjunct Faculty Numbers

Year/semester	Tenured	Adjunct
2024 Fall	3	3
2024 Spring	2 (Green on Sabbatical)	2
2024 Summer	3	0

2023 Fall	3	3
2023 Spring	3	2
2023 Summer	3	0
2022 Fall	3	1
2022 Spring	3	2
2022 Summer	3	1
2021 Fall	3	5
2021 Spring	4	4
2021 Summer	3	0
2020 Fall	3	3
2020 Spring	3	2
2020 Summer	3	0

Curriculum development and updating is the responsibility of the tenure track professors. Each semester, we have two faculty meetings that include the part time/adjunct faculty. Their input is solicited as two of them are 'in the field' and have valuable input for program improvement based on school need.

As a faculty group, we are highly collaborative in writing and service. In addition to what is listed below, we are currently in the writing phase of an article about teacher perceptions and use of AI with a goal of informing teacher education programs planning on introducing or applying AI in their courses.

Scholarship (Peer reviewed journals)

Donovan, L., Besser, E., & Green, T. (2022). One tool with multiple uses: An Innovation Configuration Map of Flip in education. *Journal of Digital Educational Technology*

Green, T., Besser, E., & Donovan, L. (2021). More than amplifying voice and providing choice: Educator perceptions of Flipgrid use in the classroom. *Tech Trends, 65,* 785-79

Donovan, L., Green, T., Besser, E. & Gonzalez, E. (2021). The whole is greater than the sum of the parts: A self-study of Equity and Inclusion in Online Teacher Education. *Studying Teacher Education, 17*(1), 5*7-81*.

Scholarship (books)

Green, T., Donovan, L. & Green, J. (2024). Making Technology Work in Schools: How PK-12 Educators can Foster Digital Age Learning. 2nd Ed. Routledge.

Green, T., Donovan, L. & Green, J. (2020). Making Technology Work in Schools: How PK-12 Educators can Foster Digital Age Learning. Routledge.

Donovan, L. & Green, T. (2014). Making Change: Creating 21st Century Teaching and Learning Environments. Shell Education: Irvine

Refereed book chapters

Green, T. & Donovan, L. (2018). iMakers: Reconsidering teaching and learning for a new generation of students. In Hall, G., Quinn, L., & Gollnick,D (Eds.) Handbook of Teaching and Learning (225-256). New Jersey: Wiley and Sons.

D. Special sessions

The program does not have any self-support programs in Special Sessions.

V. STUDENT SUPPORT AND ADVISING

A. Advising

Briefly describe how the department advises its majors, minors, and graduate students and the effectiveness of this advising structure. Describe the support from outside the department that is necessary for students to receive additional information that they need.

As a program, we have developed a system in which Dr. Donovan is the primary advisor for all candidates with Drs. Besser and Green provide more personal guidance to candidates on an as-needed basis. From the time a candidate expresses interest in the program, Dr. Donovan communicates with them about the program, the application, and the application process (pre-admission). During the program, she is the point person for study plans, grad checks, change of study plans, and leaves of absence. She also supports candidates with registration guidance, scholarship information, and any college or university information.

To complete this work, Dr. Donovan applies each year to the Outstanding Service to Students award for a 3-unit release in the Spring semester. No stipends or release is provided by the Department or University.

Drs. Besser, Donovan, and Green developed an online program orientation that all students complete prior to the first day of their first class. In addition, candidates have access to the Ed Tech Titan community for 'one-stop shopping' for university, college, department, and program resources such as forms, schedules, campus resources, and tutorials.

B. Student Scholarship and Honors

Describe opportunities for students to participate in departmental honors programs, undergraduate or graduate research, collaborative research with faculty, service learning, internships, etc. How are these opportunities made available and accessible to students? List the faculty and students participating in each type of activity and indicate any plans the department has for increasing these activities

Honors, graduate research, collaborative faculty research, service learning, and internships are not an integral part of the MS in Educational Technology program, mostly because our candidates are full-time educators in K12 schools and full-time students in the program. That said, in their final semester, **candidates plan, develop, implement and evaluate technology professional development at their school site**. They are guided through this process that starts with a needs analysis and ends with an evaluation by the EDEL 590 instructor.

As part of EDEL 590, candidates complete a conference proposal for the CUE conference which is held in Palm Springs each March. Candidates are encouraged to submit for consideration, but this is not required as acceptance would mean their school would have to allow for a day off from teaching. We know from experience that there is a substitute teacher shortage and schools are not granting teachers the time to present.

Our plan to increase this opportunity is to use online course fees to support these candidates in sharing their knowledge and, at the same time, promoting the program at this conference.

Student Scholarship Collaboration

As faculty, we serve on Doctoral committees of our graduates (at least one per year). We have **collaborated with alumni** on educational research that has stemmed from their involvement in the program.

For example, Mason, Quintana, Cabiness, Lopez, and Obermeyer are all alumni of the program and have the following publications with faculty:

Cabiness, C., & Donovan, L. (2014). Wikis in the Social Studies. In Russell, W. (Ed.) Digital Social Studies

Donovan, L., Green, T., & Mason, C. (2014). Examining the 21st Century classroom: Developing an Innovation Configuration Map. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 50(2), 161-178. doi:10.2190/EC.50.2.a

Quintana, B., & Donovan, L. (2013). Storytime using iPods: Reaching all learners using technology. Tech Trends.

Cabiness, C., & Donovan, L. (2013). Integrating wikis in the support and practice of historical analysis skills. Tech Trends

Obermeyer, P., & Donovan, L. (2011). Technology peer mentoring: The who, the what, and the how. 2011 Annual Meeting of Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL

Lopez, C., & Donovan, L. (2009). Getting Latino parents involved with mathematics through Family Math Nights: A review of literature. Latinos and Education 8, 219-230.

Department Honors

Annually, each department in the College of Education recommends a graduating master's student as an Edwin Carr Fellow. Department faculty select this individual based on three criteria:

- Meritorious achievement throughout the master's program
- Holding promise for making significant contributions to the profession.
- Having Leadership potential

The award is named in honor of Professor Emeritus Edwin Carr, who was appointed Professor of Education and Economics in 1960. In his active career, he exemplified scholarship and service to his department, school, and to the university. He was an honored member of his profession. Edwin Carr Fellows serve on the Edwin Carr College of Education Advisory Board and are looked to as educational leaders who will make outstanding contributions to the field of education.

VI. RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

A. Resources

Itemize the state support and non-state resources the program/department received during the last seven years (see instructions, Appendix E)

Please note that budget or any data regarding operating costs for the MS Ed Tech program specifically was not provided. Instead, you will see the data for the Dept. of Elementary and Bilingual Education. It should be noted that each semester, the MS Ed Tech program serves between 80-120 online students. **This is double if not triple the number of online students served by the Curriculum and Instruction MS.** There are Fall semesters where we have onboarded 60+ students and C and I did not have a cohort. Similarly, we onboard 25-30 each Spring, and C and I does not have a Spring start cohort. Table 7 is Department budget. Online course fees come from all programs. We cannot state emphatically, however given the enrolment trends in the dept. over half if not three quarters of the online course fees are from MS in Ed Tech program.

Table 7. Curriculum & Instruction Budget and Expenses

Year(s)	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Operating Expenses	19,000.00	19,000.00	14,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00

Online Course Fees			50,985.00	104,637.06	113,527.26	59,180.22

The budget for operating expenses is allocated to the Department of Elementary and Bilingual Education. This budget is used to support all of our programs within the department. Our graduate programs are only part of this overall budget. These resources are used to support our credential program, combine credential and masters program, Educational Technology program, and Masters in Curriculum and Instruction program.

Table 7a. Operating Expenses

2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
19,000.00	19,000.00	14,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00

Online Course Fees

Online course fees are utilized to support the Department of Elementary and Bilingual education online programs. Both the MS in Educational Technology and MS in Curriculum and Instruction are 100% online programs. These fees are used to support the following: graduate course development, professional development for faculty, orientations, resources for classes, webinars, guest speakers, recruitment, graduation celebration for students, and any other expenses that are needed to support online instruction.

Table 7b. Online Course Fees

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
50,985.00	104,637.06	113,527.26	59,180.22

B. Special Facilities and Equipment

Identify any special facilities/equipment used by the program/department, such as laboratories, computers, large classrooms, or performance spaces. Identify changes over the last seven years and prioritize needs for the future.

The MS Ed Tech program is online. However, faculty use a variety of online resources to enhance teaching and learning. These resources include:

Subscriptions

- Voxer - paid for by Faculty
  - Voxer is a walkie talkie app used by faculty (premium) and students (free) for just in time questions and support.
- Padlet - provided by College

        - Padlet is used by students and faculty in a range of ways. Faculty use it to curate weekly announcement information and share resources. Students use it to complete collaborative assignments, showcase learning. Most students also use Padlet in their classrooms.
    - Screencastify - paid for by faculty
        - Faculty use Screencastify for mini lessons and to screen record course navigation etc. when students have a quick question
    - Voicethread -provided by university
        - Faculty and students use Voicethread in each class. Faculty use it for mini lessons and module introduction. Students use it to complete assignments/presentations that are submitted as assignments but shared with their schools and colleagues as well
    - Wakelet - Free Version (but goal is to request premium).
        - Wakelet is a social bookmarking site used by faculty and students to curate resources
    - BreakoutEDU - paid by Dept.
        - BreakoutEDU is specifically used in EDEL 515 (Technology and Problem Solving in Schools) to model and promote critical thinking through technology.
    - Mote
        - Mote is used by faculty to provide audio feedback to students.
    - Adobe
    - Canva
    - GatherTown
    - Zoom

Books

- Over the past 7 years, resources and course materials (such syllabi, textbook chapters, website URLs, etc.) have been provided online and available at no cost for students. Several courses (EDEL 515, 523, 522, 594) do not have textbooks but use Open Educational Resources. Online, accessible versions of some textbooks have also been available through our Pollak library.

Hardware

- Faculty use their campus laptops
- Students are not provided any technology but take advantage of CEDA (campus laptops and devices) and the Office 365 and Titan Apps (Google) software offered by the university

Needs for the Future

- Due to the high level of innovative use of technology, faculty who teach in the program need to have access to higher quality devices on a more regular basis. This includes access to paid subscriptions to apps and software.

C. Library and Research Resources

Describe the current library/research resources for the program/department, the priorities for acquisitions over the next seven years, and any specialized needs such as collections, databases, etc.

There is an education specialist librarian specifically who supports our MS program and provides online tutorials as well as availability for individual meetings (virtual) to help students conduct research. There are dedicated databases for Education within the library, which is also accessible online. The librarian also helps acquire quality resources for both students and faculty to ensure access to resources that may not be available at our library. Additionally, through the years, faculty have provided online articles and resources used for courses rather than textbook purchases. Through collaboration with the library staff and abiding by copyright, book chapters have been scanned and uploaded to course Canvas sites through ExLibris Leganto, which in turn, has been helpful for students to access course materials and readings at no cost.

VII. LONG-TERM PLANS

A. Long Term Plan

Summarize the unit's long-term plan, including refining the definitions of the goals and strategies in terms of indicators of quality and measures of productivity (see instructions, Appendix F)

B. Connection to University Goals

Explain how the long-term plan implements the University's mission, goals, and strategies, as well as the unit's mission and goals.

Our long-term plans are listed below. In parenthesis are the University goals and College goals.

1. With pending program faculty retirements, it will be important to recruit and hire two new tenure-track Educational Technology faculty within the next 5-10 years. This is necessary to sustain the current rigor and size of the Program. (CSUF Goal 3/COE Goal 3)
2. Develop and implement a Combined Credential with a specific focus on Educational Technology (CSUF Goal 1/COE Goal 1)
3. Refine proposal on EdD specialization in Educational Technology Leadership with the Department of Educational Leadership. This would provide opportunities for our graduates who go on to other universities to earn a doctorate in Educational Technology. (CSUF Goal 1, 3/ COE Goal 1, 3)
4. Have a dedicated staff member to help with administrative elements of the Program that are currently being done by faculty. Or, provide a course release for an Educational Technology faculty member who completes these tasks. (CSUF Goal 1, 3/ COE Goal 1, 3)
5. Develop a more transparent accounting for student program online course fees (include what the fees can be used to support the Program). A dedicated budget would be helpful in supporting Candidates. (CSUF Goal 1/ COE Goal 1)
6. Provide financial support for Candidates to attend and present at conferences (CSUF Goal 2/ COE Goal 2)

7. Provide student accounts for various technology tools (e.g., Wakelet) (CSUF Goal 1, 2/COE Goal 1, 2))

8. Provide webinars on academic writing offered by a professional editor (CSUF Goal 1, 2/ COE Goal 1.2)

9. Continue to build alumni network through multiple avenues (e.g., events at conferences, direct communication) (CSUF Goal 1, 2/ COE goal 4)

C. Evidence to Measure Goals

Explain what kinds of evidence will be used to measure the unit's results in pursuit of its goals, how the unit will collect and analyze such evidence, and the timeline against which progress toward those goals will be measured.

Our primary goal is to maintain a strong program through the hiring of exceptional faculty and through opportunities provided to candidates

The ultimate measures of this will be the hiring of at least one new faculty member in the next 3 years and 2 in the next 7 years and a consistent enrolment each Fall (75+ students) and Spring (25 students).

Additionally, data from candidate exit surveys, course SOQ data and our program generated surveys will be used to determine if activities such as webinars and conference support are met.

Finally, an approved Ed.D. and/or Combined Credential MS Ed Tech program will be evidence of Priority 2 and 3.

D. Resources Needed

Describe the resources (internal and external) that may be necessary, available, and/or attainable to meet the unit's priorities. Describe new funding that may be needed to maintain educational quality. Discuss the appropriate balance between state-supported and external funding. Discussion in this section should address the needs identified in areas I-VI above, with the understanding that the ability to meet strategic goals depends on available resources.

In order to attain our priorities, we feel we need the following:

- course release for the coordinator.
    - 3 units per semester and summer stipend
- dedicated and appropriate funding for recruitment of high-quality faculty
    - travel
    - hotel
    - dinner
    - lunch (not a boxed lunch)
- Disbursement of online course fees that are generated by the program going to the program first and not being integrated into Dept. needs (gifts for master teachers, C and I PLC,...). MS Ed Tech Online course fees should support:
    - recruitment of MS Ed Tech candidates
    - MS Ed Tech candidate and faculty attendance at CUE (technology) conference each year
    - MS Ed Tech alumni events
    - MS Ed Tech community building events
    - student assistant

- accounts for technology subscriptions, webinars,...

VIII. APPENDICES CONNECTED TO THE SELF-STUDY (REQUIRED DATA)

A. Undergraduate degree programs

N/A

B. Graduate degree programs

Table 8. Graduate Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

Fall	# Applied	# Admitted	# Enrolled
2017	N/A	N/A	N/A
2018	N/A	N/A	75
2019	85	83	59
2020	98	96	85
2021	75	68	55
2022	84	79	69
2023	72	67	53

Table 9. Graduate Program Enrollment by Headcount and FTES

Academic Year (Annualized)	Headcount	FTES	FTES per Headcount
2017-2018	N/A	N/A	N/A
2018-2019	162	107.00	0.66
2019-2020	153	98.79	0.65
2020-2021	154	103.00	0.67
2021-2022	131	83.63	0.64
2022-2023	123	81.25	0.66
2023-2024	121	76.75	0.64

Table 10. Graduation Rates for Master's Programs

All Master's Entered in Fall:	Cohort	% Graduated		
		In 2 Years	In 3 Years	In 4 Years
2017	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2018	75	93.3	93.3	93.3

2019	59	94.9	96.6	96.6
2020	85	90.6	91.8	92.9
2021	55	90.9	90.9	N/A
2022	69	89.9	N/A	N/A
2023	53	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 11. Graduate Degrees Awarded

College Year	Degrees Awarded
2017-2018	N/A
2018-2019	96
2019-2020	112
2020-2021	86
2021-2022	105
2022-2023	68
2023-2024	82

C. Faculty

Table 12. Faculty Composition[1]

Fall	*Tenured*	*Tenure-Track*	*Sabbaticals at 0.5*	*FERP at 0.5*	*Full-Time Lecturers*	*Actual FTEF*
2017	*17*	*3*	*0.5*	*1.0*	*7*	*26.1*
2018	*15*	*3*	*0.0*	*1.5*	*6*	*23.0*
2019	*17*	*4*	*0.0*	*3.0*	*3*	*21.3*
2020	*15*	*2*	*0.0*	*2.5*	*4*	*19.3*
2021	*14*	*5*	*0.0*	*2.5*	*6*	*22.8*
2022	*13*	*5*	*0.0*	*2.5*	*5*	*21.5*
2023	*13*	*3*	*0.0*	*1.5*	*5*	*19.9*

[1] Headcount of tenured, tenure-track, sabbaticals at 0.5, and FERP at 0.5 includes full-time and part-time faculty. Headcount of lecturers only includes full-time faculty, as consistent with the IPEDS HR definition. It does not represent the number of full-time lecturer lines assigned to the department.

D. Faculty curriculum vitae

Erin Besser

Stephanie Campbell

Loretta Donovan

Tim Green

Jenith Mishne

Hue-An Wren

E. Resources

Table 13 (included above as Table 7). Provide a table showing for the past seven years all department resources and the extent to which each is from the state-supported budget or from other sources, such as self- support programs, research, contracts and/or grants, development, fund-raising, or any other sources or activities.

Table 13. Department Operating Budget

Year(s)	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Operating Expenses	19,000.00	19,000.00	14,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
Online Course Fees			50,985.00	104,637.06	113,527.26	59,180.22