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I. Program Overview

A. Mission and Goals

The Masters of Science in Instructional Design and Technology (MS-IDT) degree program is a highly regarded online program that admits 25-27 diverse students each year. The MS-IDT program is part of the College of Education whose mission is:

_The College of Education is committed to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education. As a professional community of scholar-practitioners, we promote creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world._

The mission of the MS-IDT Program is:

_The Masters of Science degree in Instructional Design and Technology (MSIDT) at CSUF is a very highly ranked cutting-edge online program designed for preparing professionals nationally and internationally who wish to further their skills and education in direct applications of emerging technology for teaching, learning, training and/or curriculum development. These professionals are usually already working in the field of technology or in curriculum development/training in P-12, higher education, the military, medical and/or corporate settings. The 21 month program accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) provides versatility and applicability for a variety of careers and leadership roles including:_

- Educators interested in developing instructional content for online delivery
- Specialists in distance/online learning, mobile learning or competency based education
- Professionals working with curriculum development for training in multimedia environments for an educational (P-12, community college, higher education, or extended education), corporate/business, medical, military or government setting
- Human Resource professionals in business, industry, medical, military, or corporate universities
- Instructional technologists whose job description involves teaching others to integrate new and emerging technologies to support learning
- Entrepreneurs interested in starting web-based businesses in the field of education or for independent consulting
- Curriculum developers for non-profit, for profit, or community-based organizations
- Instructional designers for textbook publishers or e-learning companies
- Web developers
- Software consultants or designers

_The MSIDT program was launched in 2002 as one of the first in the nation and has over 230 graduates to date representing 23 different professional business/corporate areas and over 115_
companies and higher education institutions to date (see Appendix D). Since the inception of our program, we strive to incorporate theory and research related to adult learning and cognition melded with current and emerging practices and tools in technology. Our students experience best practices in the field reflecting innovative instructional strategies and assessment and evaluation methodologies. They develop skills in project management, collaboration, written communication, technology enabled media literacy, research and critical thinking/problem solving while learning to use the tools of technology to develop cutting-edge curricula. Our cohort structure includes two on-site orientation meetings which enhance the student-centered community of learners. The program provides a challenging and rigorous educational environment and students can participate in the benefits of faculty mentoring and professional networking provided by our vibrant active alumni association.

B. Course Plan

The program consists of 30 units of coursework:

- IDT 505 - Foundations of Instructional Design and Web Authoring Environments
- IDT 510 – Research Practices in Instructional Design and Technology
- IDT 520 - Instructional Design Level 1: Issues in e-learning and the Design Process
- IDT 525 - Learning and Cognition Theories for Post-Secondary and Adult Instructional Settings
- IDT 530 - Instructional Design Level 2: Advanced Issues in Implementation, Management, and Program Evaluation
- IDT 535 - Instructional Strategies and Universal Design Issues in Learning Environments
- IDT 540 - Systematic Approach to Web and Multimedia Design and Development
- IDT 545 - Trends, Emerging Technologies, and Issues in Instructional Design
- IDT 550 – Practicum in Instructional Design and Technology
- IDT 597 – Project

Classes are offered in five 16-week term segments, with students taking two classes each term with a minimal break between term segments...thus all-year round. While the initial and fourth terms correspond to the fall term at CSU Fullerton, the winter and spring/summer terms are on a schedule that is different from the normal university schedule. This allows students to complete the entire program in approximately 20 months. This design element meets the needs of working professionals utilizing adult learning, instructional design theory and current innovative technology who want a fast-track program that prepares them for advancement in their career, job change or specialized training leadership in their corporate/business or higher education setting.

Courses are well designed and identify both curricular strands and specific course activities and assignments relevant to each strand. All program strands are addressed in each course. Students the PPR Team spoke with indicated they spent about 20 hours a week on the program, an appropriate amount of time for a program where students are taking two classes at a time.
C. Innovations

To create a sense of a community of learners that is sustained through the MSIDT program and into the professional community at large with alumni as well as to provide assistance to students to be successful in the program, they attend a one-day Boot-up Camp prior to starting the program and funded by a separate non-refundable student fee assessment of $573 through EO 857-2003. Content includes meeting fellow students and faculty teaching in the program as well as officers in the MSIDT Alumni Chapter, an introduction to the Moodle learning management system, information about university resources such as the library, software used in the program, and the discount plans offered to students to procure the software. They can request an alumni mentor at this point as well.

At the end of the first year of the program students return to campus at a Midpoint Symposium (also funded through the same $573 separate student fee assessment under EO857-2003) to discuss their progress to date. This also allows students to provide the program committee with feedback on the program and classes, as well as confirm their final project focus which is a practical, innovative multimedia adult focused product linked to their professional setting (online tutorial, client support CD, Just-in Time technician training tool, evaluation instrument for recertification, etc.). Students once again meet with officers of the MSIDT Alumni Chapter for additional support and mentoring.

At commencement, an alumnus provides a short talk to the graduating cohort and their families about the growth/issues of the profession in general and how they have used the degree in their current job or for advancement and/or recruitment by head-hunters based on their expertise. Also, as part of the commencement reception, students are invited to join the active MS-IDT alumni group. The alumni group provides support, information, and networking to graduates of the program, with many active members and professional development webinars such as the recent series on Gamification or Game-based Learning.

In addition to the Boot-Camp, the Director developed two other innovative groups: the MS-IDT Alumni Association and Cohort Co-Captains. The MS-IDT (program-specific) Alumni Association has elected offices and formalized meetings. After the first term segment in the program, each cohort selects two individuals (approved by the program director) to be Cohort Co-Captains. These students function as liaisons between the students in a course and the faculty, gathering issues and other questions that students may feel more at ease sharing with other students than with faculty. The Co-Captains then translate these issues to faculty or to the Director as needed.

The PPR Committee had the opportunity to discuss the program with alumni and current students, both at lunch and during a formal interview session. Students and alumni were very positive about the program, saying they “enjoyed the courses.” For example, one alumnus was “blown away by the quality of the program,” and another said the program offered a good “balance between theory, practice, and content.” Students described how enriching it was to have such varied backgrounds within each cohort; they learned the same material but applied it in many different ways. Both alumni and current students
said “classes built on each other,” taught them “how to learn,” “offered opportunities for needed experience,” and fostered building online relationships. Students and alumni also spoke very positively of the Boot-up Camp. It helped them set up their computers, gave them a “trial experience,” identified their (student) responsibilities for learning, and provided an opportunity to meet faculty and other members of their cohort. The PPR team believes this is an excellent method of building a community of learners at the beginning of the program so that the intensive, online instruction that follows benefits from established student and faculty relationships.

Alumni spoke of how the MS-IDT Alumni Association helped them continue supportive relationships, provided excellent opportunities for networking and employment, and allowed them to give feedback about the program. Cohort Co-Captains act as liaisons between students and the program. The Co-Captains of both cohorts were present, and spoke of the value of their role in keeping students informed, acting as resources for their cohort, and bringing issues to program meetings or the Director. Addition of these groups has created a unique and holistic interaction and communication pattern within the program.

II. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement/Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

A. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment of Student Learning (see Appendix C)

Student learning outcomes are:

- **Assessment/Evaluation**: Critically discriminate, compare, and select appropriate criteria, and effectively implement methodology for developing an effective instructional product.
- **Collaboration**: Work productively in team, group or collaborative settings to achieve common goals or purposes.
- **Critical Thinking and Problem Solving**: Critically analyze, evaluate and synthesize information as well as effectively generate, select, and apply appropriate solutions to solve problems in the development and implementation of the instructional product based on reasoned rationale.
- **Project Management**: Plan, organize, and manage resources (including needs analyses, group dynamics and leadership) to methodically bring about completion of defined project goals and objectives.
- **Research**: Conduct, evaluate, interpret, and synthesize research and apply theoretical ideas to the development and implementation of an instructional product in a practical setting.
- **Technology Enabled Media Literacy**: Compare, discriminate, design, implement and assess various media and technology sources in the development and implementation of the instructional product.
- **Written Communication**: Effectively and critically present ideas in a logical framework in a variety of written forms with proper language structure and mechanics.
All program outcomes are integrated into every course and most courses identify specifically how the course introduces (I) reinforces (R) extends (E) or enhances each learning outcome. **Assessment of Student Learning**

Courses use multi-modal assessments to document learning via projects, demonstrations, applications, presentations, research papers, online discussions, quizzes, and examinations. The culminating experience includes research and a practicum grounded in the theoretical foundations covered in the study plan coursework. Each student creates an electronic portfolio consisting of preparatory course work and the culminating project to document progress toward achieving program goals. Whereas students in many programs do not directly apply content until practicums at the end of the program, a strength of the MS-IDT program is that students immediately apply course content in their work settings, thus having concrete evidence of achieving “real world” outcomes, or authentic assessment.

Faculty teach course content based on course descriptions and objectives. They interact with students in the manner they deem best for delivering course content, identify the types of communication used in the course in the syllabus, and determine appropriate methods for assessing and evaluating student learning.

### III. Faculty

The program’s curriculum is taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty from the departments of Human Services, Educational Leadership, Special Education, Elementary and Bilingual Education, with assigned time to teach courses in their area of expertise. Additional part-time instructors are professionals from the business community with expertise in technology, leadership, elearning, training, curriculum development, and instructional design.

The Director and faculty are to be commended for maintaining the quality of the program, as none, including the Director, are assigned full-time. The Director developed the program, based on early work of a founding team of faculty, and has spent considerable time and effort incorporating new content to keep the program at the cutting edge. The interdisciplinary faculty is dedicated to supporting students and maintaining pedagogical currency and knowledge of technology, curriculum, and instructional design. Courses appear to be well thought out, with curricular strands and their associated content identified in each course. The program evidences an excellent structure for networking and building community, diversity, and gender balance. While the program is, by any measure, a success, the PPR team notes the following areas of concern/comments.

**Resources**

Faculty are provided laptop computers and some software by the CSUF Information Technology department. The program has purchased additional software and programs so that current technology
is utilized in instruction. Academic research resources are provided by the CSUF library and are adequate for program needs.

**Long-term Plans**

A goal of the MS-IDT program is to expand the current program to enroll two cohorts per year, one in Fall semester and one in Spring semester. The state, CSUF, and the college do not provide funding for advertising the program, thus enrollment has been largely based on the excellent reputation of the program and word-of-mouth referrals. There is no anticipated increase in funding in future years.

**PPR REVIEW TEAM ANALYSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The report that continues below reflects the Program Performance Review team’s evaluation of the progress of the MS in Information Technology program in implementing the program mission, goals and strategies and their contribution to the University and College’s Mission and Goals. The team carefully analyzed the evidence presented in the review documents; information obtained during the one day site visit on April 30, 2013; and interviews with students and faculty. The PPR team also assessed the alignment among the goals and criteria developed and results/outcomes achieved and planned and have made the recommendations and suggestions for quality improvement.

**Document Review, Content Analyses, Site Visit Meetings and Interviews**

a. MS in Information Technology Program Handbook- Boot-up Camp-August 23, 2008  
b. Program Director – Dr. JoAnn Carter-Wells  
c. Dean, College of Education - Dr. Claire Cavallaro  
d. Associate Dean, College of Education = Karen Ivers  
e. MS-IDT Administrative Assistant – Shannon Wilson  
f. Faculty  
   a. Dr. Carl Renold  
   b. Dr. Cynthia Gautreau  
   c. Dr. Shariq Ahmed  
   d. Dr. Barbara Glaeser  
   e. Dr. Joyce Lee  
   f. Doug Boynton  
   g. Jim Schools  
   h. Mark Worden  
g. MS-IDT Industry connections  
h. MS-IDT Team meeting minutes  
i. MS-IDT Curriculum maps  
j. Student narratives (Course Evaluations) for select courses  
k. Student/alumni testimonials  
l. Faculty CV  
m. Program meeting minutes
n. MS in IT Boot-up Camp Handbook – August 23, 2008

Course syllabi
a. MS-IDT 505 – Foundations of Instructional Design and Web Authoring Environments, Fall 2010, Fall, 2013
c. MS-IDT 520 - Issues in e-learning and the Design Process, Spring, 2012
d. MS-IDT 525 - INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES IN LEARNING AND COGNITION, Spring 2012
e. MS-IDT 530 Planning, Designing, Developing and Evaluating Technology-Based Instruction, Spring 2012, Spring 2013
f. MS-IDT 535 - Instructional Strategies in Pre-K through Adulthood, Summer, 2011
g. MS-IDT 540 Systematic Approach to Web and Multimedia Design and Development, Fall 2012
h. MS-IDT 545 - Emerging Technologies and Issues in Teaching, Fall 2012
i. MS-IDT 597 – Project, Spring 2013

Student Database and Group Projects, Case Studies, Research Papers, White Papers, and Reports – N-21

Alumni webpage and distribution list

MSIT Program Website

Students and Alumni

- **Cohort Co-Captains**
  Beth Sargent (2009), Michelle Ghoukasian and John Rodriguez (2010), Pauline Knox and Greg Walston (2011)

- **Alumni**
  Bill Bennett*, Vijay Chintamaneni (S), Cindy Edwards (S), Jim Schools (VP of Marketing, Sales and e-Learning for Zinsser USA and MSIDT faculty), Shan Schumacher, Tom Wilson*, Mark Worden, L’Oreal Battistelli* and Bob Nash, Associate Dean, Coastline Community College

**Site Visit Schedule**

*Tuesday, April 30, 2013*

**9:30 a.m.**  
Committee meeting- Documents Room-CP 570-32  
Shannon Wilson, MSIDT Administrative Assistant

10:30 a.m.  
JoAnn Carter-Wells-MSIDT Program Director

11:00 a.m.  
Karen Ivers, COE Associate Dean, Joyce Lee and Barbara Glaeser-MSIDT faculty -Founding Workgroup Members

11:30 a.m.  
Carl Renold (MSIDT faculty) and Doug Boynton-(VP, Knowledge Relay & MSIDT faculty)

12:00-1:15 pm  
Lunch at the Marriott Hotel, Fullerton-MSIDT Team, alumni, students, Employers - L’Oreal Battistelli* and Bob Nash, Associate Dean, Coastline Community College

**1:30 p.m.**  
Committee meeting- Documents Room-CP 570-32

2:00 p.m.  
Cynthia Gautreau (MSIDT faculty) and Shariq Ahmed-(ID consultant & MSIDT faculty)

2:30 p.m.  
Karen Ivers - COE Associate Dean

3:00 p.m.  
Claire Cavallaro - COE Dean

3:30 p.m.  
**MSIDT Alumni Association** – Bill Bennett*, Vijay Chintamaneni (S),...
Cindy Edwards (S), Jim Schools (VP of Marketing, Sales and E-Learning for Zinsser USA and MSIDT faculty), Shan Schumacher, Tom Wilson*, Mark Worden (*-Ph.D.student)

4:00 p.m. **Cohort Cocaptains** – Beth Sargent (9), Michelle Ghoukasian and Jon Rodriguez (S) (10), Pauline Knox and Greg Walston (11)

4:30 p.m **Committee meeting**- Documents Room-CP 570-32

5:00 pm **Exit Briefing**- Dean Cavallaro, Associate Dean Ivers & MSIDT Team

6:00 pm **Dinner**- COE Administration, MSIDT Team and Alumni

---

**PROGRAM STRENGTHS**

The PPR review team commends the MS-IDT program leadership and faculty. The PPR team particularly wants to highlight and recognize the following program and faculty components:

1. Alignment with university and college mission and goals
2. Dedication and expertise of the Program Director and faculty
3. Academically qualified faculty
4. Innovative and forward looking curriculum
5. Curriculum content contains practical knowledge that can be used in workplace setting, and
6. Many course assignments help students address real-world issues in their settings
7. Innovative cohort structure and use of Cohort Captains
8. Development of a community of learners – boot-up camp and midpoint symposium
9. Leadership and faculty support of students
10. Alumni network and support system
11. Practical capstone project as culminating experience linked to student outcomes
12. Learning outcomes are integrated in all program courses
13. Course management and delivery through Moodle LMS
14. Robustness and currency of curriculum topics
15. Convenience of program for working professional students
16. Internal and External Program groups which provide support and guidance and links to community
17. Appropriate interaction (synchronous and asynchronous) between faculty and students and among students
18. Reflects good practices for online programs
Recommendations for Quality Improvement

These recommendations and suggestions are in accordance with the requirements of UPS 410.200 (Program Performance Review), and are based upon review of program documents, course syllabi, student work (individual and group), interviews, and site visit information. Most recommendations and suggestions were presented to the MS-IDT leadership and faculty team at the completion of the site visit. The PPR team was impressed with the commitment and professionalism of the faculty as well as with the quality and commitment of the students and community partners with whom we met on the day of the visit.

I. Program Mission, Goals and Environment

1. The current director has initiated many changes to improve and strengthen the program, such as Epsilen portfolios, Cohort Co-Captains, and a program-specific alumni association. The director is assigned 3 hours of release time during Fall and Spring semesters.
   - Given the program’s three-semester all-year round structure, the Director should be compensated for summer work.

2. In addition to leading the program, the Director is responsible for developing community partnerships; linking with key businesses in the community to identify current practices and needs; liaising with CSUF support departments, such as OASIS; maintaining currency regarding industry needs and emerging technologies; interviewing all candidates; advising all students in the program; planning and running the Boot-up Camp and the mid-program in-person face-to-face sessions; and implementing new pedagogies, such as the current move to competency-based education. The Director also developed research projects to both evaluate the program and disseminate innovations via podium presentations and publications. The Director has the help of one part-time staff (only 8 hrs. weekly) who responds to website inquires (almost 5000 to date), phone calls, emails, faculty contracts, CMS course scheduling, textbook requisitions, applicant files, interviews, orientations and commencement events and maintains student records and those of applicants and performs other tasks as needed.
   - The Director has given generously of her time, but uncompensated time should not be an expectation. The College of Education should investigate the relationship between the work of the Director and the assigned time granted this position to see if the assigned time is adequate. Due to the unique nature of this degree (which is not an Education concentration), the program has been housed since 2001 under the Dean’s office since the inception as designed by the Vice-President of Academic Affairs and accredited as such by WASC. In addition, all Deans and chairs under both the College of Human Development and Community Service and the College of Education have recognized and supported the representation of MSIDT in the
Council of Chairs to maintain its visibility and innovative curriculum and unique corporate/business and higher education student and alumni. MSIDT is also represented on the Curriculum, Technology and Commencement committees under both the College of Human Development and Community Service and the College of Education.

- Given the program’s three-semester all-year round structure, the Director should be compensated for summer work.

II. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement/Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

- Based on review of the syllabus and interaction with students as well as the faculty teaching MS-IDT 510 (Research Practices), the PPR team notes the assumption that students have had statistics (and remember the information if taken in the past), thus spends only three weeks on this area. It is not clear if this length of review is sufficient for students to engage in statistical analyses appropriate to the graduate level. It might be valuable to include an assessment of a student’s knowledge of statistics prior to their entering the program and have an online tutorial available for students who have taken a course in statistics several years in the past and, for those students who have not had an undergraduate or graduate course in statistics, to require them to complete such a course.

- Additionally, students and alumni identified the need for a more rigorous review of statistics when working on the final project.

- The MS-IDT program has recognized the need to expand the use of media for teaching in all courses and to add new media formats, such as mobile learning. Epsilen online portfolios are currently being piloted and faculty are researching the use of video conferencing (e.g., Adobe Connect). The PPR team applauds these efforts and recommends adding more multimedia to course delivery (versus online portfolios). Gratuitous use of media for the sake of simply integrating media is not our intent. Rather, careful use of diverse forms of media (audio, video, animation and graphics) matched to both content and pedagogy, is our recommendation. The team observes that these enhancements would contribute to the efficacy of the instruction provided to students. But equally important, when used well they would serve as best practice in technology-facilitated instruction—a key component of the discipline in which MS-IDT students are engaged. Faculty should take advantage of CSU resources such as QOLT (Quality Online Learning and Teaching) (see, for example, https://sites.google.com/site/csulmssproject/qolt-home) as well as the eCatalist project (see http://ecatalst.org/our-services/qolt) to investigate ways to improve their online course material presentation.

- The Program Coordination Faculty Team/Advisory Council, under the direction of the Program Director, is viewing each course in the program at monthly meetings to align their
presentation format and review media and other online presentation modes. The courses will be improved on an ongoing basis for continued quality improvement.

- **Instructional Systems Design** is arguably based on the ADDIE Model. This five-phase, systematic process necessarily involves Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation. The MS-IDT program courses, faculty and students, each illustrated the curricular emphasis on the design and development phases of the model. This emphasis is well-placed, given the fact that most graduates will immediately find themselves designing and developing technology-based instruction and training. That said, the review team recommends expanding the curriculum to include a more deliberate focus on both analysis and evaluation:

  - **Analysis**: Based on course syllabi reviews and discussions with instructors, the curricular focus on analysis is largely limited to learner analysis. While critical, students should also develop familiarity with task analysis (including cognitive task analysis) and subject matter/content analysis. Additionally, the instructional design field currently emphasizes performance analysis as an initial step when addressing any performance problem. Understanding the range of influences on human performance is a critical step in determining (a) whether instruction is an appropriate solutions; and (2) advocating for a full solution that achieves predictive results.

  - **Evaluation**: Conversations with faculty and students, as well as a review of syllabi, suggests an opportunity to expand the curriculum specific to the evaluation phase of ADDIE to include theory and model beyond Kirkpatrick’s Four Levels of Evaluation. Graduates should understand that Kirkpatrick is one of many approaches to evaluating results from training efforts in the workplace—and one that has been increasingly criticized for its limitations in recent years. While it remains relevant and is perhaps the most frequently employed evaluation model, incorporation of additional models to illustrate the range of approaches is recommended.

  - While every degree program must make difficult decisions to balance discipline-specific content and available course hours, the committee believes that these content adjustments could be incorporated into the existing curriculum without too much additional time allocation.

- Students interviewed by the committee regularly referred to what we conclude is a core text in the program, Alessi & Trollip’s *Multimedia for Learning: Methods and Development* (3rd edition). Students praised the practical nature of this text, and the applied content it contains. While the committee recognizes these attributes as positive, we also note that the book has not been revised since 2001. Given the changing landscape of technology-based instruction—with regard to the brain and its processing of information, development processes, and the delivery technologies—we recommend reconsideration of this text for something more contemporary. Our recommendation is predicated on the recognition that
this is not the only text used in the program, and that courses incorporate a range of more contemporary readings (i.e., journals, chapters, etc.). The recommendation is made based out of concern, given the clear emphasis this text receives by students, graduates and instructors alike.

•

III. FACULTY

• Currently, faculty authenticate student work by comparing to application materials (i.e., personal statements), work done in Boot-up Camp (students are physically present), using question banks, and limiting time allotted for testing. One faculty required students to use a local proctor (i.e., university testing center). The PPR team recommends the adoption of an authentication plan to ensure that the student who is receiving the degree is, in fact, the person who has done the course work.

1. The program currently does not have full-time faculty, but uses faculty from other departments and adjunct faculty on a part-time basis. A goal of the program is to admit two cohorts each year, but that might become challenging in light of the resources available to the program. If the program does move to admitting two cohorts, the MS-IDT Program should consider hiring 1-2 full-time faculty who would, if possible, be tenure-track, and have instructional system design expertise. The team also recommends diversifying the lecturer pool with individuals who are not graduates of the program. Continue to foster and implement protocols for faculty currency and participation in emerging trends in online instruction and faculty involvement in online instruction."

2. The program’s curriculum is taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty from the departments of Human Services, Educational Leadership, Special Education, Elementary and Bilingual Education, with assigned time to teach courses of their expertise. Additional part-time instructors are professionals from the business community with expertise in technology, curriculum development, and instructional design. Aside from teaching, CSUF faculty do not receive additional compensation or release time to participate in MS-IDT activities (i.e., meetings, retreats, website updates, learning new technology to maintain currency). Thus CSUF faculty and adjunct instructors alike meet these commitments in addition to activities required by their department of record. During interviews with faculty, we noted the following needs:

• Increased time to meet as a group to continue to develop the program and courses and maintain recency with technology and teaching methods. Mandating this without providing additional compensation (release time or monies) will increase faculty stress.
• Due to new Web 2.0 tools and the need to maintain currency with emerging trends, sufficient hardware, such as laptop memory, should be available for faculty.
• An increased emphasis on project management. Currently students work on individual projects, but faculty note students are likely to work in teams in the workplace.

3. The MS-IDT Program should consider providing additional release time or professional development funds for faculty teaching in the program to enable them to a) stay current on technology and b) stay current on modes of delivery of on-line education. As a focus of the program is technology, faculty should have frequently updated hardware and access to current and emerging software.

IV. Student/Alumni Support

1. Several students spoke of how difficult it was to learn new software at a distance. Perhaps tutorials or webinars (i.e., Adobe Connect) in which students could work along with the faculty and troubleshoot issues (share screens) would be of benefit.

2. Alumni identified difficulty contacting graduates due to University interpretation of HIPPA regulations. Perhaps students could voluntarily “opt in” to the alumni group by giving the group an e-mail address.

V. Long-term Plans

1. An identified goal is to increase the number of cohorts to two per year. Data from 2007-2013 indicate 64-79% of applicants are accepted into the program each year under a rigorous application process, thus the current pool of qualified applicants would need to be expanded to run two cohorts. A second goal is year is to add certificate programs for executives/professionals and a 9-unit Mobile Learning certificate program through University Extended Education. This would require faculty time to develop courses and additional faculty to teach the courses (three courses for each program). Both goals require additional support staff. In addition, the program does not have the resources and monies for development, advertisement, and promotion, and maintaining an additional cohort and new programs. The lack of funding for promotional materials is not unique to the MS-IDT, but is something that constrains all of the state-supported online programs at CSUF.

• If the MS-IDT program does move to admitting two cohorts, the program should consider hiring 1-2 full-time faculty who would, if possible, be tenure-track, and have instructional system design expertise.

• It is recommended that the University use existing promotional avenues such as the OC Register weekly section on the campus and the Calstateonline website to promote the programs.
• The Administration should also consider setting aside a budget for promotion of such programs.

Although the Director has initiated a professional, collaborative relationship with Taco Bell for purposes of informing the curriculum from the application perspective, the program appears to rely primarily on student, preceptor, and alumni feedback for knowledge of current business practices and needs. The PPR team recommends the addition of a community advisory panel with representatives from key business areas or interests to determine current practices and the types of technology used. This group would assist the program in understanding future trends in various business sectors and validate the currency/relevancy of course content. It would also increase visibility of the program and provide opportunities for partnering with students as the program expands. Specifically, the team encouraged MS-IDT leadership to target organizations that do not already employ their graduates, and thus diversify the range of perspectives such a panel can provide.

APPENDIX A
MS in Instructional Design and Technology
Common Program Components/Outcomes
Technology and Multimedia Map
Spring, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENTS/PRODUCTS</th>
<th>COURSES-------------------------LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Small Group Presentation/Peer Critiques</td>
<td>505 (I), 525 (R), 540 (R), 520 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Software or Web-based Evaluation</td>
<td>505 (I), 540 (R), 520 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resource Identification</td>
<td>505 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trouble Shooting &amp; Computer System Assignments</td>
<td>505 (I), 540 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Small Team Designed Instructional Support</td>
<td>505 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td>505 (I), 525 (R), 595 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instructional Strategies Chart</td>
<td>535 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Online Discussions</td>
<td>505 (I), 535 (R), 520 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Digital Audio/Video or Software Use</td>
<td>505 (I), 535 (R), 540 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Beta Evaluation</td>
<td>505 (I), 597 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual Instruction Designed Product</td>
<td>505 (I), 597 (M), 540 (R), 520 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Prototype Evaluation</td>
<td>505 (I), 540 (R), 597 (R), 520 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Discussion Paper/Readings</td>
<td>535 (R), 540 (R), 597 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prototype Project</td>
<td>505 (I), 597 (M), 520 (I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Quizzes 540 (R)
16. Group Discussions 505 (I), 540 (R)
17. Research/Learning & Application Activities 505 (I), 540 (R), 535 (R), 597 (M)
18. Research Paper 540 (R), 535 (R)

*I = Introduce  
*R = Reinforce  
*M = Master

**APPENDIX B**

**MSIDT Collaborative Research Team and Community of Learners**  
*Publications and Pragmatic Scholarship (2002-2013)*

**Publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Type (e.g. article, chapter, software)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Refereed or Invited</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source (e.g., name of journal, publisher)</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/06</td>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>Under Construction: Scaffolding the Expansion of Online Learning Communities Through Computer-Mediated Communication</td>
<td>2006 Educational Technology and Media Yearbook, (31) 51-64</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/05</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>Facilitating the Development of a Learning Community in an Online Graduate Program</td>
<td>Quarterly Review of Distance Education (7) Spring, 2006, 13-33</td>
<td>Lee, Carter-Wells, Glaeser, Ivers, Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/04</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>Discovering the Meaning of Community In an Online Master’s Degree in Instructional Design and Technology</td>
<td>27th Annual Proceedings of the Association for Educational Communicati ons and Technology (AECT)</td>
<td>Lee, Carter-Wells, Glaeser, Ivers, Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**Pragmatic Scholarship (selected-about 30 to date-posted on MSIDT website)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Type (e.g. program evaluation, grant)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/06</td>
<td>Conference Paper-Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>An Emergent Model for Shaping Student-Centered Online Learning Communities</td>
<td>American Educational Research Association (AERA-2006 San Francisco)</td>
<td>Lee, Carter-Wells, Glaeser, Ivers, Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/05</td>
<td>Conference Paper-Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Enhancing the Formation of E-Learning Communities: The MSIDT Case Study</td>
<td>2005 Tech Ed Conference, Pasadena, CA</td>
<td>Lee, Glaeser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/05</td>
<td>Conference Paper-Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Learners’ Attitudes and Perceptions of Online Instruction</td>
<td>2005 Tech Ed Conference, Pasadena, CA</td>
<td>Carter-Wells, Ivers, Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/05</td>
<td>Conference Paper-Peer Referred</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Learners’ Attitudes and Perceptions of Online Instruction</td>
<td>National Educational Computing Conference, Orlando, FLA</td>
<td>Ivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presentation Type</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institution and Event</td>
<td>Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Implementing an Online MS Degree Program</td>
<td>Association for Educational Communications and Technology International (AECT) 2004 Conference Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Discovering the Meaning of Community in an Online Master's Degree Program in Instructional Design and Technology</td>
<td>Teaching Online in Higher Education Conference 2003 (TOHE)</td>
<td>Carter-Wells, Ivers, Lee, Glaeser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Weaving Assessment Throughout an Online Master's Degree Program</td>
<td>Association for Educational Communications and Technology International (AECT) 2003 Conference Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Developing An Online Degree Program: Design, Delivery, and Unique Features</td>
<td>2002 Teaching Online in Higher Education Conference (TOHE)</td>
<td>Carter-Wells, Ivers, Lee, Glaeser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/07</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Community of Learners in an Online Program: Student &amp; Faculty Voices</td>
<td>TECH ED- Ontario, CA</td>
<td>Ahmed, Glaeser, Lee, Carter-Wells, Galaviz (student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/08</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Best Online Practices Among Faculty: Instructional and Community Building Strategies</td>
<td>TECH ED- Pasadena, CA</td>
<td>Glaeser, Gautreau, Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Online Instructional Practices</td>
<td>Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education-Las Vegas</td>
<td>Glaeser, Gautreau, Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Type</td>
<td>Presentation Type</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Authors/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>Conference-Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Creating Online Learning Communities: A Longitudinal Examination of Student Perceptions and Engagement</td>
<td>Society for Information Technology &amp; Teacher Education International Conference-San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Gautreau, Street, Stang, Kaplowitz (student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>Invited Presentation</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>An Update on Accreditation and Online Programs</td>
<td>E-Learning Consortium, CSUF</td>
<td>Carter-Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>Conference Paper-Peer Reviewed</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Online Learning Readiness: Assessment Research and an Institutional Response</td>
<td>WASC-Academic Resources Conference, Costa Mesa</td>
<td>Carter-Wells, Randall, Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>Invited Presentation</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Technology in Research</td>
<td>Vietnam Scholars Program</td>
<td>Carter-Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>Conference Paper-Peer Reviewed-“Best-in-Track” Award</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>The Assessment and Development of Student and Faculty Readiness for Online Instruction</td>
<td>SLOAN C-Emerging Technologies Conference, Las Vegas</td>
<td>Randall, Carter-Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/13</td>
<td>Research Paper-Awardee</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Flipping the Classroom</td>
<td>Graduate Research Awards- CSU Fullerton</td>
<td>Acosta (student)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C
### Common Program Components/Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments/Products</th>
<th>A. Assessment and Evaluation</th>
<th>B. Collaboration</th>
<th>C. Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving</th>
<th>D. Project Management</th>
<th>E. Media Literacy</th>
<th>F. Research</th>
<th>G. Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Small Group Presentation/Peer Critiques</td>
<td>505 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>525 (R), 530 (R), 535 (R)</td>
<td>525 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>520 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>525 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>525 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Software or Web-based Evaluation</td>
<td>520 (I), 540 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>520 (R), 530 (R), 545 (R)</td>
<td>520 (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resource Identification</td>
<td>545 (I), 597 (M)</td>
<td>597 (M)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>545 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trouble Shooting &amp; Computer System Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>505 (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Small Team Designed Instructional Support</td>
<td>545 (I)</td>
<td>540 (R), 545 (M)</td>
<td>525 (R)</td>
<td>520 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>525 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>540, 545 (R)</td>
<td>525 (I), 545 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td>540 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>535 (R), 597 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instructional Strategies Chart</td>
<td>535 (R)</td>
<td>535 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Online Discussions</td>
<td>530 (R), 597 (M)</td>
<td>505 (I), 530 (R), 540 (R), 545 (M)</td>
<td>530 (R), 535, 597 (M)</td>
<td>520 (R), 530 (I)</td>
<td>510 (I), 525 (R), 535 (R)</td>
<td>505 (I), 510 (I), 520 (R), 525, 530 (R), 545 (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Digital Audio/Video or Software Use</td>
<td>535 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>540 (R), 545 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Beta Evaluation</td>
<td>530 (R), 597 (M)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>597 (M)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual Instruction Designed Product &amp; Final Project</td>
<td>597 (M)</td>
<td>535 (R)</td>
<td>505 (I), 540, 545 (R), 597 (M)</td>
<td>520 (R), 545 (M)</td>
<td>540 (R), 597 (M)</td>
<td>597 (M)</td>
<td>597 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Prototype Evaluation</td>
<td>520 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>505 (I), 520 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>597 (M)</td>
<td>520 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Discussion Paper/Readings</td>
<td>530 (R), 535 (R), 540 (R)</td>
<td>535 (R), 597 (M)</td>
<td>520 (R), 545 (M)</td>
<td>505 (I), 520 (R), 545 (M)</td>
<td>505 (I), 510 (I), 520 (R), 545 (M)</td>
<td>525 (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prototype Project</td>
<td>520 (I), 530 (R)</td>
<td>520 (I)</td>
<td>520 (I)</td>
<td>520 (I), 530 (I)</td>
<td>520 (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Group Discussions</td>
<td>525 (R)</td>
<td>505 (I), 510, 520 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R), 545 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Research/Learning &amp; Application Activities</td>
<td>510 (I), 525 (I), 540 (R)</td>
<td>540 (R)</td>
<td>535 (R)</td>
<td>530 (R)</td>
<td>535 (R), 540 (R), 597 (M)</td>
<td>510 (I)</td>
<td>510 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510 (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td>505 (I), 525 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>505 (I), 510 (I), 520 (R), 525 (R), 530 (R), 545 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sample Study Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>510 (I)</td>
<td>505 (I), 520 (R)</td>
<td>505 (I), 510 (I), 525 (R), 530 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Research Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>510 (I)</td>
<td>505 (I), 520 (R)</td>
<td>505 (I), 510 (I), 520 (R), 525 (R), 530 (R), 545 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Quizzes /Midterm Exam/Final Exam</td>
<td>510 (I), 520 (R), 545 (R)</td>
<td>520 (R)</td>
<td>510 (I), 520 (R), 525 (R), 530 (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epsilen Portfolio *(after each term segment)*

I = Introduce
R = Reinforce
M = Master

11-13/12
APPENDIX D

MSIDT PROGRAM
CORPORATE/BUSINESS &
HIGHER EDUCATION EMPLOYERS

CURRENT STUDENTS AND GRADUATES
FALL, 2013 N-115-(partial list)

ADP Dealer Services
Advanced Technology Consulting
Advantage Sales and Marketing
Adventist Healthcare
ALEKS Corporation
Allergan
Ameritrade
Amgen
Apple
Applied Rehabilitation Technology
Aramark Uniform Services
ATT Mobility
Auto Club of Southern California
Azusa Pacific University
Beckman Coulter
Bristol-Myers Squibb
Cal-Poly, Pomona
Capital One
Cengage Learning Systems
CenterQuest
Cerritos College
Chalis Communications
Chevron
Children’s Hospital –LA
Cingular Wirless
Coast Learning Systems
Coastline Community College
County of Riverside
Covered California
CSU Fullerton
Cypress College
Direct TV
Education Northwest
Edwards Life Science
Evernote
Experian
Extron Electronics
FAA/TSA- Airline Executives Association
Fisker Automotive
Fuller Seminary
GameTrain Learning. org
Gemological Institute of America
Gilead Sciences
GlobalView Advisors
Higher Applications
Hoag Memorial Hospital
Honda
Insignia Technology
Intel
Invensys
ITT Outsource, Inc.
ITT Technical Institute
James Hardie Building Products
Jet Propulsion Lab
Johnson and Johnson
Kaiser Permanente
Key Performance Network
Kia
Kofax
LAN International
Loma Linda University Medical Center
Lynda.com
Marquette University
Mazda
Mercy Health Care
Meridian Link
Millennium Pharmaceuticals
Mount San Antonio College
NBC Universal
Nissan
Northrup Gruman Information Systems
Oakley
OSHA NU
Petco Animal Supplies
Pinkberry
Primary Residential Mortgage
Pratt and Whitney
Pro-Build Holdings
Providence Health and Sciences
Quantum Technologies
Ryder Trucking
Safety-Kleen
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Stations (SONGS)
Schools First Credit Union
Sempra Energy
Shell
St. Joseph Health System