

Initial Approval of Specialty Program

Recommendations from Review Panel Regarding Programs to Prepare Teachers of Educational Technology (NP)

March 6, 2006

Institution: Central Michigan University					
Program Level	Major (# Credits)	Minor (# Credits)	Group Major (# Credits)	Group Minor (# Credits)	Endorsement Only (# Credits)
Elementary					18
Secondary					18
K-12					
Source of Standards/Guidelines: Michigan State Board of Education				Pub. Date: June 13, 2002	
Program Assessment Summary/Recommendation					
Meets all standards and requirements	X	Not all standards and requirements are met	X	Insufficient documentation for program review	
Approval	X	Program is not Approvable as Presented			
Standards/Requirements Not Met:					
Reviewers did not feel that the application from CMU was ready for review by the Michigan Department of Education for the following reasons:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most recent version of the application does not address many of the issues raised by the reviewers of the original application on 7-22-05. • The application lacks the polish expected in a formal submission. Beyond the typographical errors, there are serious compositional problems that interfere with the readers' ability to understand the author's intent. These problems made it difficult for reviewers to look beyond the surface features of the document and concentrate on matters of substance. • While the revised application is much improved in terms of completeness over the original submission, it reads like a rough draft that has yet to be reviewed by the author's CMU colleagues. • The application has both problems of internal consistency and problems of substance in terms of coursework appropriately matched to the standards and indicators. Reviewers were left with the impression that a collection of existing courses were squeezed together to try to meet the NP requirements instead of developing a curriculum from whole cloth, beginning with the standards and indicators and then generating courses that stem from those standards. 					

Examples of unmet standards (not a comprehensive list):

1.2.1 design developmentally appropriate learning opportunities that apply educational technology-enhanced instructional strategies to support the diverse needs of learners.

Reviewers can see how adaptive technologies are used to meet the needs of certain student populations, but what about other aspects of diversity?

1.2.2 apply current research on teaching and learning with educational technology when planning learning environments and experiences.

Because of the vague response, reviewers could not determine how or if this standard is met.

1.3.1 use, and foster the use of, educational technology-enhanced experiences to address state content and technology standards set forth in the Michigan Curriculum Framework.

The CMU response to this standard reads, "Often students identify an instructional needs that is premises that there is a gap in instruction between what the standards say students should be learning and mastering and what the MEAP assessment program reports as actual student learning." This needs explanation.

1.3.2 apply educational technology to develop students' higher order skills and creativity, including critical thinking and the learning skills set forth in the Michigan Curriculum Framework.

It is unclear how the referenced course and assignment specifically meets this standard.

1.3.4 manage student-learning activities in an educational technology-enhanced environment.

The description for 590 is fine in terms of meeting adaptive technology needs, but what about other needs? The description for 707 is insufficient and does not substantiate an understanding of those needs. The description for 643 is vague.

Additional information needed/action to be taken:

The Required Courses are listed as totaling 15 hours, but there are 18 hours of courses listed. It appears that candidates must complete one elective. Do they have a choice among multiple options? Please explain which courses candidates may take to meet this requirement.

Please explain where the 709 field experience takes place.

Comments:

This review is not intended to cover all the weaknesses in this proposed program. The institution is encouraged to thoughtfully respond to the reviewer recommendations from July 2005 and to employ a team approach to ensure that the program components are clearly presented. Please note that volunteer reviewers should not have to search for information or struggle to interpret the intent of the documentation presented.

Reviewers have observed that other institutions have entire courses devoted to movie editing. They wondered how candidates could 'master' movie editing software along with all of the other items listed in the syllabus for EDU 590.