

Running Head: SURVEYING I.T. ALUMNI

Surveying Instructional Technology Program Alumni

Contact Author:
David J. Horgan
The University of Alabama
(205)-348-6060
djhorgan@bama.ua.edu

Margaret L. Rice
Vivian H. Wright
The University of Alabama

Paper presentation at the National Educational Computing Conference
San Antonio, TX
July 2008

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine opinions of graduates of two Instructional Technology programs (I.T.), a Ph.D. program in Instructional Leadership with an emphasis in Instructional Technology and a M.A. program in Computers and Applied Technology, regarding the I.T. program and its curriculum, based on post-graduate experiences. The faculty members of the I.T. programs are interested in aligning both the doctoral and masters programs' curricula with the needs of present and future students.

Literature Review

For this study, the Strategic Needs Assessment model (Gupta, 1999) was adapted to assess gaps between the curriculum of two graduate Instructional Leadership/Technology programs and current program post-graduate (alumni) experiences. The underlying reason for this research was to ensure that the programs' curricula are meeting and will continue to meet the professional needs of post-graduates. Thus, by obtaining these data, any needed changes to the curricula can be reviewed and implemented. Also, changes to other important aspects of the graduate programs (e.g., course scheduling, graduate student advising with regard to publishing, software tools) can be reviewed and implemented. Seels and Richey (1994) define Instructional Technology as follow:

Instructional Technology is the theory and practice of design, development, utilization, management, and evaluation of processes and resources for learning. . . . The words Instructional Technology in the definition mean a discipline devoted to techniques or ways to make learning more efficient based on theory but theory in its broadest sense, not just scientific theory. . . . The purpose of instructional technology is to affect and effect learning (pp. 1-9).

Theoretical Framework

According to the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (2005) all instructional technology (I.T.) programs can be aligned with the standards set by the AECT. Institutions are permitted to decide which set of standards are suitable for an individual program (Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 2005). Institutions desiring accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) are obligated to comply with the standards for programs set forth and supported by the AECT (Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 2005). With regard to The University of Alabama's I.T. program, 2 specific sets of NCATE standards are followed:

- (1) Use AECT for programs preparing educational personnel for positions in the broader arena of educational communications and instructional technology in areas such as K-12 education, higher education, business, industry, military services, government, and health/community services and
- (2) Use either AECT or ISTE (or both) for programs preparing K-12 technology leaders, technology specialists, and technology coordinators at the state, district, or building levels (p. 11).

How is UA's I.T. Program Aligned with AECT Standards?

The Ph.D. program at UA offers 27 credit hours (9 courses) in the discipline of instructional technology. The topics are wide ranging and include theories of education; instructional systems design; use of technologies such as wikis, blogs, and social networking sites; website design; principles of distance education; properties and functionality of a computer network; and technology integration. What is more, the M.A. program offers 18 credit hours (6 courses) in the discipline of instructional technology. The topics of covered in the M.A. courses include the use of computer graphics in an education/training environment; a fundamentals course

on computer applications; emerging technologies and how they can be implemented in a learning environment; the integration of educational technologies and issues and trends in the curriculum of k-12, business, and higher education; and a course in the current issues and trends affecting educational computing from the paradigms of legal, social, and ethical issues associated with technology funding; and professional development. The determination of how each course met the said requirements was through the course descriptions found on The University of Alabama’s online graduate catalog and the I.T. program website. Moreover, each of these courses is pedagogically designed to address the 5 domains as shown in Table 1.

Table 1:
UA IT Courses Aligned with AECT/NCATE Standards

AECT/NCATE Standard		UA IT courses that Meet the Established Standard.
Standard 1: Design	Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research associated with instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.	AIL 602, CAT 689/589
Standard 2: Development	Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences by applying principles, theories, and research related to print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.	AIL 601, AIL 602, AIL 600, AIL 604, AIL 606, AIL 605, CAT 520, CAT 531, CAT 533
Standard 3: Utilization	Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to media utilization, diffusion, implementations, and policy-making.	AIL 601, AIL 690, CAT 534

Standard 4: Management	Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles, theories and research related to project, resource, delivery system, and information management.	AIL 603, AIL 602, CAT 689/589, CAT 532,
Standard 5: Evaluation	Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.	AIL 602, AIL 604, CAT 689

Methods

Description of the IT Program

As described by the University of Alabama Instructional Technology website:

The Instructional Technology program provides courses designed to assist individuals seeking to be researchers, teachers, and corporate trainers in the field of instructional technology. The doctoral (Ph.D.) concentration prepares students to discover new knowledge through basic research and to answer specific questions about practical problems through applied research. The CAT Master's program is designed to help teachers, trainers, and other professionals integrate technology into daily instruction and life.

The I.T. program admits students from varied backgrounds and the Ph.D. program admits students with Masters degrees from a variety of fields. These students enter the program with different employment goals in mind, including university professors, directors of technology programs, educational leaders, teachers, corporate trainers and independent consultants. The goals

of the PhD program are to assist the students in gaining the knowledge and skills for their choice of career.

Program goals for students include:

- using current and emerging technologies to improve teaching and learning processes,
- developing a systematic approach toward designing, developing, implementing, managing, and evaluating the integration of technology into instruction,
- conducting research, and
- respecting diversity among individuals and ascribe to the highest level of ethical standards and practice in the field of instructional technology.

In 1999, the IT program's leadership changed, and consequently, the program went through curriculum and goal changes. Students surveyed were from both the previous and current leadership and their responses will be dependent on when they attended the program. One limitation to the study was that students were not asked when they graduated, so responses could not be categorized between the old and new programs.

Participants

The request to participate in the research was sent to 52 males and females, all over the age of 25, who had been awarded either a Masters of Arts degree (M.A.) in Computers and Applied Technology or a Doctor of Philosophy degree (Ph.D.) in Instructional Leadership with an emphasis in Instructional Technology from The University of Alabama's Instructional Technology (IT) program. A total of 15 males (31.3%, $n = 48$) and 33 females (68.8%, $n = 48$) agreed to participate in the research and responded to the survey for a response rate of 92% ($n = 48$).

Instrumentation

Survey research with regard to curriculum alignment in the I.T. profession was explored.

Examined were Larson (2005), Cartlidge et al. (1999), and Ducharme and Stratton (2001). The questions from Larson's (2005) survey provided the framework for the current study as his sample and purpose were most closely aligned with the purpose and sample for the current study.

The survey contained a total of 26 items consisting of 15 Likert-Type items, 7 open-ended questions, and 4 questions (3 forced-choice, and 1 fill-in the response) to obtain gender, age, type of degree received, and current position information. The survey used components from Larson's (2005) survey.

In Larson's (2005) survey, 7 demographics were examined for 2 different target groups. These demographics were as follows: (1) degree type, (2) whether or not the respondents were currently in field of instructional design, (3) whether or not the respondent had previously designed instruction, (4) year degree was obtained, (5) level of degree, (6) years of profession instructional design practice, and (7) institutions where the degree was obtained. Larson (2005) examined two target groups; the first were individuals who received their degrees in Instructional Design or related disciplines between the years 1994-2003. The second target group received their degrees prior to 1994. Also, Larson's (2005) research inquired into what type of degree program (general vs. specific) the respondents received their degree as well as the flexibility of their degree program.

In the present research, the researcher simplified Larson's (2005) survey. This was due in part to the small sample size. Larson had distributed surveys to a sample size of 254 individuals. However, Larson's 3 guiding questions greatly influenced the design of the survey used in this research. In a nutshell, Larson (2005) explored how instructional design and technology (ID&T) programs prepare students for diverse career environments (e.g., k-12, higher education, government, non-profit, etc).

Data Collection

A list of IT program alumni e-mail addresses was obtained from the Program Coordinators of both the M.A. and Ph.D. programs. The alumni were then sent an email requesting their participation in the study. The survey was administered using the online tool Survey Monkey™. As an extra measure to ensure the anonymity of the respondents and the integrity of the survey instrument, Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) encryption was employed during the initial construction of this online survey.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question: How do alumni of the IT programs regard various aspects of the program?

Hypothesis 1: There is no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between master's degree graduates and doctoral degree graduates.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between males and females.

Hypothesis 3: There is no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between the different age categories of 25-36, 37-48, 49-60, and 61+.

Hypothesis 4: There is no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between the different occupational categories of higher education, k-12 education, and other.

Results

Chronbach Alpha (Reliability)

The instrument had a reliability coefficient using Cronbach's alpha of .873 and item-to-total correlations from .271 to .759. After dropping question 5, which had an item-to-total correlation below .300, the revised instrument of 14 items had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of

.879. As noted by Carmines and Zeller (1979), reliability should not fall below .80 for widely used scales.

Of the 14 items left, the lowest item-to-total correlation was .366 with the highest being .710. This suggests that most of the items gave a significant contribution to the total instrument. High item-to-total correlations not only support the reliability of the instrument, but also document validity in that the items are measuring the same theoretical construct. The standard error of measurement was found to be 2.73. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2.

Table 2:
Descriptive Statistics of Items (n = 48)

Item	<i>m</i>	<i>sd</i>
Total	45.7083	7.87119
q1	2.69	1.075
q2	3.00	.945
q3	2.85	1.031
q4	3.33	.808
q6	2.94	.861
q7	3.29	.743
q8	3.46	.824
q9	3.00	.799
q10	2.85	1.072
q11	2.73	1.005
q12	2.94	.836
q13	3.19	.734
q14	3.50	.684
q15	2.83	.834

Demographic Data

Respondents were asked to indicate their age by selecting from the following ranges: a) 25-36, b) 37-48, c) 49-60, and d) 61 and above. Since none of the respondents chose the age range of 61 and above, this category wasn't included in the final data analysis. Table 3 displays the data.

Table 3:
Frequency Table of Respondents by Age (n = 48)

Ages	<i>f</i>	%
25-36	14	29.2
37-48	18	37.5
48-61	16	33.3
Total	48	100.0

In an effort to further analyze the survey sample, the respondents ($n = 48$) were asked to answer which degree they received: Masters or Doctorate. There was a frequency response rate of 35 (72.9%) of respondents receiving their doctoral degree, while there was a frequency rate of 13 (27.1%) of respondents receiving their Masters degree.

The respondents were asked to indicate their current position. Since this demographic question was qualitative in nature, responses needed to be categorized so that quantitative analysis could be performed. The three categories were: a) higher education, b) k-12 education and c) other. Other relates to employment outside of higher education and k-12 education. These data are further described in Table 4.

Table 4:
Frequency Table of Respondents by Current Position (n = 48)

Current Position	<i>f</i>	%
Higher Education	21	43.8
K-12 Education	16	33.3
Other	11	22.9
Total	48	100.0

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that there would be no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between master's degree graduates and doctoral degree graduates. The results of a *t*-test (2-tailed) at the .05 level of significance found no significant difference in opinions on the IT curriculum between master degree recipients and doctorate degree recipients, $t(46) = 1.108, p = .274$. Table 5

gives the means and standard deviations between master's and doctorate recipients by graduate program.

Table 5:

Groups Statistics: Graduate Program (n = 48)

Graduate program	<i>n</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>sd</i>
Masters	13	47.7692	5.96034
Doctorate	35	44.9429	8.41897

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that there would be no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between males and females. The results of a *t*-test (2-tailed) at the .05 level of significance found no significant difference in opinions on the IT curriculum between males and females, $t(46) = 0.171, p = .865$. Table 6 gives the means and standard deviations between males and females by gender.

Table 6:

Groups Statistics: Gender (n = 48)

Gender	<i>n</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>sd</i>
Male	15	46.0000	8.40918
Female	33	45.5758	7.74609

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between the different age categories of 25-36, 37-48, 49-60, and older than 61. A one-way ANOVA at the .05 level of significance revealed no significance differences between the opinions and the respondent's chronological age, $F(2,45) = 1.117, p = .336$. Also, as previously stated, since none of the respondents acknowledged 61 and above within the age demographic question, it was not included in the statistical analysis.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted that there would be no difference in opinion on the IT curriculum between the different occupational categories of higher education, k-12 education, and other. A one-way ANVOA at the .05 level of significance revealed no significant differences between the opinions and the respondent's current position, $F(2,45) = 1.744, p = .186$.

Chi-Square tests on hypothesis 1, 2, 3, and 4

A chi square test was performed on all demographics. There were no significant chi-squares at the .05 level of significance found between all demographics (gender, age, graduate program, and current position) as all cross-tabs p values were above .05.

Analysis of the open-ended questions

Responses for the first open-ended question (*In your opinion, how can the IT Department improve its course offerings?*) varied. The responses were grouped into seven categories: a) Increase IT applications courses, b) Update curriculum, c) Hire more faculty, d) No changes, e) Networking/hardware content, f) No opinion, and g) Increased instructional design courses. The most prevalent response to the first question fell into the category, Increase IT applications courses. Table 7 displays the data visually.

Table 7
Frequency Table for Question 16 Improvement of Course Offerings (n = 48)

Open-Ended Responses	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Increase IT Applications Courses	9	18.7
Update Curriculum	8	16.6
Hire more faculty	7	14.5
No changes	7	14.5
Networking/hardware content	6	12.5
No Opinion	6	12.5
Increase instructional design courses	5	10.4

There was no one dominant response to the second open-ended question (*What was your most positive experience in the program?*) from the respondents, however, the data revealed that

the greatest percentage (25%) of the respondents indicated that performing research and having the opportunity to publish was the most positive experience in the program. Due to the wide-ranging responses to this question, the responses were grouped into nine categories: a) Research and publications, b) Cohort experience, c) Faculty, d) Dissertation process, e) Non-specified positive experiences (e.g., It was all positive, I loved the whole experience), f) Technology, g) Teaching experiences, h) Graduating, and i) Availability of online courses. Table 8 displays the data visually.

Table 8

Frequency Table for Question 17 Positive Experiences (n = 48)

Open-Ended Responses	<i>f</i>	%
Research and publications	12	25.0
Cohort experience	10	20.8
Faculty	9	18.7
Dissertation process	4	8.3
Non – specific positive experiences	4	8.3
Technology	3	6.2
Teaching experiences	3	6.2
Graduating	2	4
Availability of online courses	1	2

The most frequent answer to the third open-ended question (*What was your most negative experience in the program?*), was ‘none specified’ (22.9%). Other responses of note concerned the dissertation process (12.5 %), dealing with the graduate school (12.5%), and communication issues with the faculty (12.5%). There was a wide range of responses, which were grouped into fourteen categories: a) None specified (i.e., general responses indicating a general negative experience, however, nothing specific), b) Dissertation process, c) Dealing with the graduate school, e) Communication issues with the faculty, f) Advising and registration, g) Quality of courses, h) Graduating, i) Driving to take research courses, j) Other (e.g., Taking courses at Gadsden, Lack of theoretical instruction, Facilities (i.e., construction), Theorist paper,

Comprehensive examination was not relevant, and Academic politics). Table 9 displays the data visually.

Table 9

Frequency Table for Question 18 Negative Experiences (n = 48)

Open-Ended Responses	<i>f</i>	%
None specified	11	22.9
Dissertation process	6	12.5
Dealing with the graduate School	6	12.5
Communication issues with the faculty	6	12.5
Advising and registration	4	8.3
Quality of courses	4	8.3
Graduating	3	6.2
Driving to take research courses	2	4.1
Other	6	12.5

The dominant response to the fourth open-ended question [*How have your opinions regarding IT changed as a result of being in the IT program (i.e., negatively, positively, as an instructional medium, etc.)?*], was positive (47.9%). The top-tier secondary responses concerned instructional medium (20.8 %) and No change in respondent's opinions regarding IT (12.5%). The responses to this questions varied and were grouped into five categories: a) Positively, b) Instructional medium, c) No change in the respondent's opinions regarding IT, d) Mixed feelings regarding IT, e) Lack of job opportunities, f) Other (e.g., less interest in the field of IT, profound respect for IT professionals, constructivist teaching approach, IT program's lack of practicality). Table 10 displays the data visually.

Table 10

Frequency Table for Question 19 Changed Opinions about IT (n = 48)

Open-Ended Responses	<i>f</i>	%
Positively	23	47.9
Instructional medium	10	20.8
No change in respondent's opinions regarding IT	6	12.5
Mixed feelings regarding IT	2	4.1
Lack of job opportunities	2	4.1
Other	5	10.4

The dominant response to the fifth open-ended question (*While a graduate student, in what ways were the faculty helpful or not helpful in providing guidance for your dissertation?*) pertained to how the faculty were helpful throughout the entire dissertation process (52.0%). The top-tier secondary responses concerned: lack of timely response from faculty (20.8 %), and how the faculty members were minimally helpful (12.5%). These responses were grouped into six categories: a) Helpful throughout the entire process, b) Lack of timely response from faculty, c) Minimally helpful, d) Respondents indicated not applicable, e) Provided motivational support, and f) Advocate for dealing with the graduate school. Table 11 displays the data visually.

Table 11

Frequency Table for Question 20 Faculty Guidance during Dissertation/Thesis (n = 48)

Open-Ended Responses	<i>f</i>	%
Helpful throughout the entire dissertation process	25	52.0
Lack of timely response from faculty	10	20.8
Minimally helpful	6	12.5
Responded Not applicable	4	8.3
Provided motivational support	2	4.1
Advocate for dealing with the graduate school	1	2.0

The dominant response to the sixth open-ended question (*While a graduate student, in what ways were the faculty helpful or not helpful in providing guidance for publications and presentations?*) pertained to how the faculty were helpful by reviewing/critiquing proposals as well as identifying publications (45.8%). The top-tier secondary responses concerned faculty giving ample notice for all research opportunities (18.7 %), and how the faculty members were encouraging of journal publication and conference presentations (10.4%). These responses were grouped into six categories: a) Reviewing/critiquing proposals; identifying publications; b) Faculty gave ample notice for all research opportunities; c) Encouraging of journal publication and conference presentation; d) Sometimes would receive ‘calls for research’ notices; e) Respondent indicated n/a or none; f) Research process is unclear; and g) Other (e.g., Given no opportunities for

presentations; Original three faculty were of no help; Securing travel funds; and CAT 589/689 was excellent). Table 12 displays the data visually.

Table 12

Frequency Table for Question 21 Guidance for Publications and Presentations (n = 48)

Open-Ended Responses	<i>f</i>	%
Reviewing/critiquing proposals; identifying publications	22	45.8
Faculty gave ample notice for all research opportunities	9	18.7
Encouraging of journal publication/conference presentation	5	10.4
Sometimes would receive 'calls for research' notices	3	6.2
Respondent indicated n/a or none	3	6.2
Research process is unclear	2	4.1
Other	4	8.3%

The dominant response to the seventh open-ended question (*What changes would you suggest for the IT program?*), indicated no changes to the program were needed and to keep it as is (31.2%). Other secondary responses concerned: Increase variety and perspectives of courses (14.5%), Hire more faculty members to teach and advise (10.4%), and increase the experiential learning opportunities (10.4%). These responses were grouped into ten categories: a) Indicated no changes/keep it the same, b) Increase variety and perspectives of courses, c) Hire more faculty members to teach and advise, d) Increase experiential learning opportunities, e) Expand IT specializations in and outside of education, f) Increase courses in instructional design, g) Increase availability of AEL courses, h) Loosen residency requirements, i) Make IT a major rather than a concentration, and j) Other (e.g., More alumni involvement, More research opportunities, Create dissertation support group, and Put a degree between the M.A. and the Ph.D.). Table 13 displays the data visually.

Table 13

Frequency Table for Question 22 Overall Changes to the IT Program (n = 48)

Open-Ended Responses	<i>f</i>	%
Indicated no changes/keep it the same	15	31.2
Increase variety/perspectives of courses	7	14.5
Hire more faculty members to teach and advise	5	10.4
Increase experiential learning opportunities	5	10.4
Expand IT specializations in and outside of education	4	8.3
Increase courses in instructional design	2	4.1
Increase availability of AEL courses	2	4.1
Loosen residency requirements	2	4.1
Make IT a major rather than a concentration	2	4.1
Other	4	8.3

Conclusions

This study investigated the opinions of the Instructional Technology (IT) Program alumni. The quantitative results of this survey purport no significant statistical findings for any of the hypotheses explored. This may be due in part to the relative small sample size, which is a limitation of this study. In contrast, the open-ended survey questions brought attention to these researchers several implications: (a) there was no dominant negative experiences specified, (b) the graduate programs in IT would appear to be in line with the professional needs of the alumni, and (c) Graduate students benefited from the faculty reviewing their research proposals.

Furthermore, it is clearly demonstrated by the results of this study, the graduates of the IT program are succeeding in their professions because the alignment with AECT supported NCATE standards. In the confines of this study, it could be said that the IT alumni has identified that the IT program is aligned with the current needs of IT professionals.

For the future use of this survey research, this researcher recommends the following modifications be made to the design and implementation of the survey instrument (a) modify question 20 so that it includes M.A. comprehensive examinations, (b) add a demographic question for year of graduation so as to narrow down any and all negative experiences an alumnus may

have about the program and to account for any opinions about the program prior to the current faculty, and (c) repeat the administration of this survey on a yearly basis soon after spring commencement exercises for both the M.A. and the Ph.D. program.

References

- Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (2005). *Standards for the accreditation of school media specialist and educational technology specialist programs* (4th ed.). Bloomington, IN: Author
- Carlidge, S., Gerity, B., & Eastmond, N. (1999). *Utah State University, Department of Instructional Technology: Needs Assessment* (Rep.). Logan, UT. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 434 649).
- Ducharme, S. A., & Stratton, R. W. (2001). *UA Key Student Outcomes Indicators: a comparative analysis of alumni survey response by survey year cohort & College, 1997-2000* (Rep. No. R-2001-02). Akron, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 459 203).
- Gupta, K. (1999). Overview of needs assessment. *A practical guide to needs assessments*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Larson, M. (2005). Instructional design career environments: survey of the Alignment of Preparation and Practice. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 49(6), 68-68. Retrieved September 11, 2007, from Professional Development Collection database.
- Program in instructional technology*. Retrieved August 30, 2007, from <http://elpts.ua.edu/it/index.html>
- Seels, B. B., & Richey, R. C. (1994a). *Instructional technology: definition and domains of the field*. Washington, DC: Association for Educational Communications and Technology.
- University of Alabama graduate school catalog*. (2007, August 8). Retrieved October 8, 2007, from <http://graduate.ua.edu/catalog/22500.html>

Appendix A: Instructional Technology Alumni Survey

The purpose of this survey is to examine opinions of graduates of both the Ph.D. program in Instructional Leadership with an emphasis in Instructional Technology and the M.A. program in Computers and Applied Technology (which in this survey both programs will be referred to as one labeled I.T. program) regarding the I.T. program and its curriculum, based on post-graduate experiences. As this is an anonymous survey, *please do not include your name anywhere on the survey.*

Part A:

Directions: Select the best response to the following statements using the rating scale below:

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
 SD D A SA

(1) I received a promotion as result of receiving my graduate degree from the I.T. program.	SD	D	A	SA
(2) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I received an increase in salary.	SD	D	A	SA
(3) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I obtained a better position.	SD	D	A	SA
(4) The I.T. program provided me with professional development experiences.	SD	D	A	SA
(5) The I.T. program’s courses included relative abstract theories and concepts.	SD	D	A	SA
(6) The I.T. program afforded me many opportunities to conduct research.	SD	D	A	SA
(7) The I.T. program’s courses included tangible projects (e.g., developing web-based instruction modules) that allowed for the integration of theories, concepts and skills.	SD	D	A	SA
(8) The I.T. program’s classes were easy to fit into my schedule.	SD	D	A	SA
(9) The I.T. program provided me with the courses necessary for job opportunities in I.T.	SD	D	A	SA
(10) My occupational responsibilities increased as a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program.	SD	D	A	SA
(11) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, my job security increased.	SD	D	A	SA

Strongly Disagree SD	Disagree D	Agree A	Strongly Agree SA	
(12) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I have more proficiency in using software tools.	SD	D	A	SA
(13) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I am more effective in administering instructional technology in the workplace.	SD	D	A	SA
(14) I believe I have benefited from the experience of completing a graduate degree in the I.T. program.	SD	D	A	SA
(15) I was satisfied with the range of course offerings in the I.T. program.	SD	D	A	SA

Part B:

Directions: The following questions ask for your opinions about the I.T. program.

- (16) In your opinion, how can the I.T. Department improve its course offerings?

- (17) What was your most positive experience in the program?

- (18) What was your most negative experience in the program?

- (19) How have your opinions regarding I.T. changed as a result of being in the I.T. program (i.e., negatively, positively, as an instructional medium, etc.)?

- (20) While a graduate student, in what ways were the faculty helpful or not helpful in providing guidance for your dissertation/thesis?
- (21) While a graduate student, in what ways were the faculty helpful or not helpful in providing guidance for publications and presentations?

- (22) What changes would you suggest for the I.T. program?

Part C: Demographic Data

- (23) Gender (circle only one answer):
 - A. Male
 - B. Female

- (24) Age range (circle only one answer):

- A. 25 – 36
- B. 37 – 48
- C. 49 – 60
- D. 61 – Above

(24) Which graduate degree did you complete?

- A. Masters
- B. Ph.D.

(26) Current position: _____

Appendix B Instructional Technology Alumni Survey (Revised)

The purpose of this survey is to examine opinions of graduates of both the Ph.D. program in Instructional Leadership with an emphasis in Instructional Technology and the M.A. program in Computers and Applied Technology (which in this survey both programs will be referred to as one labeled I.T. program) regarding the I.T. program and its curriculum, based on post-graduate experiences. As this is an anonymous survey, *please do not include your name anywhere on the survey.*

Part A:

Directions: Select the best response to the following statements using the rating scale below:

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
SD D A SA

(1) I received a promotion as result of receiving my graduate degree from the I.T. program.	SD	D	A	SA
(2) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I received an increase in salary.	SD	D	A	SA
(3) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I obtained a better position.	SD	D	A	SA
(4) The I.T. program provided me with professional development experiences.	SD	D	A	SA
(5) The I.T. program afforded me many opportunities to conduct research.	SD	D	A	SA
(6) The I.T. program's courses included tangible projects (e.g., developing web-based instruction modules) that allowed for the integration of theories, concepts and skills.	SD	D	A	SA
(7) The I.T. program's classes were easy to fit into my schedule.	SD	D	A	SA
(8) The I.T. program provided me with the courses necessary for job opportunities in I.T.	SD	D	A	SA
(9) My occupational responsibilities increased as a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program.	SD	D	A	SA
(10) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, my job security increased.	SD	D	A	SA

Strongly Disagree SD	Disagree D	Agree A	Strongly Agree SA
(11) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I have more proficiency in using software tools.	SD	D	A SA
(12) As a result of being a graduate of the I.T. program, I am more effective in administering instructional technology in the workplace.	SD	D	A SA
(13) I believe I have benefited from the experience of completing a graduate degree in the I.T. program.	SD	D	A SA
(14) I was satisfied with the range of course offerings in the I.T. program.	SD	D	A SA

Part B:

Directions: The following questions ask for your opinions about the I.T. program.

- (15) In your opinion, how can the I.T. Department improve its course offerings?

- (16) What was your most positive experience in the program?

- (17) What was your most negative experience in the program?

- (19) How have your opinions regarding I.T. changed as a result of being in the I.T. program (i.e., negatively, positively, as an instructional medium, etc.)?

- (20) While a graduate student, in what ways were the faculty helpful or not helpful in providing guidance for your dissertation/thesis?

- (21) While a graduate student, in what ways were the faculty helpful or not helpful in providing guidance for publications and presentations?

- (22) What changes would you suggest for the I.T. program?

Part C: Demographic Data

(23) Gender (circle only one answer):

- A. Male
- B. Female

(24) Age range (circle only one answer):

- A. 25 – 36
- B. 37 – 48
- C. 49 – 60
- D. 61 – Above

(24) Which graduate degree did you complete?

- A. Masters
- B. Ph.D.

(26) Current position: _____