

Educational Media and Technology Yearbook

For further volumes:
<http://www.springer.com/series/8617>

Michael Orey • Stephanie A. Jones
Robert Maribe Branch
Editors

Educational Media and Technology Yearbook

Volume 36, 2011

 Springer

Editors

Michael Orey
Learning, Design, and Technology Program
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA, USA
mikeorey@uga.edu

Stephanie A. Jones
Instructional Technology
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, GA, USA
sjones@georgiasouthern.edu

Robert Maribe Branch
Learning, Design, and Technology Program
University of Georgia
Athens, GA, USA
rbranch@uga.edu

ISSN 8755-2094

ISBN 978-1-4614-1304-2

e-ISBN 978-1-4614-1305-9

DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-1305-9

Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

All rights reserved. This work may not be translated or copied in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 233 Spring Street, New York, NY 10013, USA), except for brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis. Use in connection with any form of information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed is forbidden.

The use in this publication of trade names, trademarks, service marks, and similar terms, even if they are not identified as such, is not to be taken as an expression of opinion as to whether or not they are subject to proprietary rights.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Preface

The audience for the *Yearbook* consists of media and technology professionals in schools, higher education, and business contexts. Topics of interest to professionals practicing in these areas are broad, as the Table of Contents demonstrates. The theme unifying each of the following chapters is the use of technology to enable or enhance education. Forms of technology represented in this volume vary from traditional tools such as the book to the latest advancements in digital technology, while areas of education encompass widely ranging situations involving learning and teaching which are idea technologies.

As in prior volumes, the assumptions underlying the chapters presented here are as follows:

1. Technology represents tools that act as extensions of the educator.
2. Media serve as delivery systems for educational communications.
3. Technology is *not* restricted to machines and hardware, but includes techniques and procedures derived from scientific research about ways to promote change in human performance.
4. The fundamental tenet is that educational media and technology should be used to:
 - (a) Achieve authentic learning objectives
 - (b) Situate learning tasks
 - (c) Negotiate the complexities of guided learning
 - (d) Facilitate the construction of knowledge
 - (e) Aid in the assessment/documenting of learning
 - (f) Support skill acquisition
 - (g) Manage diversity

The *Educational Media and Technology Yearbook* (EMTY) has become a standard reference in many libraries and professional collections. Examined in relation to its companion volumes of the past, it provides a valuable historical record of current ideas and developments in the field. Part One, "Trends and Issues," presents an array of chapters that develop some of the current themes listed above, in addition

to others. Part Two, “Library and Information Science,” concentrates upon chapters of special relevance to K-12 education, library science education, school learning resources, and various types of library and media centers – school, public, and academic among others. In Part Three, “Leadership Profiles,” authors provide biographical sketches of the careers of instructional technology leaders. Part Four, “Organizations and Associations in North America,” and Part Five, “Graduate Programs in North America,” are, respectively, directories of instructional technology-related organizations and institutions of higher learning offering degrees in related fields. Finally, Part Six, the “Mediagraphy,” presents an annotated listing of selected current publications related to the field.

The Editors of the *Yearbook* invite media and technology professionals to submit manuscripts for consideration for publication. Contact Michael Orey (mikeorey@uga.edu) for submission guidelines.

For a number of years we have worked together as editors and the eighth with Dr. Michael Orey as the senior editor. Within each volume of the EMTY we try to list all the graduate programs, journals, and organizations that are related to both Learning, Design, and Technology (LDT) and Information and Library Science (ILS). We also include a section on trends in LDT, trends in ILS, and we have a section profiling some of the leaders in the field. Beginning with the 2007 volume, we have attempted to generate a list of leading programs in the combined areas of LDT and ILS. One year, we were able to compose an alphabetical list of 30 of the programs that people told us were among the best. However, each year we have worked on being more systematic. Instead of following the *US News and World Report* model and have one top program list, we decided to use some of the same numbers that they use and generate a collection of top-20 lists, rather than attempt to generate a statistical model to generate the rankings list. One thought was to rank programs according to the number of publications that were produced; however, deciding which journals to include was an issue. We decided to use 2007 through 2009 as the years to count (since at the time of writing, it is still 2010 and so we do not have a complete year). Furthermore, we decided to only count actual research reports that appeared in one of two journals, *Educational Technology Research and Development* and the *Journal of the Learning Sciences*. These two journals were primarily selected based on the general sense that they are the leading journals in the area of LDT. Noticeably absent is the area of information and library science. So, while these numbers are pretty absolute, choosing to only count these journals is somewhat arbitrary.

The other top-20 lists are based on self-report data collected as part of the program information in the EMTY. Every year, we collect general information about programs in LDT and ILS and publish this information in the *Yearbook*. This year we opted to collect some additional data. We asked the representatives of each of the institutions to enter the US dollar amount of grants and contracts, the number of PhD graduates, the number of Masters graduates, and the number of other graduates from their programs. We also asked them for the number of full-time and part-time faculty. We then generated a top-20 list for some of these categories. The limitation in this case is that it is self-report data and there is no real way of verifying that the

Table 1 Top 20 Graduate Programs in the area of Learning, Design, and Technology as measured by the number of publications in *Educational Technology Research and Development* and the *Journal of the Learning Sciences*

Rank	Institution	Pubs
1	University of Georgia	7.65
2	Indiana University	6.66
3	Arizona State University	5.32
4	Nanyang Technological University	4.33
5	University of Wisconsin	4.1
6	University of Colorado	2.83
7	Stanford University	2.5
7	University of New Mexico	2.5
9	University of Toronto	2.3
10	Sultan Qaboos University	2
10	SUNY-Buffalo	2
10	University of Hong Kong	2
10	Wayne State University	2
10	Florida State University	2
10	Open University of the Netherlands	2
16	Brigham Young University	1.83
16	UCLA	1.83
18	SRI International	1.81
19	University of Northern Colorado	1.75
20	University of Memphis	1.7

data is accurate. So, while the list of the 30 top programs from the first year lacked hard data, and the lists this year are based on numbers, those numbers may be just as unreliable. In the end, we have a collection of lists that we hope will be of use to our readers. Many of the universities that appeared in the list last year are here again, in addition to many others. More information about many of these universities can be found in part five of this edition.

There are six top-20 lists in this preface. The first of these top-20 lists is based on a count of publications. We used every issue from the 2007 through 2009 volume years of the *Educational Technology Research and Development* journal and the *Journal of the Learning Sciences*. We eliminated all book reviews and letters-to-the-editor and such. We only used the primary academic articles of these journals. Each publication counted 1 point. If the article had two authors, then each authors' institution received 0.5 points. If there were three authors, then 0.33 was spread across the institutions. Also, as an additional example, if there were three authors and two of them were from the same institution, then that institution received 0.66 points and the institution of the remaining author received 0.33. Finally, the unit receiving the points was the University. So, in the case of Indiana University where they have both a Learning Sciences and an Instructional Technology program, all of the points for IT and LS were aggregated into one variable called Indiana University. Table 1

shows our results. The University of Georgia came out as the top LDT program in the world. They were not in the top 5 last year; they were tied for sixth. Moving to the top program moved the University of Colorado to the sixth position. Since we are now counting publications across 3 years, we are getting a bit more variance. Last year, we had a 28-way tie for twentieth. This year we still have a large number of institutions in a tie (six tied for tenth), but we do have a list of just 20 schools. Even with large number of ties last year, we had the University of Toronto not make last year's list and come out as the ninth-ranked LDT program this year. Others that made the top 20 this year that were not in last year's top 20 included Florida State University, SRI International, and the University of Northern Colorado. While we did this list to rate universities, it is interesting that a research center comes in eighteenth place on the list even though they are not a university. We included them because of the way we counted the data.

We would love to hear your feedback on this approach for the future. Are there other journals that ought to be included? Is it unfair that there are more publications in ETRD than IJLS? What about recent graduates publishing with their new institution when the work was done at their previous institution? I am certain there are many other issues, and we welcome constructive feedback.

The two primary measures of research achievement are publications and grants. While choosing ETRD and IJLS was somewhat arbitrary, the numbers are verifiable. In Table 2, we present the top-20 programs according to the dollar amount of grants and contracts for that program over the academic year of 2009–10. While Table 1 was constrained to LDT, Table 2 has both LDT programs and ILS programs which resulted in the University of Calgary being number one in the grants and contracts list, but not appearing at all in the publication list. In fact, the only institutions that are both on the list for publications and grants are the University of Wisconsin (five for publications and ten for grants) and Wayne State University (ten for publications and fourteen for grants).

Tables 1 and 2 are measures of research productivity. The remaining four tables are more related to teaching than research. The first, Table 3, shows the top-20 programs in terms of the number of fulltime faculty. You will notice that the list is ordered by the number of full-time faculty (FT), but number five, The University of Hong Kong has 102 total faculty members. We decided that full-time faculty was more important than part time as a measure and so only generated one list for number of faculty. We just thought it would be interesting to see the total number of faculty as well. For example, it is interesting to see The University of Hong Kong and the University of Calgary with very large numbers (102 and 83, respectively), while the University of North Carolina has 31 full-time and only one part-time faculty members.

Table 2 Top-20 LDT and ILS programs by the amount of grant and contract monies

Rank	University	Department/Program	Monies
1	University of Calgary	Office of Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education	\$20,000,000.00
2	University of North Carolina	School of Information and Library Science	\$6,843,136.00
3	George Mason University	Instructional Technology Programs	\$2,500,000.00
4	University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Learning, Media and Technology Masters Program/Math Science and Learning Technology Doctoral Program	\$2,300,000.00
5	Virginia Tech	College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences	\$1,800,000.00
6	Georgia State University	Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology	\$1,600,000.00
7	University of Missouri-Columbia	School of Information Science & Learning Technologies	\$1,585,885.00
8	New York University	Educational Communication and Technology Program, Steinhart School of Culture, Education, and Human Development	\$1,500,000.00
9	The Ohio State University	Cultural Foundations, Technology, & Qualitative Inquiry	\$1,200,000.00
10	University of Wisconsin-Madison	Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education	\$1,000,000.00
10	Lehigh University	Teaching, Learning, and Technology	\$1,000,000.00
10	California State University Monterey Bay	Master of Science in Instructional Science and Technology (IST)	\$1,000,000.00
13	Texas A&M University	Educational Technology Program, Department of Educational psychology	\$876,000.00
14	Wayne State University	Instructional Technology	\$750,000.00
15	Utah State University	Department of Instructional Technology & Learning Sciences, Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services	\$642,000.00
16	University of Virginia	Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Special Education, Curry School of Education	\$500,000.00
16	University of Geneva	Master of Science in Learning and Teaching Technologies	\$500,000.00
16	Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey	School of Communication and Information	\$500,000.00
16	Ohio University	Instructional Technology	\$500,000.00
20	Valley City State University	School of Education and Graduate Studies	\$450,000.00

Table 3 Top-20 LDT and ILS programs by the number of fulltime faculty (also shown is the total faculty which includes both full and part-time faculty)

Rank	University	Department/Program	FT	Total
1	University of North Carolina	School of Information and Library Science	31	32
2	Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey	School of Communication and Information	22	37
3	Valdosta State University	Curriculum, Leadership, & Technology	20	30
4	University of Bridgeport	Instructional Technology	14	35
5	Anadolu University	Computer Education and Instructional Technology	12	21
5	Valley City State University	School of Education and Graduate Studies	12	17
5	The University of Hong Kong	Faculty of Education	12	102
5	Fordham University	MA Program in Public Communications in the Department of Communication and Media Studies	12	16
9	University of Georgia	Department of Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, College of Education	11	11
9	University of Louisville	College of Education and Human Development	11	25
9	The University of Oklahoma	Instructional Psychology and Technology, Department of Educational Psychology	11	11
12	Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute	Media Education (Social Pedagogic Faculty)	10	30
12	University of West Georgia	Department of Media and Instructional Technology	10	14
12	California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB)	Master of Science in Instructional Science and Technology (IST)	10	22
12	Indiana University	School of Education	10	14
12	Utah State University	Department of Instructional Technology & Learning Sciences, Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services	10	11
12	University of Missouri-Columbia	School of Information Science & Learning Technologies	10	18
18	Hacettepe University	Computer Education and Instructional Technology	9	19
19	Western Illinois University	Instructional Technology and Telecommunications	8	11
19	University of Calgary	Office of Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education	8	83
19	Ball State University	Masters of Arts in Curriculum and Educational Technology	8	12

The next top-20 list is the number of PhD graduates. This list might be a good measure of research productivity as well as teaching productivity. The number of graduates is self-reported. The number of publications is verifiable, so it is interesting to compare who is on both lists. None of the top four are on the top-20 publications list, but there are six institutions on both lists. Wayne State, Florida State, Indiana, Northern Colorado, Georgia, and Memphis are on both of these lists. The top school in terms of PhD graduates is also on the list for the top grant-awarded institutions, George Mason (Table 4).

Our next top-20 list is based on the number of master's graduates. In our mind, we might consider this an indication of whether the program is more practitioner-oriented than say the number of PhD graduates. Interestingly, George Mason comes in fifth here whereas they were number one in PhD graduates. So, this differentiation may be meaningless. It is interesting to note that schools like University of Bridgeport, University of Calgary, Rutgers, NYIT, George Mason, and North Carolina are all producing more than 100 graduates per year. It appears that for profit institutions such as Walden University and the University of Phoenix are very active; however, neither of these two schools chose to complete the form. We are not implying that the large numbers are necessarily because these programs are online, but online degree programs certainly allow many more people to further their education (Table 5).

The final top-20 list is the combined degree graduate list. It is very similar to the master's list, but since the online form only had entries for PhD graduates, masters graduates, and other graduates, I thought it might be most useful to just show the total number of graduates from each of the programs who chose to update their information in our database. It is very interesting to see the University of Bridgeport come out on top here with 426^o! This is nearly double the number of second place University of Calgary with 261 graduates (Table 6).

We acknowledge that any kind of rankings of programs is problematic. We hope you find our lists useful. If you have suggestions, please let us know and we will try to accommodate those changes in future publications of the *Yearbook*. If your program is not represented, please contact one of us and we can add you to the database so that you can be included in future issues.

Athens, GA, USA
Statesboro, GA, USA
Athens, GA, USA

Michael Orey
Stephanie A. Jones
Robert Maribe Branch

Table 4 Top 20 LDT and ILS programs by the number of PhD graduates

Rank	University	Department/Program	PhD Grads
1	George Mason University	Instructional Technology Programs	15
1	University of Bridgeport	Instructional Technology	15
3	University of Central Florida	College of Education - ERTL	12
4	University of Calgary	Office of Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education	11
4	Wayne State University	Instructional Technology	11
6	University of Missouri-Columbia	School of Information Science & Learning Technologies	10
6	Florida State University	Educational Psychology and Learning Systems	10
6	Illinois State University	Curriculum and Instruction	10
6	Ohio University	Instructional Technology	10
10	Indiana University	School of Education	7
10	Virginia Tech	College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences	7
12	The Ohio State University	Cultural Foundations, Technology, & Qualitative Inquiry	5
12	The University of Texas at Austin	Curriculum & Instruction	5
12	Kent State University	Instructional Technology	5
12	University of Louisville	College of Education and Human Development	5
16	Utah State University	Department of Instructional Technology & Learning Sciences, Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services	4
16	University of Northern Colorado	Educational Technology	4
16	Texas A&M University	Educational Technology Program, Dept. of Educational psychology	4
16	University of Toledo	Curriculum & Instruction	4
20	Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey	School of Communication and Information	3
20	University of Georgia	Department of Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, College of Education	3
20	University of North Carolina	School of Information and Library Science	3
20	University of Memphis	Instructional Design and Technology	3
20	University of Virginia	Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Special Education, Curry School of Education	3
20	Georgia State University	Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology	3

Table 5 Top 20 LDT and ILS programs by the number of master’s graduates

Rank	University	Department/Program	Masters
1	University of Bridgeport	Instructional Technology	294
2	University of Calgary	Office of Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education	235
3	Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey	School of Communication and Information	144
4	New York Institute of Technology	Department of Instructional Technology and Educational Leadership	130
5	George Mason University	Instructional Technology Programs	130
6	University of North Carolina	School of Information and Library Science	111
7	University of Colorado Denver	School of Education and Human Development	84
8	The University of Rhode Island	Graduate School of Library and Information Studies	80
9	University of Central Florida	College of Education - ERTL	65
10	University of Missouri- Columbia	School of Information Science & Learning Technologies	59
11	San Francisco State University	College of Education, Department of Instructional Technology	50
11	Buffalo State College	Computer Information Systems Department	50
11	Illinois State University	Curriculum and Instruction	50
14	Wayne State University	Instructional Technology	48
14	Emporia State University	Instructional Design and Technology	48
16	University of Nebraska-Omaha	Department of Teacher Education	41
17	University of Georgia	Department of Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, College of Education	40
17	Georgia Southern University	College of Education	40
17	Lehigh University	Teaching, Learning, and Technology	40
17	University of West Georgia	Department of Media and Instructional Technology	40
17	University of Central Arkansas	Leadership Studies	40
17	Bloomsburg University	Instructional Technology & Institute for Interactive Technologies	40
17	University of Nebraska at Kearney	Teacher Education	40
17	Michigan State University	College of Education	40

Table 6 Top 20 LDT and ILS programs by the overall total number of graduates

Rank	University	Department/Program	Total Degrees
1	University of Bridgeport	Instructional Technology	426
2	University of Calgary	Office of Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education	261
3	Illinois State University	Curriculum and Instruction	260
4	Valley City State University	School of Education and Graduate Studies	191
5	Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey	School of Communication and Information	147
6	George Mason University	Instructional Technology Programs	145
7	University of North Carolina	School of Information and Library Science	136
8	New York Institute of Technology	Department of Instructional Technology and Educational Leadership	130
9	University of Missouri-Columbia	School of Information Science & Learning Technologies	87
10	University of West Georgia	Department of Media and Instructional Technology	85
10	University of Colorado Denver	School of Education and Human Development	85
12	University of Central Florida	College of Education - ERTL	84
13	California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB)	Master of Science in Instructional Science and Technology (IST)	80
13	The University of Rhode Island	Graduate School of Library and Information Studies	80
15	Wayne State University	Instructional Technology	67
16	University of Central Arkansas	Leadership Studies	60
17	University of Nebraska-Omaha	Department of Teacher Education	54
18	University of Georgia	Department of Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, College of Education	53
19	San Francisco State University	College of Education, Department of Instructional Technology	50
19	Buffalo State College	Computer Information Systems Department	50

Contents

Part I Trends and Issues in Learning, Design, and Technology

Introduction	3
Liz May and Michael Orey	
Storytelling Among Israeli and Palestinian Children in the Era of Mobile Innovation	7
Elizabeth Buckner and Paul Kim	
Self-regulated Learning as a Foundational Principle for a Successful Strategy in Teaching Educational Research Methods to Doctor of Philosophy Students	23
Tonia A. Dousay, Diane Igoche, and Robert Maribe Branch	
Fostering Student Cognition in Computer-Supported Online Collaborative Learning Environment	37
Khe Foon Hew, Seng Chee Tan, and Wing Sum Cheung	
A Two-Dimensional Framework for Evaluating Teachers’ Technology Adoption	49
Manuel Gerardo Saldivar, Keith E. Maull, Benjamin R. Kirshner, and Tamara R. Sumner	
Issues and Trends in Instructional Technology: Lean Times, Shifts in Online Learning, and Increased Attention to Mobile Devices	67
Abbie Brown and Tim Green	
Enlisting the Collaboration of the Educational Technology Professional Community to Develop a Knowledge Management System of the Field: edu-techKNOWiki	81
Anne K. Bednar and Nancy L. Copeland	

The Vital Role(s) of School Librarians in Literacy Learning 91
 Nancy Flanagan Knapp

An Analysis of Educational Technology-Related Doctoral Programs in the United States 99
 Heng-Yu Ku, Shari Plantz-Masters, Kim Hosler, Watsatree Diteeyont, Chatchada Akarasriworn, and Tzong-Yih Lin

Examining the Design of Media-Rich Cognitive Tools as Scaffolds in a Multimedia Problem-Based Learning Environment 113
 Min Liu, Lucas Horton, Paul Toprac, and Timothy T. Yuen

An Instructional Design Approach to Effective Instructional Game Design and Assessment 127
 Debbie Denise Reese

PowerPoint and the Pedagogy of Digital Media Technologies 139
 Catherine Adams

Part II Trends and Issues in Library and Information Science

Introduction 157
 Stephanie A. Jones

Culturally Sensitive Learning Practices 161
 Lesley S.J. Farmer

In the District and on the Desktop: School Libraries as Essential Elements of Effective Broadband Use in Schools 173
 Nancy Everhart and Marcia Mardis

ACCESS Issues in School Library Media Centers: Examining Library Schedules, Library Closures, and Poverty 187
 Karen Gavigan, Gail Dickinson, and Shana Pribesh

School Counselors and School Media Specialists: Innovative Leaders in Partnerships Promoting Student Mental Health with Online Resources 199
 Kylie P. Dotson-Blake and Kaye B. Dotson

Towards an Understanding of Professional Dispositions of Exemplary School Librarians 209
 Jami L. Jones and Gail Bush

Revised *Library Media Standards* Adopted by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards 219
 Delia Neuman

Part III Leadership Profiles

Introduction 229
 Robert Maribe Branch

**Tillman (Tim) James Ragan: Celebrating Four Decades
 of Excellent Scholarship** 231
 Diane Igoche

Thomas Reeves 235
 Diane Igoche

Glenn Snelbecker 239
 Diane Igoche

Ron Zemke: A Leader on the Other Side of the Fence..... 243

Part IV Organizations and Associations in North America

Introduction 247
 Michael Orey

Organizations and Associations in the US and Canada 249

Part V Graduate Programs

Introduction 333
 Michael Orey

Organizations and Associations in the US and Canada 335

Part VI Mediagraphy: Print and Non-print Resources

Introduction 481
 Jinn-Wei Tsao

Mediagraphy 485

Index..... 507

Contributors

Catherine Adams Department of Secondary Education, Faculty of Education,
University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
cathy.adams@ualberta.ca

Chatchada Akarasriworn Educational Technology Program,
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, University of Northern Colorado,
Greeley, CO, USA

Anne K. Bednar Educational Media & Technology, Eastern Michigan
University, Ypsilanti, MI, USA
abednar@emich.edu

Robert Maribe Branch Learning, Design, and Technology Program,
University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
rbranch@uga.edu

Abbie Brown Department of Mathematics, Science Instructional Technology
Education, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA
brownab@ecu.edu

Elizabeth Buckner Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, USA
ebuckner@stanford.edu

Gail Bush Department of Reading and Language, National-Louis University,
Skokie, IL, USA

Wing Sum Cheung Learning Sciences and Technologies, National Institute
of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore
wingsum.cheung@nie.edu.sg

Nancy L. Copeland Educational Media & Technology, Eastern Michigan
University, Ypsilanti, MI, USA
ncopeland@emich.edu

Gail Dickinson Darden College of Education, Old Dominion University,
Norfolk, VA, USA
gdickins@odu.edu

Watsatree Diteeyont Educational Technology Program, College of Education
and Behavioral Sciences, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO, USA

Kaye B. Dotson Department of Library Science, East Carolina University,
Greenville, NC, USA
dotsonl@ecu.edu

Kylie P. Dotson-Blake Department of Higher, Adult and Counselor Education,
East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA
blakek@ecu.edu

Tonia A. Dousay Department of Educational Psychology and Instructional
Technology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
teedee@uga.edu

Nancy Everhart Partnerships for Advancing Library Media (PALM) Center,
School of Library and Information Studies, College of Communication
& Information, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA
everhart@fsu.edu

Lesley S.J. Farmer CSULB/EdPAC, California State University Long Beach,
Long Beach, CA, USA
lfarmer@csulb.edu

Karen Gaviganssor School of Library and Information Science,
University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA
kgavigan@mailbox.sc.edu

Tim Green Department of Elementary and Bilingual Education,
California State University, Fullerton, CA, USA
timdgreen@gmail.com

Khe Foon Hew Learning Sciences and Technologies, National Institute
of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore
khefoon.hew@nie.edu.sg

Lucas Horton Instructional Technology Program, Department of Curriculum
and Instruction, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

Kim Hosler Educational Technology Program, College of Education and
Behavioral Sciences, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO, USA

Diane Igoche Department of Educational Psychology and Instructional
Technology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
dai011@uga.edu

Jami L. Jones Department of Library Science, East Carolina University,
Greenville, NC, USA
jonesj@ecu.edu

Stephanie A. Jones Instructional Technology, Georgia Southern University,
Statesboro, GA, USA
sjones@georgiasouthern.edu

Paul Kim Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, USA
phkim@stanford.edu

Benjamin R. Kirshner Institute of Cognitive Science, University of Colorado
at Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA
Ben.kirshner@colorado.edu

Nancy Flanagan Knapp Applied Cognition and Development Program,
University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
nfknapp@uga.edu

Heng-Yu Ku Educational Technology Program, College of Education
and Behavioral Sciences, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO, USA
heng-yu.ku@unco.edu

Tzong-Yih Lin Educational Technology Program, College of Education
and Behavioral Sciences, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO, USA

Min Liu Instructional Technology Program, Department of Curriculum
and Instruction, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA
MLiu@mail.utexas.edu

Marcia Mardis Partnerships for Advancing Library Media (PALM) Center,
School of Library and Information Studies, College of Communication
& Information, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA
mardis@fsu.edu

Keith E. Maull Institute of Cognitive Science, University of Colorado
at Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA

Liz May Learning, Design, and Technology Program, The University of Georgia,
Athens, GA, USA
lizmay3@hotmail.com

Delia Neuman College of Information Science and Technology,
Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA
dneuman@drexel.edu

Michael Orey Learning, Design, and Technology Program, The University
of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
mikeorey@uga.edu

Shari Plantz-Masters Educational Technology Program, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO, USA

Shana Pribesh Darden College of Education, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, USA
spribesh@odu.edu

Debbie Denise Reese Center for Educational Technologies, Wheeling Jesuit University, Wheeling, WV, USA
debbie@cet.edu

Manuel Gerardo Saldivar Institute of Cognitive Science, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA
saldivar@colorado.edu

Tamara R. Sumner Institute of Cognitive Science, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA
tamara.sumner@gmail.com

Seng Chee Tan Learning Sciences and Technologies, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore
sengchee.tan@nie.edu.sg

Paul Toprac Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, USA

Jinn-Wei Tsao Learning, Design, and Technology Program, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
miketsao@uga.edu

Timothy T. Yuen The University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, USA