Preface

The *Educational Media and Technology Yearbook* 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 I, "Trends and Issues," presents an array of chapters that develop some of the current themes listed above, in addition to others. Part II, "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 III, "Leadership Profiles," authors provide biographical sketches of the careers of instructional technology leaders. Part IV, "Organizations and Associations in North America," and Part V, "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 VI, the "Mediagraphy," presents an annotated listing of selected current publications related to the field.

For a number of years we have worked together as editors and the sixth with Dr. Michael Orey as the senior editor. Last year as the senior editor, Orey decided to try and come up with a list of the top programs rather than just the list of all the programs. This has proven to be problematic. First of all, bias exists when we are rating a field in which our program is within those to be rated. A second concern is the lack of data available for selecting the top programs which might remove some of this bias. Yet another issue is why a list is needed at all. Finally, an issue we had not foreseen is that there actually several "fields" interested in how technology influences teaching and learning.

Here we attempt to address some of these issues. First, why do this list. In the short period of time we attempted to create such a list, many people have expressed concern. People want to know why their program may have been left out. Our intent was to generate a list of the top programs, without a rank ordered list similar to the method employed by *US News and World Report*. So, why go through this process? There are some good reasons to do this. One is that potential students want to make decisions about which school to attend and a list like this may assist them. Another reason is that often we compete for resources within our colleges and membership among the top programs in the country may provide some leverage. Another reason

might be to motivate some departments that are left out to work towards being included in the list. The bottom line is that the last three sections of this book are essentially data and this list provides some analysis for that data.

The inherent weakness in this analysis is its basis in our conversations with others as the sole rubric for judgment. Data has not been analyzed to create this list of top programs. Initially this year we tried to use some measurement for this process. We examined the past two years of issues of the Educational Technology Research and Development (ETRD) journal and counted the number of publications from different Instructional Technology related departments. We counted the institution only once if it had multiple authors from a single institution, but multiple authors from separate institutions, were counted as distinct individuals. This method generated the following list:

5 – Nanyang Technological University in Singapore
4 – University of Georgia
3 – Indiana University, Florida State University, Utah State University
2 – Brigham Young University, University of Miami (Ohio), Virginia Tech, Penn State University

This analysis was sent to some of the people from last year's identified programs of instructional technology. Those universities not in the list immediately began lobbying to be put on the list based on other data such as grant money generated. Others complained that ETRD provides too narrow of a focus and members of organizations such as the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), International Conference on the Learning Sciences (ICLS), International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI), and Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE) often do not choose to publish in ETRD. Thus we return to the issue of what is the field that concerns itself with technology and how it relates to learning, teaching and education.

The programs participating in ISTE are not the same as the programs participating within our sponsoring organization, AECT. The programs in ICLS are not the same as those participating in ISTE and AECT. Not only do we have various organizations with nuanced differences in focus, but the field itself can be called, "Instructional Technology," "Educational Technology," "Learning Sciences," or "Information Science."

If we are the Learning Sciences, then we are a "... community of researchers and practitioners who use cognitive, socio-cognitive, and socio-cultural approaches to studying learning in real-world situations and designing environments, software, materials, and other innovations that promote deep and lasting learning" (ISLS, 2008). In contrast, AECT says, "Educational technology is the study and ethical practice of facilitating learning and improving performance by creating, using, and managing appropriate technological processes and resources" (Januszewski & Molenda, 2008, p. 1). The former definition points to a more theory driven focus, yet the two definitions seem to have the same focus to us as editors. Library and information science converge with these areas with Information Literacy (IL). The AASL/AECT standards explain that the information literate individual accesses

information efficiently and effectively, critically evaluates it, and can use and gather information accurately and creatively and technology is a leading tool in this endeavor (AASL/AECT, 1998). The bottom line is that there is a great deal of overlap between these allegedly distinct fields. For the sake of convenience, we are going to break the world up into Learning and Information. The former we will label Learning, Design, and Technology (LDT) because this seems to embrace all perspectives. The Information Science field has largely influenced the former School Library Media section, so the other field we will call Information Science. Given this variance in field definitions, and with little comparative data available, we are trying to create a list of the top programs in a field of related studies peopled by organizations such as ISTE, AECT, AACE, ISPI and ISLS for the LDT field. Certainly there are other great programs and we will work towards gathering data for the 2010 edition of EMTY so that will be data driven.

In the meantime, we compiled a list of top LDT programs. You might think of this list as an opinion list and that is okay. We sought and received opinions from about 5 to 10 other faculty members from around the country, but other than the data on publications in ETRD, all of this anecdotal data was opinions. For a while, we had separate categories for those programs that focused most of their efforts at the masters level and those that focused on doctoral education. In the end, we just combined them into a single list. The top 30 LDT programs based on this opinion data *listed alphabetically* are:

Arizona State University
Brigham Young University
Carnegie Mellon University
East Carolina University
Florida State University
George Mason University
Georgia Tech
Indiana University
Miami University of Ohio
MIT Media Lab
Nanyang Technological University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Penn State University
Purdue University
San Diego State University
Stanford University
Syracuse University
University of California Berkeley
University of California Los Angeles
University of Georgia
University of Memphis
University of Michigan

   University of South Alabama
   University of Twente
   University of Washington
   Utah State University
   Vanderbilt University
   Virginia Tech
   Wayne State University

   Similarly, we polled just a very few folks working in schools in the area of Infor-
mation Science. If the LDT list is tentative, this list is even more tentative because
fewer people offered opinions. However, we would like to use this list as a starting
point for gathering further data next year. We do not want to rank order our list, just
have a list of some of the most influential programs. Here is our very tentative list
of IS programs that focus on information in the schools *listed alphabetically*:

   Drexel University
   Florida State University
   Rutgers University
   San Jose State University
   University of British Columbia
   University of Georgia
   University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
   University of Maryland
   University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
   University of North Texas
   University of South Carolina
   University of Washington
   University of Wisconsin

   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:

- Technology represents tools that act as extensions of the educator.
- Media serve as delivery systems for educational communications.
- 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.

- The fundamental tenet is that educational media and technology should be used to:

  1. achieve authentic learning objectives,
  2. situate learning tasks,
  3. negotiate the complexities of guided learning,
  4. facilitate the construction of knowledge,
  5. aid in the assessment/documenting of learning,
  6. support skill acquisition, and
  7. manage diversity.

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.

Athens, USA	Michael Orey
Athens, USA	V. J. McClendon
Athens, USA	Robert Maribe Branch

References

1. ISLS. (2008). *About the International Society of the Learning Sciences*. Accessed July 15, 2008, from http://www.isls.org/about.html
2. Januszewski, A., & Molenda, M. (2008). *Educational technology: A definition with commentary*. New York: Erlbaum.
3. American Association of School Librarians and Association of Educational Communications and Technology. (1998). *Information power*. Chicago: American Library Association.