

School of Education
PLO Data – MAT, 2022-23

Learning Outcome: PLO 1 - Candidates articulate research question(s) connected to an area of focus.

Outcome Measure 1a: GED6089P Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Area of Focus (DQP1) section of the GED6089 Final Project Rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: Specialized Knowledge

	Average Score on Area of Focus section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	56	51	31	3.83 (.33)
Area of Focus	3.85	3.80	3.82	

*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by clearly stating their area of focus and research questions in their thesis projects.
- Data is mixed over the last three years but changes fall well within the 3yr. average standard deviation of .33 indicating the changes are likely natural fluctuation around the average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses, GED6094 and GED6095 (See Outcome Measures 1-5b), have been developed for completing a Master’s of Arts in Teaching (MAT). As the number of candidates completing GED6089 Final Projects wanes, and the number of candidates completing GED6095 Capstone Projects increases, SOE will have a more homogeneous dataset to report on candidate outcomes. For now, SOE notes that MAT students have consistently been exceeding the criteria for success on outcome measure one, and based on early returns for outcome 1b that trend will continue going forward.

Rubric Used

Category	Rubric Score: 4 Exceeds Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 3 Meets Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 2 Below Standard	Rubric Score: 1 Far Below Standard
Area of Focus (DQP 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated area of focus • Research questions are clearly written and appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of focus is somewhat vague • Research questions are somewhat vague 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area of focus is overly broad or narrow • Research questions are unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no clear area of focus • Research questions are inappropriate

Outcome Measure 1b: GED6095 Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (2.0) out of a possible (3.0) points on Criteria 1 Introduction of the GED6095 Final Project Rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Average Score on Introduction section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.				
		2023-24*		3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students			31	NA
Introduction			2.71	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by clearly stating their area of focus and research questions in their capstone projects.
- It is too early in the implementation of this new finishing course to draw meaningful conclusions but early indications suggest the transition to the new indicator will align with historical trends on this indicator (See 1a).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses are being deployed for completing a Master’s of Arts in School Counseling. As the pool of enrollment and historical data increases we will be able to better gauge candidate performance on this indicator.

Rubric Used

Rubric	Exceeds Standards	Meets Standards	Below standards
Introduction	Detailed and thorough description of personal philosophy of education, purpose of capstone, connection to program standard(s), strong connection to literature review, artifacts, capstone format.	Indicates personal philosophy of education, purpose of capstone, connection to program standard(s), some connection to literature review, artifacts, capstone format.	Some description of personal philosophy of education, purpose of capstone, connection to program standard(s), minimal or no connection to literature review, artifacts, capstone format.

Learning Outcome: PLO 2a - Candidates synthesize research from/in the primary field of study.

Outcome Measure 2a: GED6089P Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Literature Review (DQP2) section of the GED6089 Final Project rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. **Broad Integrative Knowledge**
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: Broad Integrative Knowledge

	Average Score on Literature Review section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	56	51	31	3.67 (.42)
Literature Review	3.59	3.73	3.72	

*2022-23 data collected 6/01/23, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is above target criterion each of the last three years – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by drawing upon reference sources from within the last five years, meeting minimum source counts, making sure references are relevant and credible and adhering to APA format in their thesis projects.
- Data is mixed over the last three years with 2021-22 forming the floor of the three year distribution. Average score changes from 2021-22 to 2022-23 but remains unchanged from 2022-23 to 2023-24. Recent scores exceed the three year average which is pulled lower by the 2021-22 score. The 3yr average standard deviation of .42 spans the gaps between all three annual scores rendering these differences observable but not noteworthy. It is worth noting 2021-22 is when the program pushed to fully implement APA7 formatting, perhaps it took a year to adjust teaching practices as scores bobbed back up toward 2020-21 highs in 2022-23.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses are being deployed for completing a Master's of Arts in Teaching (MAT). As more and more students matriculate into the new finishing courses our understanding of their performance will become more nuanced and may prompt an increase in outcome expectations.

Rubric Used

Category	Rubric Score: 4 Exceeds Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 3 Meets Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 2 Below Standard	Rubric Score: 1 Far Below Standard
Literature Review (DQP 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 or more recent (5 years) sources cited • At least 20 sources • All sources are relevant and credible • All citations are correctly made according to APA format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 to 5 recent sources cited • At least 15 sources • Most sources are relevant and credible • Most citations are correctly made according to APA format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 recent sources cited • At least 10 sources • Some are relevant and credible • Some citations are correctly made according to APA format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few or no citations • Less than 10 sources • Citations are not in the proper format

Outcome Measure 2b: GED6095 Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (2.0) out of a possible (3.0) points on Criteria 2 Literature Review of the GED6095 Final Project Rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Average Score on <i>Literature Review</i> section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.				
		2023-24*	3 yr Avg (SD)	
Number of Students		31	NA	
Introduction		2.74		
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by demonstrating their ability to synthesize research in their capstone project literature review chapter.
- It is too early in the implementation of this new finishing course to draw meaningful conclusions, but early indications suggest the transition to the new indicator will align with historical trends on this indicator (See 2a).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses are being deployed for completing a Master’s of Arts in School Counseling. As the pool of enrollment and historical data increases we will be able to better gauge candidate performance on this indicator.

Rubric Used

Literature Review	Strong connection to program standard(s)	Includes connection to program standard(s)	Minimal/No connection to program standard(s)
	Includes 10 or more references. 5 references or more dated within the last 5 years.	Includes 10 references. 5 references dated within the last 5 years.	Includes less than 10 references. Less than 5 references dated within the last 5 years.
	All references are relevant and peer reviewed.	All references are relevant and peer reviewed.	Some references are relevant and peer reviewed.
	All citations in APA format.	Most citations in APA format.	Some citations in APA format.
	Literature review is synthesized and/or analyzed and has 2 or more alternate points of view.	Literature review has some synthesis and/or analysis with at least 1 alternate point of view.	Literature review has minimal synthesis and/or analysis and missing an alternate point of view.

Learning Outcome: PLO 3 - Candidates convey their data collection and analysis methods.

Outcome Measure 3a: GED6089P Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Data Collection and Analysis (DQP3) section of the GED6089 Final Project rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: Intellectual Skills

	Average Score on <i>Data Collection and Analysis</i> section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	56	51	31	3.59 (.42)
Data Collection and Analysis	3.51	3.66	3.61	

*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by clearly describing their target participant group, describing their data collection methods, data sources and their analysis plans and findings in their thesis projects.
- Data is mixed over the last three years with changes falling well within the 3yr. average standard deviation of .42. The increase in scores from 3.51 to 3.66 was followed by a decrease from 3.66 to 3.61. The decrease in participants is a product of new finishing courses being phased in for MAT candidates. These score changes are minor and support the notion of natural fluctuation around the three-year average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses have been developed for completing a Master's of Arts in Teaching (MAT). We look forward to collecting data on these courses and rubrics that align to PLO's and DQP Learning Areas. Early returns (see outcome 3b) suggest that candidate performance on the new PLOs align well with past performance.

Rubric Used

Category	Rubric Score: 4 Exceeds Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 3 Meets Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 2 Below Standard	Rubric Score: 1 Far Below Standard
Data Collection and Analysis (DQP 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of target population • Detailed description of how data was collected • Utilizes multiple data sources • Detailed analysis of the data provides identification of themes and patterns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of target population • Some details of how data was collected • Utilizes at least two sources of data • Analysis of the data mentions themes and patterns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some description of target population • Minimal description of how data was collected • Utilizes one or two sources of data • Little analysis of the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no description of target population • Little or no description of how the data was collected • Utilizes one source of data • No analysis of the data

Outcome Measure 3b: GED6095 Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (2.0) out of a possible (3.0) points on Criteria 3 Artifacts of the GED6095 Final Project Rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Average Score on Artifacts section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.				
		2023-24*		3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students			31	NA
Introduction			2.77	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by demonstrating their ability to select artifacts that align to the theme of their capstone and evaluate them on their own merit.
- It is too early in the implementation of this new finishing course to draw meaningful conclusions, but early indications suggest the transition to the new indicator will align with historical trends on this indicator (See 3a).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses are being deployed for completing a Master’s of Arts in School Counseling. As the pool of enrollment and historical data increases, we will be able to better gauge candidate performance on this indicator.

Rubric Used

Artifacts	Provides detailed justification of artifact choice connecting to standard.	Provides justification of artifact choice connecting to standard.	Provides minimal justification for artifact choice with some explanation connecting to the standard.
	Provides thorough evaluation of the product in terms of the criteria established and with reference to literature review.	Provides evaluation of the product in terms of the criteria established and with reference to literature review.	Provides minimal evaluation of the product in terms of the criteria established with minimal reference to literature review.

Learning Outcome: PLO 4 - Candidates connect research findings and recommendations to initial research questions and the larger field of education.

Outcome Measure 4a: GED6089P Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Action Plan (DQP4) section of the GED6089 Final Project rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: Intellectual Skills

	Average Score on <i>Action Plan</i> section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	56	51	31	3.60 (.43)
Action Plan	3.54	3.68	3.58	

*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by connecting their findings, recommendation or action plan and their original research questions in their thesis projects.
- 2023-24 scores decreased from 2022-23 but remain slightly above 2021-22 levels. These changes fall well within the 3yr. average standard deviation indicating the changes are likely natural fluctuation around the average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses have been developed for completing a Master’s of Arts in Teaching (MAT). We look forward to developing courses and rubrics that will align to PLO’s and DQP Learning Areas. Early returns (See outcome 4b) on new course outcome measures suggest candidates are meeting criteria for success at similar levels.

Rubric Used

Category	Rubric Score: 4 Exceeds Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 3 Meets Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 2 Below Standard	Rubric Score: 1 Far Below Standard
Action Plan (DQP 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific and clear connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions • Elements of the action plan are missing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions • Most components of the action plan are missing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recommendations or action plan

Outcome Measure 4b: GED6095 Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
 Candidate average score of (2.0) out of a possible (3.0) points on Criteria 4 Reflection on Artifacts of the GED6095 Final Project Rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. **Applied and Collaborative Learning**, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Average Score on Reflection on Artifacts section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.				
		2023-24*		3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students			31	NA
Introduction			2.71	

*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by demonstrating their ability to reflect on their artifacts applying what they learned in their literature review to their artifacts in their capstone project artifact reflections.
- It is too early in the implementation of this new finishing course to draw meaningful conclusions, but early indications suggest the transition to the new indicator will align with historical trends on this indicator (See 4a).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses are being deployed for completing a Master’s of Arts in School Counseling. As the pool of enrollment and historical data increases, we will be able to better gauge candidate performance on this indicator.

Rubric Used

Reflection of Artifacts	Reflections include connection to the standard.	Reflections include connection to the standard.	Reflections include some connection to the standard.
	Artifact supports Conclusions and implications from literature review.	Artifact supports conclusions from literature review.	Artifact not connected to literature review.
	Provides focus areas to improve artifacts.	Provides a focus area to improve artifacts.	Provides a minimal or unclear focus area to improve artifacts.
	Provides detailed plans for use in future context(s).	Provides plans for use in future context(s).	Provides minimal and unclear plans for use in future context(s).
	Identifies potential barrier(s) to use in future context(s). Explains how the barriers will be addressed.	Identifies at least 1 potential barrier(s) to use in future context(s). Explains how the barrier(s) will be addressed.	Potential barrier(s) to use in future context(s) are unclear or not identified.
	Explains how the existing research on this topic is valuable.	Explains how the existing research on this topic is valuable.	Minimal or unclear explanation of how the existing research on this topic is valuable.
	Clearly identifies the focus area for future action research.	Identifies the focus area for future action research.	Minimal or unclear focus area for future action research.

Learning Outcome: PLO 5 - Candidates explain the relevance of their research to the field of education and their educator practices.

Outcome Measure 5a: GED6089P Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Impact on Teaching Practice (DQP5) section of the GED6089 Final Project rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: Intellectual Skills

	Average Score on <i>Impact on Teaching Practice</i> section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	56	50	31	3.76 (.37)
Impact on Teaching Practice	3.66	3.84	3.79	

*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations describing transformation changes in their knowledge, skills and dispositions; making connections between their project and student learning, and connecting the work in their thesis projects back to the existing body of literature.
- Data is mixed over the last three years with 2023-24 values dipping below 2022-23 levels yet well above the 2021-22 level. These changes fall well within the 3yr. average standard deviation indicating they are likely natural fluctuation around the average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses have been developed for completing a Master’s of Arts in Teaching (MAT). We look forward to developing courses and rubrics that will align to PLO’s and DQP Learning Areas.

Rubric Used

Category	Rubric Score: 4 Exceeds Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 3 Meets Standard (passing)	Rubric Score: 2 Below Standard	Rubric Score: 1 Far Below Standard
Impact on Teaching Practice (DQP 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes a clear transformation of candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project gives a clear description of how and why research improves student learning • Project is clearly and articulately situated in and tied to existing body of literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes some transformation of candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project somewhat describes how and why research improves student learning • Project is partially situated in and tied to existing body of literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes little transformation of candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project describes very little of how and why research improves student learning • Project is vaguely situated in and tied to existing body of literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project describes no transformation of candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions • Project does not describe how and why research improves student learning • Project does not refer to existing body of literature or literature is inappropriate

Outcome Measure 5b: GED6095 Written Product

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

Candidate average score of (2.0) out of a possible (3.0) points on Criteria 4 Reflection on Capstone of the GED6095 Final Project Rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Average Score on Reflection on Capstone section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.				
		2023-24*		3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students			31	NA
Introduction			2.81	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by demonstrating their ability to explain the relevance of their capstone to their fields through their performance on the outcome measure
- It is too early in the implementation of this new finishing course to draw meaningful conclusions, but early indications suggest the transition to the new indicator will align with historical trends on this indicator (See 5a).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, GED6089 is being phased out for all SOE candidates. New courses are being deployed for completing a Master’s of Arts in School Counseling. As the pool of enrollment and historical data increases, we will be able to better gauge candidate performance on this indicator.

Rubric Used

Reflection of the Capstone Project/Program	Reflection is clearly written and explains with detail the candidate’s experience.	Reflection is clearly written and explains the candidate’s experience.	Reflection is written and minimally explains the candidate’s experience.
---	--	--	--