

School of Education
PLO Data – MA SPED, 2023-24

Learning Outcome: 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	14	10	6	3.88 (.31)
Area of Focus	3.93	3.80	3.92	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MA Sped candidates demonstrated their ability to articulate research questions through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2023-24 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The average score has generally remained stable over the last three academic years with year over year change well below the three-year average standard deviation of .31.

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 along two pathways for completion a Master’s of Arts (MA) and a Master’s of Science (MS) in Special Education.

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 <i>Introduction</i> section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.				
		2023-24*		3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students			3	NA
Introduction			3.0	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- No conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is new, as is the course that we are sourcing the PLO data from. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and no previous years of data.

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: 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 <i>Literature Review</i> section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	14	10	6	3.67 (.46)
Literature Review	3.74	3.59	3.63	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MA Sped candidates demonstrated their ability to synthesize research in their field through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2022-23 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The average score has generally remained stable over the last three academic years. Though it rose slightly from 2022-23 to 2023-24, year over year change was close to the three-year average standard deviation of .46. The utility of this outcome, particularly in 2023-24 is undermined by low N.

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 along two pathways for completion a Master’s of Arts (MA) and a Master’s of Science (MS) in Special Education. As more MA Sped candidates transition to the new finishing courses the Ns will increase offering outcomes with more utility.

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			3	NA
Literature Review			3.0	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- No conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is new, as is the course that we are sourcing the PLO data from. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and no previous years of data.

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. All references are relevant and peer reviewed. All citations in APA format. Literature review is synthesized and/or analyzed and has 2 or more alternate points of view.	Includes 10 references. 5 references dated within the last 5 years. All references are relevant and peer reviewed. Most citations in APA format. Literature review has some synthesis and/or analysis with at least 1 alternate point of view.	Includes less than 10 references. Less than 5 references dated within the last 5 years. Some references are relevant and peer reviewed. Some citations in APA format. Literature review has minimal synthesis and/or analysis and missing an alternate point of view.

Learning Outcome: 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	14	10	6	3.62 (.47)
Data Collection and Analysis	3.64	3.65	3.50	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MA Sped candidates demonstrated their ability to convey their data collection and analysis methods through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2023-24 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. Though dipping observably from 2022-23 levels, the average score has generally remained stable over the last three academic years with year over year change well below the three-year average standard deviation of .47. Further, the 2023-24 score utility is undermined by low N – increasing that number is desirable.

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 along two pathways for completion a Master’s of Arts (MA) and a Master’s of Science (MS) in Special Education.

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			3	NA
Artifacts			2.67	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- No conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is new, as is the course that we are sourcing the PLO data from. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and no previous years of data.

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: 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 Action Plan section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	14	10	6	3.60 (.48)
Action Plan	3.61	3.59	3.63	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MA Sped candidates demonstrated their ability to connect research findings and recommendations to their initial research questions through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2023-24 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The average score has remained very stable over the last three academic years varying by a mere .02 over time. That change falls well below the three-year average standard deviation of .48. The low N in 2023-24 calls for caution when interpreting this data and should increase when candidates fully transition to the new finishing courses (see below and Outcome 4b).

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 along two pathways for completion a Master’s of Arts (MA) and a Master’s of Science (MS) in Special Education.

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				3	NA
Reflection on Artifacts				2.67	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.					

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- No conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is new, as is the course that we are sourcing the PLO data from. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and no previous years of data.

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: 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	14	10	6	3.77 (.40)
Impact on Teaching Practice	3.75	3.69	3.96	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MA Sped candidates demonstrated their ability to explain the relevance of their research to their fields through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2023-24 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The average score observably increased in 2023-24 but has generally remained stable over the last three academic years with year over year change well below the three-year average standard deviation of .44. It should be noted that the low 2023-24 N undermines the reliability of this indicator.

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 along two pathways for completion a Master’s of Arts (MA) and a Master’s of Science (MS) in Special Education.

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 5 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			3	NA
Reflection on Capstone			3.0	
*2023-24 data collected 6/01/24, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- No conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is new, as is the course that we are sourcing the PLO data from. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and no previous years of data.

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.
---	--	--	--