School of Education
PLO Data – MA SPED, 2024-25

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

Outcome Measure 1: 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	2024-25*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students		3	5	NA
Introduction		3.0	3.0	
*2024-25 data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
- This is the second year this program pathway has been in place. At this early juncture, and with such a small N, meaningful conclusions cannot be drawn.
- Observations
  - there are few students on this pathway
  - Criteria is Met - those that are included in this indicator scored at the ceiling of the rubric in 2023-24 and in 2024-25.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
None at this point due to small N and little historical data. It is worth noting scores for both years this data has been collected have been at the ceiling of the rubric.

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 2: 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 *Literature Review* section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
		2023-24	2024-25*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students		3	5	NA
Literature Review		3.0	2.8	
*2024-25 data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- This is the second year this program pathway has been in place. At this early juncture, and with such a small N, meaningful conclusions cannot be drawn.
- Observations
  - there are few students on this pathway
  - Criteria is Met - those that are included in this indicator scored at the ceiling of the rubric in 2023-24 and in 2024-25.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
None at this point due to small N and little historical data.

Rubric Used

Literature Review	Strong 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 connection to program standard(s) 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.	Minimal/No connection to program standard(s) 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 3: 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	2024-25*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students		3	5	NA
Artifacts		2.67	3.0	
*2024-25 data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- This is the second year this program pathway has been in place. At this early juncture, and with such a small N, meaningful conclusions cannot be drawn.
- Observations
  - there are few students on this pathway
  - Criteria is Met - those that are included in this indicator scored at the ceiling of the rubric in 2023-24 and in 2024-25.

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 thorough evaluation of the product in terms of the criteria established and with reference to literature review.	Provides justification of artifact choice connecting to standard. Provides evaluation of the product in terms of the criteria established and with reference to literature review.	Provides minimal justification for artifact choice with some explanation connecting to the standard. 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 4: 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	2024-25*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students		3	5	NA
Reflection on Artifacts		2.67	3.0	
*2024-25 data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- This is the second year this program pathway has been in place. At this early juncture, and with such a small N, meaningful conclusions cannot be drawn.
- Observations
  - there are few students on this pathway
  - Criteria is Met - those that are included in this indicator scored at the ceiling of the rubric in 2023-24 and in 2024-25.

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. Artifact supports Conclusions and implications from literature review. Provides focus areas to improve artifacts. Provides detailed plans for use in future context(s). Identifies potential barrier(s) to use in future context(s). Explains how the barriers will be addressed. Explains how the existing research on this topic is valuable. Clearly identifies the focus area for future action research.	Reflections include connection to the standard. Artifact supports conclusions from literature review. Provides a focus area to improve artifacts. Provides plans for use in future context(s). Identifies at least 1 potential barrier(s) to use in future context(s). Explains how the barrier(s) will be addressed. Explains how the existing research on this topic is valuable. Identifies the focus area for future action research.	Reflections include some connection to the standard. Artifact not connected to literature review. Provides a minimal or unclear focus area to improve artifacts. Provides minimal and unclear plans for use in future context(s). Potential barrier(s) to use in future context(s) are unclear or not identified. Minimal or unclear explanation of how the existing research on this topic is valuable. 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 5: 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	2024-25*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students		3	5	NA
Reflection on Capstone		3.0	2.8	
*2024-25 data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- This is the second year this program pathway has been in place. At this early juncture, and with such a small N, meaningful conclusions cannot be drawn.
- Observations
  - there are few students on this pathway
  - Criteria is Met - those that are included in this indicator scored at the ceiling of the rubric in 2023-24 and in 2024-25.

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.