

School of Education
PLO Data – Ed. Administration, 2025-26

Learning Outcome: Candidates will articulate research questions connected to an area of focus and justify their significance within the field.

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 <i>Introduction</i> section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	3	10	6	3.0
Introduction	3.0	3.0	3.0	

*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Only preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is only three years old and has a small enrollment. As program enrollment grows, we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- The N decreased for this program from 2024-25 levels while remaining well above those of 2023-24.
- Criteria is met - The indicator held constant at its ceiling of 3.0, well above the criteria of success of 2.0 and at the same level as the 3yr average. Candidates in this program continually demonstrate their ability to articulate a research question connected to a problem of practice in their field.

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 will synthesize research in their primary field of study to inform understanding and practice.

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 <i>Literature Review</i> section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	3	10	6	2.95
Literature Review	3.0	3.0	2.83	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Only preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is only three years old and has a small enrollment. As program enrollment grows, we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- The N decreased for this program from 2024-25 levels while remaining well above those of 2023-24.
- Criteria is met - The indicator decreased from its ceiling of 3.0, while remaining well above the criteria of success of 2.0. In 2025-26 it falls below the 3yr average while indicating candidates in this program continually demonstrate their ability to synthesize research in their field related to a problem of practice or topic of their choice.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and history of meeting performance criteria.

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: Candidates will be able to clearly describe, justify, and communicate their data collection and analysis methods in ways appropriate to the field of study.

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	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	3	10	6	2.90
Artifacts	2.67	2.9	3.0	

*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Only preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is only three years old and has a small enrollment. As program enrollment grows, we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- The N decreased for this program from 2024-25 levels while remaining well above those of 2023-24.
- Criteria is met - The indicator increased returning to its ceiling of 3.0, remaining well above the criteria of success of 2.0. In 2025-26 it exceeds the 3yr average indicating candidates in this program continually demonstrate their ability to collect data and conduct analysis in their field related to a problem of practice or topic of their choice.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and history of meeting performance criteria.

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 will analyze research findings, draw evidence-based recommendations, and connect them to their research questions and the 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	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	3	10	6	2.89
Reflection on Artifacts	3.0	2.8	3.0	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

- Only preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is only three years old and has a small enrollment. As program enrollment grows, we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- The N decreased for this program from 2024-25 levels while remaining well above those of 2023-24.
- Criteria is met - The indicator increased, returning to its ceiling of 3.0, remaining well above the criteria of success of 2.0. In 2025-26 it exceeds the 3yr average indicating candidates in this program continually demonstrate their ability to analyze research findings and make recommendations to their field related to a problem of practice or topic of their choice.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and history of meeting performance criteria.

Rubric Used

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

Learning Outcome: Candidates will critically evaluate their research and explain its relevance to the field and their professional practice using evidence.

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	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	3	10	6	2.84
Reflection on Capstone	2.67	2.8	3.0	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Only preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the data at this point. This program is three years old and has a small enrollment. As program enrollment grows, we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- The N decreased for this program from 2024-25 levels while remaining well above those of 2023-24.
- Criteria is met - The indicator increased, returning to its ceiling of 3.0, remaining well above the criteria of success of 2.0. In 2025-26 it exceeds the 3yr average indicating candidates in this program continually demonstrate their ability to evaluate their research and explain its relevance to their field.
-

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and history of meeting or exceeding established criteria.

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.
---	--	--	--