

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

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

Outcome Measure 1a: GED6095 Written Product

Outcome Measure 1b: GED6099 Written Product

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

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

1b. Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Criteria 1 Area of Focus and Introduction of the GED6099 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

Outcome 1a.	Average Score on <i>Introduction</i> section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Weighted Avg
Number of Students	2	12	6	2.80
Average	3.0	2.75	2.83	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Outcome 1b.	Average Score on <i>Introduction</i> section of GED6099 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	NA	NA	3	NA
Average	NA	NA	4.0	
*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. As program enrollment grows, we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- Criteria is Met - The indicator increased over last year, remaining well above the criteria for success of 2.0. Current level does not differ from 3yr weighted average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and little historical data. The addition of the MS students, reflected in Outcome B, helps ensure both Masters of Science and Masters of Arts candidates are included in reporting.

Outcome 1a. 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.

Outcome 1b. Rubric Used

Criteria	Far Below Standard (1)	Below Standard (2)	Meets Standard (3)	Exceeds Standard (4)
<p>Area of Focus and Introduction</p> <p>Introduces the research study offering background information and the problem statement, setting its context, and establishes the "why" for the study. Sets up research topic and transition to formal research questions (RQ) along with a description of who the study is significant for and why.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not introduce research Does not establish the study RQ not related to rationale and not researchable Does not describe the study's significance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces research context <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes the study RQ relates to rationale and is researchable Incomplete description of study's significance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sets up a clear research context Establishes a "why" for the study RQ are aligned to rationale, and generate complex results Describes who the study is significant for and why 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sets up a clear & detailed research context Establishes a compelling "why" for the study RQ are aligned to rationale, neutral, and generate complex results Clear and detailed description of who the study is significant for and why

Learning Outcome: Candidates will synthesize research in their primary field of study to inform understanding and practice.

Outcome Measure 2a: GED6095 Written Product

Outcome Measure 2b: GED6099 Written Product

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

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

2b. Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Criteria 2 Literature Review of the GED6099 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

Outcome 2a.	Average Score on <i>Literature Review</i> section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Weighted Avg
Number of Students	2	12	6	2.90
Average	3.0	2.83	3.0	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Outcome 2b.	Average Score on <i>Literature Review</i> section of GED6099 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	NA	NA	3	NA
Average	NA	NA	4.0	
*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. As program enrollment grows, we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- Criteria is Met - The indicator increased over last year returning to its level of 2023-24, well above the criteria for success of 2.0. Current level exceeds 3yr weighted average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and little historical data. The addition of the MS students, reflected in Outcome B, helps ensure both Masters of Science and Masters of Arts candidates are included in reporting.

Outcome 2a. Rubric Used

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

Outcome 2b. Rubric Used

Criteria	Far Below Standard (1)	Below Standard (2)	Meets Standard (3)	Exceeds Standard (4)
<p>Literature Review</p> <p>Literature review responds to the initial research question. Total of 20 sources meeting the following requirements: 5 sources from within the last 5 years; at least 2 seminal papers; and a minimum of 15 studies from peer review journals are cited. Includes critical and purposeful analysis and synthesis of cited research relevant to the initial research question (RQ). Gaps in literature are identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few or no citations Less than 10 sources References do not inform RQ Literature gaps or alternative point of view are not identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 recent citations At least 10 sources Some are relevant and credible Synthesis and summary of references inform RQ Literature gaps or alternative points of view are identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 to 5 recent citations At least 15 sources Most sources are relevant and credible Synthesis and summary of references inform RQ Literature gaps or alternative points of view are identified and explored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5+ recent (5 years) citations At least 20 sources All sources are relevant and credible Both synthesis and summary of references effectively inform RQ Literature gaps/ alternative points of view are identified and explored.

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 3a: GED6095 Written Product

Outcome Measure 3b: GED6099 Written Product

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

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

3b. Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Criteria 3 Methods and Data Analysis of the GED6099 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

Outcome 3a	Average Score on Artifacts section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Weighted Avg
Number of Students	2	12	6	2.85
Average	3.0	2.83	2.83	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Outcome 3b	Average Score on Methods section of GED6099 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	NA	NA	3	NA
Average	NA	NA	3.33	
*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. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- Criteria is Met - The indicator maintained its level from last year, below its initial ceiling while remaining well above the criteria for success of 2.0. Current level does not differ from 3yr weighted average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and little historical data. The addition of the MS students, reflected in Outcome B, helps ensure both Masters of Science and Masters of Arts candidates are included in reporting.

Outcome 3a. Rubric Used

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

Outcome 3b. Rubric Used

Table 3: GED6099 Written Final Thesis Rubric

Criteria	Far Below Standard (1)	Below Standard (2)	Meets Standard (3)	Exceeds Standard (4)
<p>Methods: Data Collection and Analysis</p> <p><u>For Action Research:</u> Clear and detailed description of participants, setting, instrumentation (including multiple data sources), data collection, ethical considerations, and data analysis, informed by significance of the study and literature review and aligned to RQ.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little or no description of research context: setting, participants Little or no description of data collection: instrument(s), timeline, and only one data source used Little or no description of ethical considerations: risks/benefits ratio, consent/assent, researcher's role and bias Little or no description of how data was analyzed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete description of research context: setting, participants Incomplete description of data collection: instrument(s), timeline, and only 1-2 data sources Incomplete description of ethical considerations: risks/benefits ratio, consent/assent, researcher's role and bias Incomplete description of how data was analyzed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of research context: setting, participants Clear description of data collection: instrument(s), timeline, and at least two data sources Clear description of ethical considerations: risks/benefits ratio, consent/assent, researcher's role and bias Clear description of how data was analyzed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear & detailed description of research context: setting, participants Clear & detailed description of data collection: instrument(s), timeline, and multiple data sources Clear & detailed description of ethical considerations: risks/benefits ratio, consent/assent, researcher's role and bias Clear & detailed description of how data was analyzed
<p><u>For Literature Analysis:</u> Clear and detailed description of process to answer RQ: systematic search plan and timeline, article inclusion and exclusion criteria, databases used and content search terms, rationale for article selection, ethical considerations and data analysis procedures informed by significance of the study and mini-literature review and aligned to RQ.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little or no description of plan to answer RQ Little or no description of proposed data collection: inclusion/exclusion, database and content search terms used, rationale for article selection Little or no description of data analysis procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete description of plan to answer RQ Incomplete description of proposed data collection: inclusion/exclusion, database and content search terms used, rationale for article selection Incomplete description of data analysis procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of plan to answer RQ Clear description of data collection: inclusion/exclusion, database and content search terms used, rationale for article selection Clear description of data analysis procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear & detailed description of plan to answer RQ Clear & detailed description of data collection: inclusion/exclusion, database and content search terms used, rationale for article selection Clear & detailed description of data analysis procedures

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 4a: GED6095 Written Product

Outcome Measure 4b: GED6099 Written Product

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

4a. 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.

4b. Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Criteria 4 Findings of the GED6099 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

Outcome 4a.	Average Score on Reflection on Artifacts section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Weighted Avg
Number of Students	2	12	6	2.85
Average	3.0	2.75	3.0	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Outcome 4b.	Average Score on Findings section of GED6099 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	NA	NA	3	NA
Average	NA	NA	3.33	
*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. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- Criteria is Met - The indicator increased from its level last year returning to its initial ceiling and remaining well above the criteria for success of 2.0. Current level exceeds 3yr weighted average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and little historical data. The addition of the MS students, reflected in Outcome B, helps ensure both Masters of Science and Masters of Arts candidates are included in reporting.

Outcome 4a. Rubric Used

Reflection of Artifacts	<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>
--------------------------------	--	--	---

Outcome 4b. Rubric Used

Table 3: GED6099 Written Final Thesis Rubric

Criteria	Far Below Standard (1)	Below Standard (2)	Meets Standard (3)	Exceeds Standard (4)
<p>Findings: Study Results</p> <p>Restates study purpose and RQ, describes the results of data analysis as it relates to RQ, and describes themes, categories, and patterns with illustrative examples: uses tables, figures, graphs, and artwork as necessary in APA 7 format.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no description of purpose of RQ • Little or no description of the results of data analysis as it relates to the RQ • Little or no description of themes, categories or patterns with illustrative examples 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete description of purpose of RQ • Incomplete description of the results of data analysis as it relates to the RQ • Incomplete description of themes, categories or patterns with illustrative examples 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of purpose of RQ • Clear description of the results of data analysis as it relates to the RQ • Clear description of themes, categories or patterns with illustrative examples 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear & detailed description of purpose of RQ • Clear & detailed description of the results of data analysis as it relates to the RQ • Clear & detailed description of themes, categories or patterns with illustrative examples

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

Outcome Measure 5a: GED6095 Written Product

Outcome Measure 5b: GED6099 Written Product

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

5a. 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.

5b. Candidate average score of (3.0) out of a possible (4.0) points on Criteria 5 Discussion 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

Outcome 5a.	Average Score on Reflection on Capstone section of GED6095 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Weighted Avg
Number of Students	2	12	6	2.75
Average	3.0	2.58	3.0	
*2025-26 data collected 6/02/26, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.				

Outcome 5b.	Average Score on Discussion section of GED6099 Final Project Rubric.			
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	NA	NA	3	NA
Average	NA	NA	3.33	
*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. As program enrollment grows we will have better data to draw conclusions upon.
- Criteria is Met - The indicator increased over last year returning to its ceiling, well above the criteria for success of 2.0. Current level exceeds 3yr weighted average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this point due to small N and little historical data. The addition of the MS students, reflected in Outcome B, helps ensure both Masters of Science and Masters of Arts candidates are included in reporting.

Outcome 5a. 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.
---	--	--	--

Outcome 5b. Rubric Used

Table 3: GED6099 Written Final Thesis Rubric

Criteria	Far Below Standard (1)	Below Standard (2)	Meets Standard (3)	Exceeds Standard (4)
<p>Discussion: Limitations, Further Research, Final Thoughts</p> <p>Limitations of the study are discussed in detail and rationale for accepting them are mentioned. Threats (if any) to validity, reliability and generalizability of project findings are offered. Describes ideas for future research based on the study's results and limitations. Provides meaningful reflection on implications of the study including experience as a researcher, successes, challenges, and perceptions around how study contributed to the community and/or impacted self as an educator.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no description of limitations and rationale for accepting them • Little or no description of threats to validity, reliability & generalizability of study findings • Little or no description of ideas for further research • Little or no reflection on teaching/leadership/counseling practice • Little or no reflection on self as a researcher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete description of limitations and rationale for accepting them • Incomplete description of threats to validity, reliability & generalizability of study findings • Incomplete description of ideas for further research • Incomplete reflection on teaching/leadership/counseling practice • Incomplete reflection on self as a researcher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of limitations and rationale for accepting them • Clear description of threats to validity, reliability & generalizability of study findings • Clear description of ideas for further research • Clear reflection on teaching/leadership/counseling practice • Clear reflection on self as a researcher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear & detailed description of limitations and rationale for accepting them • Clear & detailed description of threats to validity, reliability & generalizability of study findings • Clear & detailed description of ideas for further research • Clear & detailed reflection on teaching/leadership/counseling practice • Clear & detailed reflection on self as a researcher