

School of Education
PLO Data – MA Masters of Arts in Leadership and Learning, 2021-22

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

Outcome Measure: 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 <i>Area of Focus</i> section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	15	11	4	3.95 (.27)
Area of Focus	3.94	3.93	4.0	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MALL candidates demonstrated their ability to articulate research questions through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2021-22 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 and has not been close to the three-year average standard deviation of .26.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, the GED6089 rubric is due for a full calibration exercise in the 2022-23 academic year. We look forward to that exercise bearing out in the 2022-23 academic year scores.

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

Learning Outcome: Candidates synthesize research from/in the primary field of study.

Outcome Measure: 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.			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	15	11	4	3.84 (.36)
Literature Review	3.81	3.82	4.0	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MALL candidates demonstrated their ability to synthesize research in their field through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2021-22 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 and has not been close to the three-year average standard deviation of .36.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, the GED6089 rubric is due for a full calibration exercise in the 2022-23 academic year. We look forward to that exercise bearing out in the 2022-23 academic year scores.

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

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

Outcome Measure: 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.			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	15	11	4	3.82 (.31)
Data Collection and Analysis	3.84	3.83	3.75	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MALL candidates demonstrated their ability to convey their data collection and analysis methods through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2021-22 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 and has not been close to 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, the GED6089 rubric is due for a full calibration exercise in the 2022-23 academic year. We look forward to that exercise bearing out in the 2022-23 academic year scores.

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

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

Outcome Measure: 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.			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	15	11	4	3.86 (.29)
Action Plan	3.92	3.82	3.75	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MALL candidates demonstrated their ability to connect research findings and recommendations to their initial research questions through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2021-22 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 and has not been close to the three-year average standard deviation of .29.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, the GED6089 rubric is due for a full calibration exercise in the 2022-23 academic year. We look forward to that exercise bearing out in the 2022-23 academic year scores.

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

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

Outcome Measure: 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.			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	15	11	4	3.84 (.30)
Impact on Teaching Practice	3.86	3.93	3.50	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. MALL candidates demonstrated their ability to explain the relevance of their research to their fields through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2021-22 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The average score has varied over the last three academic years with the recent drop in score between 2020-21 and 2021-22 exceeding the three-year average standard deviation of .30. This change is real BUT may be a product of the low number of scores (N=4) and the nature of the average. Because the score remains well above the target criteria we will look to update this data point next year before reacting to the decreasing score.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: While no immediate plan for change is being made based on this data, the GED6089 rubric is due for a full calibration exercise in the 2022-23 academic year. We look forward to that exercise bearing out in the 2022-23 academic year scores.

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