

**School of Education**  
**PLO Data – Master’s in Teacher (MAT), 2021-22**

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 1 - 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**

	<b>Average Score on Area of Focus section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.</b>			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	86	54	56*	3.89 (.27)
Area of Focus	3.89	3.94	3.85*	

\*2021-22 data collected 6/10/22, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by clearly stating their area of focus and research questions in their thesis projects.
- Data is mixed over the last three years but changes fall well within the 3yr. average standard deviation of .27 indicating the changes are likely natural fluctuation around the average.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

- These indicators have not been calibrated with the adjuncts or program faculty in the last four years. Revisions of PLO language offer a good opportunity to bring the group together to examine exemplars and calibrate scoring expectations.

**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"> <li>Clearly stated area of focus</li> <li>Research questions are clearly written and appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area of focus is somewhat vague</li> <li>Research questions are somewhat vague</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area of focus is overly broad or narrow</li> <li>Research questions are unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no clear area of focus</li> <li>Research questions are inappropriate</li> </ul>

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 2 - 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	86	54	56	3.77 (.36)
Literature Review	3.79	3.92	3.59	

\*2021-22 data collected 6/10/22, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

- Data is above target criterion each of the last three years – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by drawing upon reference sources from within the last five years, meeting minimum source counts, making sure they are relevant and credible and adhering to APA format in their thesis projects.
- Data is mixed over the last three years with 2020-21 peaking close to the top end of the rubric. Average score changes from 2020-21 to 2021-22 approach the 3yr average standard deviation of .36 and call for some investigation into why the scores might have dropped. It is worth noting 2021-22 is when the program pushed to fully implement APA7 formatting.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

- These indicators have not been calibrated with the adjuncts or program faculty in the last four years. Revisions of PLO language offer a good opportunity to bring the group together to examine exemplars and calibrate scoring expectations.
- Decreasing scores at this level call for examination at the program level.

**Rubric Used**

Category	Rubric Score: 4 Exceeds Standard ( <b>passing</b> )	Rubric Score: 3 Meets Standard ( <b>passing</b> )	Rubric Score: 2 Below Standard	Rubric Score: 1 Far Below Standard
Literature Review (DQP 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 or more recent (5 years) sources cited</li> <li>• At least 20 sources</li> <li>• All sources are relevant and credible</li> <li>• All citations are correctly made according to APA format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 to 5 recent sources cited</li> <li>• At least 15 sources</li> <li>• Most sources are relevant and credible</li> <li>• Most citations are correctly made according to APA format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 recent sources cited</li> <li>• At least 10 sources</li> <li>• Some are relevant and credible</li> <li>• Some citations are correctly made according to APA format</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few or no citations</li> <li>• Less than 10 sources</li> <li>• Citations are not in the proper format</li> </ul>

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 3 - 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

	<b>Average Score on <i>Data Collection and Analysis</i> section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.</b>			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	86	54	56	3.68 (.41)
Data Collection and Analysis	3.74	3.77	3.51	

\*2021-22 data collected 6/10/22, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

#### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by clearly describing their target population, describing their data collection methods, data sources and their analysis plans and findings in their thesis projects.
- Data is mixed over the last three years with changes falling well within the 3yr. average standard deviation of .41, indicating the changes are likely natural fluctuation around the average. The drop of .26 between 2020-21 and 2021-22 is worth keeping an eye on into the end of the academic year.

#### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

- These indicators have not been calibrated with the adjuncts or program faculty in the last four years. Revisions of PLO language offer a good opportunity to bring the group together to examine exemplars and calibrate scoring expectations.

#### Rubric Used

Category	Rubric Score: 4 Exceeds Standard ( <b>passing</b> )	Rubric Score: 3 Meets Standard ( <b>passing</b> )	Rubric Score: 2 Below Standard	Rubric Score: 1 Far Below Standard
Data Collection and Analysis (DQP 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear description of target population</li> <li>• Detailed description of how data was collected</li> <li>• Utilizes multiple data sources</li> <li>• Detailed analysis of the data provides identification of themes and patterns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of target population</li> <li>• Some details of how data was collected</li> <li>• Utilizes at least two sources of data</li> <li>• Analysis of the data mentions themes and patterns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some description of target population</li> <li>• Minimal description of how data was collected</li> <li>• Utilizes one or two sources of data</li> <li>• Little analysis of the data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little or no description of target population</li> <li>• Little or no description of how the data was collected</li> <li>• Utilizes one source of data</li> <li>• No analysis of the data</li> </ul>

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 4 - 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	86	54	56	3.67 (.41)
Action Plan	3.74	3.69	3.54	

\*2021-22 data collected 6/10/22, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

#### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations by connecting their findings, recommendation or action plan and their original research questions in their thesis projects.
- Data is trending lower over the last three years though changes fall well within the 3yr. average standard deviation indicating the changes are likely natural fluctuation around the average. Given the declining scores, and their acceleration from 2020-21 to 2021-22 the department should monitor 2022-23 scores and prepare to make changes if the declining trend continues.

#### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

- These indicators have not been calibrated with the adjuncts or program faculty in the last four years. Revisions of PLO language offer a good opportunity to bring the group together to examine exemplars and calibrate scoring expectations.

#### 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"> <li>Specific and clear connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions</li> <li>Elements of the action plan are missing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little connection between findings of the study, recommendations or action plan and the original questions</li> <li>Most components of the action plan are missing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No recommendations or action plan</li> </ul>

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 5 - 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**

	<b>Average Score on <i>Impact on Teaching Practice</i> section of GED6089 Final Project Rubric.</b>			
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	86	54	56	3.73 (.37)
Impact on Teaching Practice	3.73	3.81	3.66	

\*2021-22 data collected 6/10/22, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

- Data is well above target criterion – MAT candidates are meeting expectations describing transformation changes in their knowledge, skills and dispositions; making connections between their project and student learning, and connecting the work in their thesis projects back to the existing body of literature.
- Data is mixed over the last three years but changes fall well within the 3yr. average standard deviation indicating the changes are likely natural fluctuation around the average.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

- These indicators have not been calibrated with the adjuncts or program faculty in the last four years. Revisions of PLO language offer a good opportunity to bring the group together to examine exemplars and calibrate scoring expectations.

**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"> <li>Project describes a <b>clear</b> transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions</li> <li>Project gives a <b>clear</b> description of how and why research improves student learning</li> <li>Project is <b>clearly and articulately</b> situated in and tied to existing body of literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project describes <b>some</b> transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions</li> <li>Project <b>somewhat</b> describes how and why research improves student learning</li> <li>Project is <b>partially</b> situated in and tied to existing body of literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project describes <b>little</b> transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions</li> <li>Project describes <b>very little</b> of how and why research improves student learning</li> <li>Project is <b>vaguely</b> situated in and tied to existing body of literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project describes <b>no</b> transformation of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions</li> <li>Project <b>does not describe</b> how and why research improves student learning</li> <li>Project <b>does not refer</b> to existing body of literature or literature is <b>inappropriate</b></li> </ul>