



Program Name	Date Completed
Education, EdD	5/28/2026
Report Completed By	Report Contributors
Jeff Piquette	
Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals	
The Ed.D. in Educational Leadership at CSU Pueblo is designed to provide a practice-based doctoral degree for educational leaders who wish to advance their knowledge and skills to address the critical issues and challenges that exist in the field of education.	

Table I Closing the Loop

Report on at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during AY 2025-2026 that was implemented to improve student learning, in response to prior assessments or other data.

A. Describe issues or SLOs addressed in the AY 2025-2026 cycle. Paste SLOs verbatim below.
This is the first year we have a report, so there is no loop to close yet!
B. In which academic year and semester was this SLO last assessed to generate data that informed the change(s)?
C. What were the recommendations for change in the previous cycle? (See Column H in the previous cycle's report.)
D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?
E. How did the change(s) impact student learning? If the change was not effective, what are the next steps or new recommendations?

Enter Table I Closing the Loop Comments Below



Program Name	Date Completed
Education, EdD	5/28/2026
Report Completed By	Report Contributors
Jeff Piquette	

Table II Annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in AY 2025-26

1. Include information to share assessment processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Copy this table for each assessed outcome.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
1. Completers are transformative leaders who engage with complex perspectives to strategically promote inclusive, non-oppressive school contexts that serve the best interests of students, families, and communities for a more equitable and socially-just education system and society.
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
N/A – First time was this year.
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
EdD Candidate Final Evaluation Rubric (included at the end of this report)
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
All (100%) program completers should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards; b) >80% of graduates report self-evaluation ratings of “proficient” (3.0) or higher on individual SLOs.
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) All program completers (n = 7) received ratings of at least 3 on this SLO. The average rating was 3.75 (scale 1-4), which is the second highest SLO average among the five. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 3.68.



G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
EdD candidates are meeting program expectations on this SLO and even excel on it. Several courses are devoted to this SLO, so the strong ratings maybe aren't surprising.
H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2026-2027 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
2. Completers are reflective practitioners who seek and embrace critical feedback with the personal insight necessary to continuously improve and are willing to fully dedicate their knowledge, skills, and passion towards becoming critically conscious scholars, researchers, and change agents.
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
N/A – First time was this year.
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
EdD Candidate Final Evaluation Rubric (included at the end of this report)
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards; b) >80% of graduates report self-evaluation ratings of “proficient” (3.0) or higher on individual SLOs.
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 7) received ratings of at least 3 on this SLO. The average rating was 3.79 (scale 1-4), which is the highest SLO average among the five. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 3.61.
G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
EdD candidates are meeting program expectations on this SLO and even excel on it. The dissertation process requires getting a lot of feedback and so higher ratings might be expected here.



H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2026-2027 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
3. Completers are critical consumers of knowledge that base leadership and professional practice as a leader and scholar on historical and cultural awareness, ethics, and professionalism for the communities served.
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
N/A – First time was this year.
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
EdD Candidate Final Evaluation Rubric (included at the end of this report)
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards; b) >80% of graduates report self-evaluation ratings of “proficient” (3.0) or higher on individual SLOs.
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 7) received ratings of at least 3 on this SLO. The average rating was 3.64 (scale 1-4), which is the third highest SLO average among the five. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 3.71, which was the highest among the 5 self-evaluated SLOs.
G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
EdD candidates are meeting program expectations on this SLO and even excel on it. The dissertation process requires getting a lot of feedback and so higher ratings might be expected here.
H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2026-2027 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO this year.



A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
4. Completers are academic scholars who are able to design and implement scientific inquiry for the development of new knowledge and data-driven decisions to improve practice.
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
N/A – First time was this year.
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
EdD Candidate Final Evaluation Rubric (included at the end of this report)
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards; b) >80% of graduates report self-evaluation ratings of “proficient” (3.0) or higher on individual SLOs.
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 7) received ratings of at least 3 on this SLO. The average rating was 3.57 (scale 1-4), which is among the two lowest SLO averages among the five. b) One program completer’s self-reported rating was below 3 on this SLO, which is still above the benchmark, with an overall average of 3.54.
G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
Research design is probably the most difficult part of our program. We were a bit surprised by how high the other completers rated themselves, but were glad the average aligned with the faculty ratings.
H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2026-2027 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.



A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
5. Completers are advocates who have the necessary tools for the design, planning, communication, implementation, and assessment of current or proposed policy and how to engage with appropriate entities for effective change.
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
N/A – First time was this year.
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
EdD Candidate Final Evaluation Rubric (included at the end of this report)
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards; b) >80% of graduates report self-evaluation ratings of “proficient” (3.0) or higher on individual SLOs.
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 7) received ratings of at least 3 on this SLO. The average rating was 3.43 (scale 1-4), which is the lowest SLO average among the five. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 3.61.
G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
The biggest issue the graduate faculty in the EdD program noticed was with our completers’ inability to clearly articulate specific, actionable steps related to their dissertations. They had general recommendations, but struggled more to describe what could be done tomorrow to start taking steps toward the bigger goals. This was reflected in the ratings.
H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2026-2027 informed by this assessment.
EdD chairs will be told about this at our next meeting and we will brainstorm ways to improve this as a group. It will be a point of interest for all completers next year.

Enter Table II AY 2026 Assessment Comments Below
The evaluation rubric for the EdD program is shown on the following pages.



Instructions for Completing the Rubric

This rubric is used to evaluate performance in the EdD Program in Educational Leadership. It is designed to support both student self-reflection and faculty evaluation of student progress, particularly related to scholarly work such as coursework, research activities, and the dissertation.

Performance is rated on a four-point scale:

- 1 – **Basic:** Demonstrates minimal understanding of the competency; substantial development, supports, and/or scaffolds are needed.
- 2 – **Developing:** Demonstrates emerging competence but performance is inconsistent or incomplete; depends on supports and/or scaffolds.
- 3 – **Proficient:** Demonstrates solid and consistent competence aligned with program outcome. Minimal reliance on supports and scaffolds.
- 4 – **Advanced:** Demonstrates exceptional, consistent, and independent performance that exceeds program expectations.

Ratings may be assigned in quarter-point increments (e.g., 2.25, 2.5, 2.75) to provide a more precise evaluation when performance falls between descriptors.

Instructions for Students (Self-Evaluation)

Students should use this rubric as a self-assessment tool to reflect on their current level of development in each competency area.

1. **Review each rubric criterion carefully.** Consider the descriptions for each performance level.
2. **Evaluate your current performance** based on evidence from your work in the program, including coursework, leadership activities, research, and, most importantly, your dissertation.
3. **Assign a rating from 1 to 4**, using quarter-point increments if your performance falls between two levels.
4. **Provide brief justification or evidence** where appropriate, referencing specific examples such as assignments, research products, presentations, or dissertation evidence.

The goal of the self-evaluation is to promote honest reflection, professional growth, and alignment with program expectations.

Instructions for Faculty (Student & Program Evaluation)

Faculty members should use this rubric to evaluate the student's demonstrated competencies, with particular attention to scholarly work, leadership development, and the dissertation.

1. **Review the student's submitted materials**, which must include the dissertation, but may include other evidence as known/provided.
2. **Evaluate each criterion independently**, using the rubric descriptors as the primary guide.
3. **Assign a rating from 1 to 4**, using quarter-point increments when the student's performance falls between levels.
4. **Base ratings on observable evidence** in the student's work rather than potential or effort alone.
5. Provide **brief comments when helpful**, especially when ratings indicate areas needing development or when performance exceeds expectations.

Faculty ratings should reflect the student's **current demonstrated level of competence** relative to the expectations of the EdD program.

1. *Completers are transformative leaders who engage with complex perspectives to strategically promote inclusive, non-oppressive school contexts that serve the best interests of students, families, and communities for a more equitable and socially-just education system and society.*

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Advanced (4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited understanding of inclusive and socially just leadership. Engagement with diverse perspectives is superficial or inconsistent. Leadership actions show minimal attention to systemic inequities or the needs of marginalized students, families, and communities. • Extensive supports and scaffolds needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates emerging awareness of equity, inclusion, and social justice issues. Engages with multiple perspectives but applies them inconsistently in leadership decisions. Efforts to promote inclusive school contexts are present but lack strategic coherence or depth. • Depends on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates strong capacity as a transformative leader who strategically integrates diverse and complex perspectives. Actively promotes inclusive, non-oppressive educational contexts that serve students, families, and communities. Leadership decisions reflect a clear commitment to equity and social justice. • Minimal dependence on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplifies transformative leadership that challenges and reshapes systems using complex perspectives to advance equity and social justice grounded in critical awareness of power, privilege, and systemic inequities; engages diverse and complex perspectives, especially those historically marginalized. Consistently embodies moral courage, cultural responsiveness, and strategic vision through research and educational leadership opportunities in their field. Influences organizational and community practices in sustained and measurable ways that advance inclusive educational environments. • Consistently and independently demonstrates goal attributes 	
<p>List qualities that are not passing:</p>		<p>List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:</p>	<p>List qualities that are advanced:</p>	

2. *Completers are reflective practitioners who seek and embrace critical feedback with the personal insight necessary to continuously improve and are willing to fully dedicate their knowledge, skills, and passion towards becoming critically conscious scholars, researchers, and change agents.*

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Advanced (4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited reflective practice and minimal responsiveness to feedback. Professional growth is sporadic and lacks intentionality. Shows limited development as a critically conscious scholar or change agent. • Extensive supports and scaffolds needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages in reflection and accepts feedback, though application to practice is inconsistent. Demonstrates growing self-awareness and professional commitment, with emerging identity as a scholar-practitioner and change agent. • Depends on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates consistent, meaningful reflection informed by feedback, theory, and practice. Shows personal insight and a strong commitment to continuous improvement. Functions effectively as a critically conscious scholar, researcher, and educational leader. • Exemplifies a growth mindset • Minimal dependence on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplifies deep, critical, sustained reflective practice that drives personal, professional, and organizational transformation. Actively seeks, welcomes, and meaningfully integrates critical feedback and uses it to become critically conscious scholars, researchers, and change agents. Serves as a model of lifelong learning. • Consistently and independently demonstrates goal attributes 	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:		List qualities that are advanced:

3. *Completers are critical consumers of knowledge that base leadership and professional practice as a leader and scholar on historical and cultural awareness, ethics, and professionalism for the communities served.*

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Advanced (4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited ability to critically evaluate knowledge or apply ethical and cultural considerations to leadership practice. Awareness of historical and community contexts is minimal or disconnected from decision-making. • Extensive supports and scaffolds needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates growing ability to analyze research and professional knowledge with attention to ethics and cultural context. Applies historical and community awareness inconsistently in leadership and scholarly work. • Depends on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critically evaluates and applies knowledge grounded in historical, cultural, and ethical awareness. Demonstrates professionalism and sound judgment in leadership practice that respects and serves diverse communities. • Minimal dependence on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates exceptional critical consumption and synthesis of research, theory, and professional knowledge. Leadership and scholarly practice are deeply informed by ethical reasoning, historical understanding, and cultural responsiveness. Serves as a trusted professional voice within and beyond the educational community. Applies knowledge strategically to improve systems, practice, and outcomes. • Consistently and independently demonstrates goal attributes 	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

4. *Completers are academic scholars who are able to design and implement scientific inquiry for the development of new knowledge and data-driven decisions to improve practice.*

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Advanced (4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited understanding of research design, methodology, or data analysis. Inquiry efforts lack rigor or clear alignment with educational problems of practice. • Extensive supports and scaffolds needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates foundational competence in research design and data use. Inquiry addresses relevant problems of practice but may show weaknesses in methodological rigor, analysis, or application to decision-making. • Depends on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs and implements sound, ethical, and systematic inquiry to generate new knowledge. Uses data effectively to inform leadership decisions and improve educational practice. Demonstrates strong alignment between research, theory, and practice. • Minimal dependence on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs and implements rigorous, methodologically sound research that contributes meaningful new knowledge to the field. Demonstrates sophisticated interpretation of data to drive innovation and sustained improvement in educational contexts. • Consistently and independently demonstrates goal attributes 	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

5. *Completers are advocates who have the necessary tools for the design, planning, communication, implementation, and assessment of current or proposed policy and how to engage with appropriate entities for effective change.*

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Advanced (4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited understanding of policy processes or advocacy strategies. Policy analysis and communication are underdeveloped or disconnected from educational contexts. • Extensive supports and scaffolds needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates emerging competence in analyzing and communicating policy issues. Engages in advocacy efforts with some effectiveness but limited strategic planning or stakeholder engagement. • Depends on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates strong skills in policy design, analysis, implementation, and assessment. Effectively communicates with relevant stakeholders and engages appropriate entities to advocate for meaningful educational change. • Minimal dependence on supports and scaffolds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates exemplary leadership in policy advocacy and systems change. Strategically influences policy development and implementation through sustained collaboration, scientific and scholarly communication, and evidence-based analysis at organizational, local, or broader levels. • Consistently and independently demonstrates goal attributes 	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	