

CSU Pueblo EdD Program

2026 Assessment Plan

Person Responsible: Jeff Piquette, Dean & Director

Table of Contents

Mission of the Doctor of Education Program	2
Program Assessment Overview.....	2
EdD Program Standards/Student Learning Outcomes	2
Curriculum Map of SLO Development & Evaluation	3
Performance Benchmarks & Rating Scale	3
Appendix A: Assessment at Program Completion.....	6
Appendix B: Rubric/Evaluation Tools of the Program.....	8

Mission of the Doctor of Education Program

The EdD 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. To meet the rural, regional, and national need for highly qualified educational leaders, this program is offered online. The unique design of this program recognizes the application of leadership in the daily work of educators in P-12 or higher education.

Program Assessment Overview

The assessment plan for Colorado State University Pueblo's EdD ensures that the program 1) monitors individual student progress necessary to support success, 2) provides summative information on student proficiency on all performance-based standards, and 3) provides reliable and valid information on the program's successes and weaknesses to ensure continuous program improvement. The assessment design has four components:

1. Research-informed professional program standards (i.e. the SLOs).
2. A series of tasks assigned by faculty within courses and at program completion to develop student mastery of all standards.
3. A system for documenting and monitoring student progress using the campus LMS.
4. A system to identify program strengths and weaknesses resulting in continual program improvement (i.e. overall ratings on candidate final evaluation rubric).

EdD Program Standards/Student Learning Outcomes

The following 5 program standards/student learning outcomes govern program performance.

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

Curriculum Map of SLO Development & Evaluation

All courses contribute to the successful mastery of program SLOs. However, there are some critical tasks that contribute to the development of each SLO from a variety of courses as shown in the table below.

EdD Program Standard (SLO)	Aligned Course	Artifacts
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.	ED 711 ED 712 ED 715 ED 717 ED 898 ED 899	Self-Reflection Self-Evaluation Case Studies in Ethics School Culture Plan Mentored Supervision SLO-Aligned Reflection Dissertation
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.	ED 711 ED 723 ED 898 ED 899	Case Studies Critical Literature Review Mentored Supervision SLO-Aligned Reflection Dissertation
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.	ED 711 ED 712 ED 715 ED 898 ED 899	Self-Reflection/Evaluation School Culture Plan Mentored Supervision SLO-Aligned Reflection Dissertation
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.	ED 715 ED 720 ED 721 ED 722 ED 898 ED 899	School Culture Plan Research Design Matrices Data-Driven Decision Plan Mentored Supervision SLO-Aligned Reflection Dissertation
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.	ED 713 ED 714 ED 722 ED 898 ED 899	Strategic Change Plan Policy Brief & Evaluation Mentored Supervision SLO-Aligned Reflection Dissertation

Performance Benchmarks & Rating Scale

The success of the program to instill its SLOs in all candidates will be evaluated at the end of the program during the dissertation defense. Candidates will have completed all required courses

and their dissertation research at that time. Therefore, it is an ideal point to evaluate the degree to which they embody the program standards/SLOs. Appendix B presents the details of this evaluation and how it is used. However, in brief, candidates are evaluated on the following 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. The dissertation advisory committee will come to consensus on these ratings at the end of the defense, and the chair will report them to the Director.

Performance Benchmarks

Upon completion:

- a) all candidates should earn ratings of 3.00 or higher on all program standards/SLOs; and
- b) 80% or more of completers report self-evaluation ratings 3.00 or higher on all SLOs.

Appendices

Appendix A: Assessment at Program Completion

Appendix B: Matrices/Evaluation Tools of the Program

Appendix A

Assessment at Program Completion

Introduction

The student's responsibilities for completing the program are:

- A cumulative graduate GPA of 3.000 or better at graduation. A maximum of six semester hours of course work at the grade of C+ or C may be applied toward graduation. A maximum number of nine semester hours of transfer credit may be applied to the degree.
- Regular student status.
- The program's minimum number of hours of approved course work (58 credit hours).
- Completion of a written dissertation, public presentation of dissertation, and private defense of dissertation to student's advisory committee.
- Submission of a graduation planning sheet signed by the student's graduate advisor and program director, in accordance with published deadlines during the semester is to occur. The deadline for submission is published in the *Semester Notes*, *University Calendar*, and *CSU Pueblo Catalog*.
- A final self-evaluation on SLOs.

The program's responsibilities are to provide the candidate with:

- The support and mentorship required to successfully complete the program.

The Dissertation

For those academic terms in which the student (candidate) is performing research, the determination as to whether or not adequate progress has been achieved will lay primarily with the dissertation advisor, with input from the faculty advisory committee.

It is expected that the candidate will meet regularly with the advisory committee to describe progress, difficulties and changes, if any, in experimental directions. In any event, at least one progress report to the advisory committee is required per academic year. The program director and department chair may also weigh in on decisions regarding student progress. If adequate progress has been achieved, a grade of pass is awarded. Alternatively, a grade of 'fail' is given, with likely dismissal from the program.

The final grade for Dissertation Research - and the determination of whether an Ed.D. is granted to the student - is based on three indications of the candidate's performance: the written dissertation, the public presentation and defense, and the private defense to the advisory committee.

The candidate will write and then defend a dissertation after the aims of the research proposal have been achieved – as agreed upon by the candidate, the mentor and other members of the Advisory Committee. A copy of the dissertation is to be submitted to each member of the Advisory Committee at least two weeks prior to the scheduled defense.

The committee will read and evaluate the dissertation. Evaluation is based on criteria defined in the assessment plan (i.e. the rubric). Finally, the Advisory Committee will examine the candidate in private. Members of the Advisory Committee may amend their scoring of the

candidate based on what happens in this forum. The Advisory Committee may also detail revisions to the dissertation that are required.

If the candidate's performance is satisfactory, a final grade of pass will be given, and the Advisory Committee will recommend, pending acceptable revision of the dissertation, that the EdD be granted.

If the dissertation is deemed non-defendable, the Advisory Committee may recommend postponement of the presentation and defense to allow corrections of identified deficiencies. The Committee may also stipulate the time period in which such corrections must be completed. If the candidate's performance during the presentation and defense is not satisfactory, the Committee can recommend a reexamination (defense) or a grade of 'fail', with dismissal from the program. In either event, failure of the student to revise the dissertation or to present and defend the dissertation to the satisfaction of the majority of the Advisory Committee will result in a grade of 'fail' and a recommendation that the EdD not be awarded.

The Final Self-Evaluation

Appendix B includes the final self-evaluation that needs to be submitted to the School of Education during or before the dissertation defense. It is the same rubric that will be used by program faculty for a student's final evaluation. Students will give themselves ratings on each SLO and can list comments as they wish within the sheet.

Appendix B

Rubric Used in EdD Program Evaluation

General Rules for Evaluating Performance

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate's advisor, as the primary and closest contact, to rate the SLOs independently, at least initially.
2. Other members of the advisory committee should review the candidate's work (written dissertation, public presentation, and defense discussion) and evaluate it according to the program rubric. The final evaluation will be a consensus among the advisor and advisory committee.
3. The consensus information will be reported to the Program Director by the dissertation advisor for program records and evaluation.

Instructions and complete rubric are found starting on the following page.



Edd Candidate Final Evaluation Rubric

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.
- 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 	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

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:	