

5-25-2016

SLO Assessment Report Elementary & Secondary Special Education BSED 2016

UNO College of Education
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/oiestudentlearning>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

College of Education, UNO, "SLO Assessment Report Elementary & Secondary Special Education BSED 2016" (2016). *Student Learning*. Paper 34.

<http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/oiestudentlearning/34>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Portfolio/Visit 2016-18 at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Learning by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



Student Learning Outcome Report:

College: College of Education
Unit: Special Education & Communication Disorders
Degree: BSED - Elementary Education, Special Education
BSED - Secondary Education, Special Education

I. Student Learning Outcomes for this Degree

Student learning outcomes for these degree programs are based on the following professional standards:

1. The 2011 Interstate Teacher Assessment & Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards developed and adopted by the Council of Chief State School Officers
2. The 2012 Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) – Initial Preparation Standards

InTASC Standards -The teacher:

1. understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
2. uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
3. works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
4. understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
5. understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
6. understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
7. plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
8. understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
9. engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.
10. teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

CEC Standards - Beginning special education professionals:

1. understand how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.
2. create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination.
3. use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.
4. use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources in making educational decisions.
5. select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.
6. use foundational knowledge of the field and their professional Ethical Principles and Practice Standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.
7. collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with exceptionalities, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with exceptionalities across a range of learning experiences.

II. Measures Used

SLOs addressed (from Section I)	InTASC Standards 1-10
Element or artifact measured	Performance during a 16 week clinical practice in a P-12 classroom.
Assessment method	Final Clinical Practice Rubric SLO/Standard 1 – Items 5, 9 SLO/Standard 2 – Items 10, 36 SLO/Standard 3 – Items 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 SLO/Standard 4 – Items 1, 2, 4, 7 SLO/Standard 5 – Items 3, 6, 8 SLO/Standard 6 – Items 23, 24, 25, 26 SLO/Standard 7 – Items 17, 18, 22 SLO/Standard 8 – Items 18, 19, 20, 21 SLO/Standard 9 – Items 11, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 SLO/Standard 10 – Items 34, 35
UNO’s Assessment domain <i>Examination, Product, or Performance?</i>	Performance
Students assessed	All students who are enrolled in SPED 4720 – Clinical Practice
When and by whom administered	Assessment is administered each fall and spring semester at the conclusion of the clinical practice experience. The assessment is completed by:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US - University supervisors (full-time & adjunct faculty members) • CT - Cooperating teachers (P-12 classroom teachers) • TC - Teacher candidates (university students)
Proficiency definition and target	85% of students will be evaluated as either developing or proficient (upper two categories of a rubric with four performance levels).*

***Rubric performance level descriptors:**

Proficient – The teacher candidate has demonstrated competence in the knowledge, skill, or disposition, providing evidence of the sustained adeptness in integrating it routinely and intentionally as expected of a highly qualified teacher.

Developing – The candidate has demonstrated growth in the knowledge, skill, or disposition, providing evidence that the candidate is approaching the level of competence expected of a highly qualified teacher.

SLOs addressed (from Section I)	CEC Standards 1-7
Element or artifact measured	Performance during a 16 week clinical practice in a P-12 classroom.
Assessment method	Final Clinical Practice Rubric SLO/Standard 1 – Items 51, 52, 53 SLO/Standard 2 – Items 48, 49, 50, 53 SLO/Standard 3 – Items 47, 52 SLO/Standard 4 – Items 54, 55 SLO/Standard 5 – Items 47, 50, 52, 53 SLO/Standard 6 – Items 46 SLO/Standard 7 – Items 56, 57
Assessment domain <i>Examination, Product, or Performance?</i>	Performance
Students assessed	All students who are enrolled in SPED 4720 – Clinical Practice
When and by whom administered	Assessment is administered each fall and spring semester at the conclusion of the clinical practice experience. The assessment is completed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US - University supervisors (full-time & adjunct faculty members) • CT - Cooperating teachers (P-12 classroom teachers) • TC - Teacher candidates (university students)
Proficiency definition and target	85% of students will be evaluated as either developing or proficient (upper two categories of a rubric with four performance levels).

***Rubric performance level descriptors:**

Proficient – The teacher candidate has demonstrated competence in the knowledge, skill, or disposition, providing evidence of the sustained adeptness in integrating it routinely and intentionally as expected of a highly qualified teacher.

Developing – The candidate has demonstrated growth in the knowledge, skill, or disposition, providing evidence that the candidate is approaching the level of competence expected of a highly qualified teacher.

SLOs addressed (from Section I)	CEC Standards 1-7
Element or artifact measured	Written analysis of instructional strategies as applied during clinical practice
Assessment method	Instructional Strategies Project SLO/Standards 1, 2, 3, 5 – Item A, Target Behavior SLO/Standards 3, 5, 6 – Item B, Journal Summary SLO/Standard 4 – Item C, Monitoring & Data Collection SLO/ Standards 3, 5 – Item D, Lesson Plan SLO/Standards 1-7 – Item E, Reflection
Assessment domain <i>Examination, Product, or Performance?</i>	Product
Students assessed	All students who are enrolled in SPED 4720 – Clinical Practice
When and by whom administered	Assessment is administered each fall and spring semester during the course of the clinical practice experience. The assessment is completed by university supervisors (full-time & adjunct faculty members).
Proficiency definition and target	85% of students will be evaluated as either developing or proficient (upper two categories of a rubric with four performance levels).

III. Results

Data provided in the results table are from 2013-14 and 2014-15 (four administrations) of two assessments. Because of the small number of students who were assessed, the data for the two programs are aggregated into one data set.

Item-by-item analysis of the clinical practice evaluation instrument as aligned to the specific SLOs (see Item II) is available and is routinely provided to the department chair. Item analysis of the clinical practice evaluation for the cycle reflected in this report were also reviewed by the accreditation teams for both NDE and NCATE. These data are available on request. Because of the number (57) of individual items and evaluation perspectives (three evaluators for each student), the data in the following chart reflect the item which asks evaluators to assess the overall rating of a student's performance during clinical practice.

Data are from 2013-14 and 2014-15 (four administrations of the assessment)				
	<u>Total # Students Who Participated in End-of-Program Assessment</u>	<u># Participants Met or Exceeded Proficiency Score</u>	<u>% Participants Met or Exceeded Proficiency Score</u>	<u>Does % Meet or Exceed Program's Proficiency Target? (Y/N)</u>
InTASC Standards 1-10	Fall 2013: n=8	As assessed by Fall 2013: US - 8 CT - 8	As assessed by Fall 2013: US - 100% CT - 100%	

Clinical Practice Evaluation	<u>Spring 2014:</u> n=14 <u>Fall 2014:</u> n=6 <u>Spring 2015:</u> n=13	TC - 8 <u>Spring 2014:</u> US -14 CT - 14 TC - 14 <u>Fall 2014:</u> US - 6 CT - 6 TC - 6 <u>Spring 2015:</u> US - 13 CT - 13 TC - 13	TC - 100% <u>Spring 2014:</u> US - 100% CT - 100% TC - 100% <u>Fall 2014:</u> US - 100% CT - 100% TC - 100% <u>Spring 2015:</u> US -100% CT - 100% TC - 100%	Yes
CEC Standards 1-7 Clinical Practice Evaluation	<u>Fall 2013:</u> n=8 <u>Spring 2014:</u> n=14 <u>Fall 2014:</u> n=6 <u>Spring 2015:</u> n=13	As assessed by <u>Fall 2013:</u> US - 8 CT - 8 TC - 8 <u>Spring 2014:</u> US -14 CT - 14 TC - 14 <u>Fall 2014:</u> US - 6 CT - 6 TC - 6 <u>Spring 2015:</u> US - 13 CT - 13 TC - 13	As assessed by <u>Fall 2013:</u> US - 100% CT - 100% TC - 100% <u>Spring 2014:</u> US - 100% CT - 100% TC - 100% <u>Fall 2014:</u> US - 100% CT - 100% TC - 100% <u>Spring 2015:</u> US -100% CT - 100% TC - 100%	Yes
CEC Standards 1-7 Instructional Strategies Project	<u>Fall 2013:</u> n=7 <u>Spring 2014:</u> n=13 <u>Fall 2014:</u> n=5	<u>Fall 2013:</u> Item A: n=7 Item B: n=7 Item C: n=6 Item D: n=7 Item E: n=7 <u>Spring 2014:</u> Item A: n=13 Item B: n=13 Item C: n=13 Item D: n=12 (1 no score) Item E: n=13 <u>Fall 2014:</u> Item A: n=5 Item B: n=5 Item C: n=5 Item D: n=5 Item E: n=5	<u>Fall 2013:</u> Item A: n=100% Item B: n=100% Item C: n=85% Item D: n=100% Item E: n=100% <u>Spring 2014:</u> Item A: n=100% Item B: n=100% Item C: n=100% Item D: n=100% Item E: n=100% <u>Fall 2014:</u> Item A: n=100% Item B: n=100% Item C: n=100% Item D: n=100% Item E: n=100%	Yes

	Spring 2015: n=9	Spring 2015: Item A: n=9 Item B: n=9 Item C: n=8 Item D: n=9 Item E: n=9	Spring 2015: Item A: n=100% Item B: n=100% Item C: n=89% Item D: n=100% Item E: n=100%	
--	------------------	---	---	--

IV. Decisions and Actions

As part of the UNO College of Education teacher preparation programs, the BSED in Elementary Special Education and BSED in Secondary Special Education degree programs must meet the accreditation standards of the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE - which will transition to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)].

All three accreditation bodies (NDE, NCATE, CAEP) are based on a seven-year cycle for accreditation. Both NDE and CAEP require yearly updates. The College of Education most recently completed the NCATE and NDE accreditation process in November 2015. At that time, the College met the NDE requirements as well as the NCATE standard regarding assessment processes (Standard 2). The NCATE Standard was evaluated by external reviewers from across the United States and was further reviewed by the NCATE Board of Examiners.

Requirements for NCATE Standard 2 are found below with key elements related to the UNO SLO review process highlighted:

Standard 2: *The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.*

Supporting Explanation: *The unit has a professional responsibility to ensure that its programs and graduates are of the highest quality. The unit manages the assessment system, which includes both program and unit data. Units conduct assessments at the unit or program level or in a combination of the two. Meeting this responsibility requires the systematic gathering, summarizing, and evaluation of data and using the data to strengthen candidate performance, the unit, and its programs. Units are expected to use information technologies to assist in data management. **The unit's assessment system should examine the (1) alignment of instruction and curriculum with professional, state, and institutional standards; (2) efficacy of courses, field experiences, and programs, and (3) candidates' attainment of content knowledge and demonstration of teaching that leads to student learning or other work that supports student learning.** It should include the assessment of candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical and/or professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and their effects on student learning as outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards and identified in the unit's conceptual framework. The assessment system should be based on the assessments and scoring guides that are the foundation for NCATE's program review process (i.e., licensing exam scores and assessments of content knowledge, planning, clinical practice, and student learning).*

*Preparation of professional school personnel is a dynamic and complex enterprise, and one that requires units to plan and evaluate on a continuing basis. Program review and refinement are needed, over time, to ensure quality. Candidate assessments and unit evaluations must be purposeful, evolving from the unit's conceptual framework and program goals. They must be comprehensive, including measures related to faculty, the curriculum, and instruction, as well as what candidates know and can do. **The measures themselves must be of a quality that can actually inform the important aspects of faculty, curriculum, instruction, and candidate performance.***

*Fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in the assessment system must be considered, especially when the assessments are used to determine whether candidates continue in or complete programs. Attention must be paid to the potential adverse impact of the assessments on a diverse pool of teacher candidates. In addition, **the unit assessments and evaluations must consider how to provide and use information constructively from various sources—the unit, field experiences, clinical sites, general education courses, content courses, faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers.** Technology should play an increasingly important role in data gathering and analysis, as well as more broadly in unit planning and evaluation.*

Assessment systems include plans and timelines for data collection and analysis related to candidates and unit operations.

In conjunction with other data from student surveys and advisory boards, data related to SLOs were used to inform program decisions and actions within the BSED – Elementary Special Education and BSED – Secondary Special Education. Examples of these decisions include:

The Instructional Strategies rubric was revised for 2013-2014 in order to break down the main areas of the project and provide feedback. Based on the revised project, program faculty are able to determine if there are areas to focus on for program improvement. During the 4 cycles of administration of the Instructional Strategies project with the revised rubric, 2 students out of 34 were not at the upper two categories of the rubric. Based on this information, the following changes have been made:

1. A new practicum course, SPED 4000 was developed and blocked with two existing courses, SPED 4640: Methods and Materials in Special Education and SPED 3020: Data Collection. This was the first implementation of a practicum with the Data Collections course which provides supervised experiences for the students during this course.
2. University supervisors provide Data Collection information during clinical practice seminars and resources are available to students.

Please send the completed assessment report, along with a copy of the unit's current Assessment Plan document, to Candice Batton at cbatton@unomaha.edu

