

5-25-2016

# SLO Assessment Report Elementary & Secondary Special Education MA-MS 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 MA-MS 2016" (2016). *Student Learning*. Paper 33.

<http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/oiestudentlearning/33>

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](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



## Student Learning Outcome Report:

**College:** College of Education  
**Unit:** Special Education & Communication Disorders  
**Degree:** MA - Special Education  
MS - Special Education

### **I. Student Learning Outcomes for this Degree**

Student learning outcomes for these degree programs are based on the professional standards established by the Council for Exceptional Children (see below).

2012 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**

<b>SLOs addressed (from Section I)</b>	CEC Standards 1-7
<b>Element or artifact measured</b>	Performance during a 16 week internship in a P-12 classroom.
<b>Assessment method</b>	Final Clinical Practice Rubric - Items specific to SPED SLO/Standard 1 – Items 6, 7, 8 SLO/Standard 2 – Items 3, 4, 5, 8 SLO/Standard 3 – Items 2, 7, SLO/Standard 4 – Items 9, 10 SLO/Standard 5 – Items 2, 5, 7, 8 SLO/Standard 6 – Item 1 SLO/Standard 7 – Items 11, 12
<b>Assessment domain</b> <i>Examination, Product, or Performance?</i>	Performance

<b>Students assessed</b>	All students enrolled in SPED 8720 & SPED 8830 (Internship in Special Education & Internship in Behavioral Disorders).
<b>When and by whom administered</b>	Assessment is administered each fall and spring at the conclusion of the internship.  The assessment is completed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US – University supervisors (full-time &amp; adjunct faculty members)</li> <li>• CT – Cooperating teachers (P-12 teachers or administrators)</li> <li>• ST – Students enrolled in the internship</li> </ul>
<b>Proficiency definition and target</b>	Based on a 4 point Likert scale, mean scores for each item will be 3.5 or greater

<b>SLOs addressed (from Section I)</b>	CEC Standards 1-7
<b>Element or artifact measured</b>	Written analysis of instructional strategies as applied during clinical practice
<b>Assessment method</b>	SLOs/Standards 1, 2, 3, 5 – Item A, Target Behavior SLOs/Standards 3, 5, 6 – Item B, Journal Summary SLOs/Standard 4 – Item C, Monitoring & Data Collection SLOs/ Standards 3, 5 – Item D, Lesson Plan SLOs/Standards 1-7 – Item E, Reflection
<b>Assessment domain</b> <i>Examination, Product, or Performance?</i>	Product
<b>Students assessed</b>	All students enrolled in SPED 8720 & SPED 8830 (Internship in Special Education & Internship in Behavioral Disorders)
<b>When and by whom administered</b>	Assessment is administered each fall and spring semester during the course of the internship. The assessment is completed by university supervisors (full-time & adjunct faculty members).
<b>Proficiency definition and target</b>	Currently based on a 4 point Likert scale, mean scores for each item will be 3.5 or greater.

### III. Results

Data provided in Results Tables A and B are from 2012-13 and 2013-14 (four administrations) of the assessments. Because of the small number of assessed students, data for the MA Special Education and MS Special Education programs were combined. Item analysis for the internship evaluation is included below (Results Table A). Alignment to specific SLOs and CEC Standards are found in the above section (II – Measures Used).

Results Table A

Student Learning Outcome	<u>Total # Students Assessed</u>	<u>Aggregated Mean</u>	<u>Does % Meet or Exceed Program's Proficiency Target? (Y/N)</u>
Item 1	23	ST – 3.90 CT – 3.92 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 2	23	ST – 3.90 CT – 3.75 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 3	23	ST – 4.00 CT – 3.92 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 4	23	ST – 4.00 CT – 3.83 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 5	23	ST – 4.00 CT – 3.90 US – 3.92	Yes
Item 6	23	ST – 3.90 CT – 3.70 US – 3.92	Yes
Item 7	23	ST – 4.00 CT – 3.75 US – 3.75	Yes
Item 8	23	ST – 3.80 CT – 4.00 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 9	23	ST – 3.78 CT – 4.00 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 10	23	ST – 3.90 CT – 3.80 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 11	23	ST – 3.80 CT – 3.90 US – 4.00	Yes
Item 12	23	ST – 3.80 CT – 3.80 US – 4.00	Yes

In 2012-2013, the programs used a holistic scoring process for the instructional strategies project. Students were given a single score based on a 3 point scale (3=Target, 2=Acceptable, 1=Unacceptable). During this cycle, 10 students completed the project, and the mean score was 2.90.

Beginning in 2013-2014, the programs moved to a more direct measure of SLOs via the instructional strategies project and implemented a 4 point rating scale (4=Proficient, 3=Developing, 2=Beginning, 1= Not Demonstrated) for five separate components of the project. Data for 2013-2014 are found in Results Table B.

Results Table B

Student Learning Outcome	Total # Students Assessed	Aggregated Mean	Does % Meet or Exceed Program's Proficiency Target? (Y/N)
SLO/Standards 1, 2, 3, 5 Item A, Target Behavior	9	3.83	Yes
SLO/Standards 3, 5, 6 Item B, Journal Summary	9	3.67	Yes
SLO/Standard 4 Item C, Monitoring & Data Collection	9	3.50	Yes
SLO/ Standards 3, 5 Item D, Lesson Plan	9	3.83	Yes
SLO/Standards 1-7 Item E, Reflection	9	3.83	Yes

#### IV. Decisions and Actions

As part of the UNO College of Education teacher preparation programs, the MA and MS - 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 data from student surveys and advisory boards, SLO data informed program decisions and actions within the MA –Special Education and MS –Special Education programs. Examples of these include:

1. A new course, SPED 8810: Research in Special Education, was developed based on survey data and data from the Journal Summary ( $M = 3.67$ ). See Results Table B.
2. Revisions were made to the course, SPED 8910: Assessment in Special Education, to assist with Data Collection which was indicated in Table B- Data Collection ( $M = 3.50$ ).

**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](mailto:cbatton@unomaha.edu)**