Option C: Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment
**Student Learning Outcomes**

1. **Theory and Knowledge**
   Students will perform entry-level Sign Language interpreting skills by applying theoretical, ethical, cultural, and practical knowledge of the interpreting field using Demand-Oriented Schema to faithfully abide by the Code of Professional Conduct in educational and/or community settings.

2. **Human Relations**
   Students will demonstrate collegiality and productive collaboration with colleagues, consumers, and employees by showing respect, taking responsibility for one’s work and being an advocate for deaf and hard of hearing individuals.

3. **Language Skills**
   Students will demonstrate superior proficiency in one’s native language and near-native like communicative competence and flexibility in one’s second language by effectively communicating in a variety of routine personal and professional settings using effective interpersonal and cross-cultural communication skills to build professional relationships with various stakeholders in the Deaf and interpreting communities.

4. **Interpreting Skills**
   Students will analyze and apply different modes of interpreting and transliterating (simultaneous and consecutive) and different target language forms (e.g., ASL, spoken or signed English, tactile language) in order to transfer a message from the source language into the target language with minimal errors for multicultural consumers of varying ages in a variety of settings.

5. **Professionalism**
   Students will demonstrate the attitudes and skills expected of professionals including knowledge of research studies and application of results to interpretation practice, ability to plan for lifelong learning and participation in professional organizations.

---

**Interpreting Readiness Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Theory and Knowledge</td>
<td>Achieves competencies as demonstrated in course work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Human Relations</td>
<td>Demonstrates collegial and productive collaboration with colleagues, consumers, and employees by showing respect, taking responsibility for one’s work and being an advocate for deaf and hard of hearing individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Language Skills</td>
<td>Demonstrates superior proficiency in one’s native language and near-native like communicative competence and flexibility in one’s second language by effectively communicating in a variety of routine personal and professional settings using effective interpersonal and cross-cultural communication skills to build professional relationships with various stakeholders in the Deaf and interpreting communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interpreting Skills</td>
<td>Analyzes and applies different modes of interpreting and transliterating (simultaneous and consecutive) and different target language forms (e.g., ASL, spoken or signed English, tactile language) in order to transfer a message from the source language into the target language with minimal errors for multicultural consumers of varying ages in a variety of settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Professionalism</td>
<td>Demonstrates the attitudes and skills expected of professionals including knowledge of research studies and application of results to interpretation practice, ability to plan for lifelong learning and participate in professional organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Language Development Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Skill</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vocabulary</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to use complete and complex sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grammar</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to use complete and complex sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contextual Coherence</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to use complete and complex sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discourse</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to use complete and complex sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interpretive Performance</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to use complete and complex sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**References**

The Anatomy & Physiology course is designed to provide speech-language pathology (SLP) candidates with a significant component of the foundation necessary to enable them to develop skills in assessment and rehabilitation in the areas of speech, language, voice, and swallowing. It examines the anatomy and physiology of the human communication processes by exploring the mechanisms of respiration, phonation, respiration, speech articulation, and basic neurology.

One of the major assessments in the course is an anatomical model, in which the students have to: 1) Construct a model of one of the four sub-systems (i.e., respiration, phonation, articulation/resonation, the brain); 2) Identify the structures of the model; and 3) Describe structures and functions of the model in an oral presentation as well as a written paper. The purpose of this assignment is to help students understand the nature of the anatomy & physiology of the human communication process.
Assessment Components for Master’s Degree in Communication Disorder  
SPED 8500-3, SPED 8560, SPED 8240

Kathy Coufal, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, Jill Kumke, M.S., CCC-SLP, and Shari DeVeney, Ph.D., CCC-SLP  
Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders, College of Education

Assessment Description

Project focus:
- Graduate program in speech-language pathology
- According to the program’s accrediting body, Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA), and the standards set by the Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) program faculty and clinical educators must document competencies that all students meet upon completion of the graduate degree.
- Development of program assessments inform program faculty and clinical educators and are useful in accreditation reporting.

Goals:
- Develop program-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) and appropriate assessment measures that include competencies consistent with the CAA/CFCC standards, which include a focus on interprofessional education in the context of human communication development, disorders, and cultural and linguistic differences.
- Define and align measurements with the SLOs that have been established and to collect and analyze data from those measures in order to make informed decisions and appropriate actions. Two specific program-level SLOs to be targeted, include those related to Collaborative Practice and Evidence-Based Practices.

Student Learning Outcome 1

Collaborative Practice

Students will apply values and principles of interprofessional team dynamics to establish and maintain collaborative working relationships that promote optimal patient/client care using a collaborative patient/client-family centered approach

Students will be assessed on their ability to:
- Establish and maintain collaborative relationships with those in other disciplinary fields (e.g., nursing, occupational therapy, physical therapy, school psychology) for planning and providing patient/client care through use of effective communication strategies.
- Describe roles and responsibilities of their own profession with those in other disciplinary fields
- Share evidence-based and/or best practice discipline-specific knowledge with others.
- Demonstrate active listening and respect when engaging with those from other disciplinary fields who are sharing different perspectives and opinions.
- Promote integration of information from those in other disciplinary fields when planning and providing care for patients/clients.

Student Learning Outcome 2

Evidence-Based Practice

Students will access, critically evaluate, and integrate sources of information to support clinical decisions regarding assessment and intervention/management.

Students will be assessed on their ability to:
- Access and critically evaluate information sources
- Apply that information to appropriate populations
- Articulate how the evidence supports provision of speech-language pathology services.

Proficiency Targets

SLO #1: 
Direct Measure

Direct Measure: 80% of students enrolled will achieve competency or above across the interprofessional experience observational rubric indicators. following a structured interprofessional experience.

SLO #2: 
80% of students enrolled will score “20” or higher for each client profile in the portfolio for (up to) three clients

Interprofessional Experience Rubric

SLO #1: 
Direct Measure

Results & Interpretation

Fall, 2017: 8500-3: 100% of the 8 students enrolled reached competency or above (SLO2)
Fall, 2017: 8560-3: 100% of the 16 students enrolled scored 4 or higher on the Indirect Measure (IPR Self Perception Scale) (SLO1)

References/Next Steps/Conclusion and Future Directions

Next: Going forward. Data collection will proceed for both SLOs using all three measures. Once a complete data set is compiled analysis, interpretation, and further directions will be discussed.
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Objective
The main objective is the assessment of student’s research quality and maturity, CS knowledge, and technical communication skills for life long learning. These artifacts are assessed through thesis (CSCI 8990) and project (CSCI 8960). The capstone course is a one-semester project. The thesis and project routes require the establishment of a supervisory committee consisting of two computer science faculty and an external graduate faculty. The committee members are asked to assess the students by filling out the rubric forms that have been developed by Graduate Program Committee (GPC) and approved by the department. The rubrics assess the students through their proposal submission and approval, presentation defense, and the final report.

Overview
The MS-CS program has three exit routes to graduation: thesis (CSCI 8990), project (CSCI 8960), and coursework through the capstone course (CSCI 8910). The capstone course is a one-semester project. The thesis and project routes require the establishment of a supervisory committee consisting of two computer science faculty and an external graduate faculty. The committee members are asked to assess the students by filling out the rubric forms that have been developed by Graduate Program Committee (GPC) and approved by the department. The rubrics assess the students through their proposal submission and approval, presentation defense, and the final report.

MS-CS Program SLOs
1. Students will have the competence to examine a problem and design a methodology to achieve a solution.
2. Students will have the competence to assess the performance of a computational artifact, entity, or process.
3. Students will have the competence to work toward a common objective in a team and contribute effectively.
4. Students will have the competence to communicate their thoughts and ideas to varied audiences, both orally and through written materials.
5. Students will have the knowledge and skill for independent learning and professional development.

Proposal Weight Distribution

Proposal Scoring Rubrics

Presentation Weight Distribution

Presentation Scoring Rubrics

Report Weight Distribution

Report Scoring Rubrics

Results of Proposal Assessment

The Next Steps
- The results will be reviewed and evaluated by the CS department.
- The rubrics will be revised after collecting feedbacks.
- Feedbacks will be collected for improving data collection.
English Major

Joan Latchaw, Amber Rogers, Jody Keisner, Tanushree Ghosh, and Dustin Pendley
Department of English, College of Arts & Sciences, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

Method of Collection (Background)

Papers/projects were collected by the English Department Coordinator, who identified senior English majors by reviewing class rosters. Professors of these courses with identified seniors were asked to provide a paper or project for each of these students. Once the papers were collected, they were scrubbed of information (either from the printed page or electronic copies.) (We do not have enough artifacts to create a random sample.)

Method of Assessment

A team of five readers met on October 27th from 9:00 am–2:00 pm to assess a group of 14 papers. The team normed two papers and discussed criteria for rating using the rubric (ratings 1-4 with 4 being the highest). We counted a paper as proficient if it received a 2, 3, or 4. Each paper was rated by every reader and given a score. Rater reliability was 79% based on either an exact match or one number difference. Raters made notes detailing their findings and rationale for their scores. The team then discussed each paper based on ratings and comments. Although the team read a small number of papers, the discussions were productive and informative for sharing results with faculty.

Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Bloom's Taxonomy - Cognitive Level</th>
<th>Check mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Demonstrates the ability to analyze and interpret texts in a written paper or project</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Demonstrates the ability to incorporate research into a written paper or project</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Demonstrates the ability to incorporate research into a written paper or project</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric (Instrument)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0: No evidence of analysis</td>
<td>4: Proficient with a score of 3 or 4</td>
<td>3: Proficient with a score of 2 or higher</td>
<td>2: Proficient with a score of 1 or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation and/or Next Steps for Program Improvement

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Date Range</th>
<th>Number of Students Assessed</th>
<th>Percentage of Students who Met/Exceeded Threshold Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring and Fall of 2017</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We checked the “Met” status of the program because it was so close to the proficiency target. We established a target of 80% and reached 78.6% proficiency (based on a rating of 2 or higher). This was a small sample: 14 papers. In reviewing our last assessment in Spring of 2016, we had similar results. However, in that assessment, we had not established a target proficiency and only rated a paper proficient with a score of 3 or 4. If we had used the same proficiency target, that Spring assessment would have had a 100% proficiency.

Although this is not really valid, if we took the two assessments (Sp 2017, F 2017) together—counting 24 papers—we would have had a proficiency rate of 87.5%.

References

ENGLISH MA Program Assessment

G. Travis Adams, Kristin Girten, and Ramon Guerra

English Department, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

SLO #3: Graduating MA Students will demonstrate professional Communication Skills

Element or artifact measured: Substantial seminar project 2015-2016

Assessment method: Committee members developed a rubric (adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities), members and readers then had a norming session before reading and scoring artifacts from 1-4, with each artifact being read by two readers (some if the first two scores differ by more than one point).

Assessment domain: Communication Product or Performance?

Students assessed: 24 MA level students

When and by whom administered: Fall 2016, by MA Assessment Committee plus readers (selected from other graduate faculty) as necessary

Rubrics

Norming Discussion Scoring

Results

SLO #3

In fall 2017, our MA Program Assessment Committee developed a rubric for SLO #3, enlisted three additional readers from our faculty, held a norming session, and scored final seminar papers/projects from Fall 2016 MA seminars. The results of our scoring were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Category</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Category</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-observer agreement</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage ofPass/NotPass</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO #4: Graduating MA Students will demonstrate Purposeful Reading

Proficiency Target

For SLO #4 proficiency was a 3.0 or higher on a four point scale with a target of 80%.

For SLO #4 proficiency was a 3.0 or higher on a four point scale with a target of 80%.

Decisions and Actions

SLO #3 Decisions: The scores for two rubric categories and overall averages are below our program’s expectations, and the artifacts scored do not meet our proficiency target. It is important to note that these artifacts were drawn only from MA seminars that were offered in the fall of 2016 and that of the six seminars offered, artifacts were submitted from half those seminars. Thus, the artifacts do not fully represent work from the range of seminars offered in this semester. Additionally, because students in the program do not take seminars at specific required points in their program, artifacts assessed were not necessarily written by students at the end of their MA work. Some of the lower scores may reflect projects from students in their first semester of the program. For SLO #3 readers also expressed particular challenges using the “Genre, Format, and Conventions” portion of the rubric because 1) the word “purpose” is included in the rubric (and the broader SLO language) complicated whether readers were supposed to identify a thesis or main point in addition to looking at genre/format and 2) without assignment prompts, identifying the intended genre/format and accompanying conventions sometimes left readers guessing at what students tried to produce. Assessing the “Revision and Refinement” portion of the rubric was also a challenge. While readers were comfortable—and consistent—in articulating expectations for polished projects, we were not all in agreement as to whether or not the extent to which a student revised writing can be evaluated from a single artifact that only shows what was turned in as a final product.

Actions:

- For future assessments of SLO #3, we will collect artifacts from students that have completed 18 or more credit hours in our program
- Our Graduate Program Committee and Department Chair will communicate the importance of faculty submitting requested artifacts for assessment
- Our assessment committee will suggest removing “purpose” from SLO #3 & revising the rubric accordingly
- Our assessment committee will suggest faculty submit assignment prompts along with seminar papers, thus allowing assessment readers to see what genre/format was required/attempted
- Our assessment committee will communicate the need for artifacts that allow us to see the process student projects go through

SLO #4 Decisions: We remain on schedule for assessing SLO #4, though our work this semester revealed that we need additional discussions with our Graduate Program Committee to determine what artifacts would allow us to see student reading processes. Part of the SLO makes clear we cannot simply assess final projects/papers.

Actions:

- Work with Graduate Program Committee to identify and collect appropriate artifacts
- Develop a norming/scoring guide for SLO #4
- Finalize SLO #4 Rubric
- Conduct assessment of SLO #4 (Spring 2018)

Student Learning Outcomes

SLO #3: Graduating MA Students will demonstrate professional Communication Skills

SLO #4: Graduating MA Students will demonstrate Purposeful Reading

Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Assessment Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Measured Expectations</th>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Inter-observer agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant Support

The Program Level Assessment grant provided stipends to the assessment cohort and to readers. Grant funding helped the English MA program:

- Draft and refine rubrics for SLO #3 and SLO #4
- Recruit additional readers
- Conduct assessment for one of our four program SLOs
- Purchase a professional text, Strain and Potter’s Degrees of Change: The MA in English (Studies) (2010) that will continue to inform our interpretation of assessment data and recommendations that come out our assessment
- Offering small monetary rewards to faculty readers was crucial to our assessment efforts. Without those additional faculty we would not be able to assess as large of a sample of artifacts.

Grant funding allowed us to have a wider range of faculty involved in assessment. This made our conversations as a cohort and with our Graduate Program Committee much richer and more likely to spark long-term programmatic change.
Communication Standards of Learning in Psychology Research Methods

S. I. Sollars, B. O. Ryalls & J. D. Omelian
Psychology Department, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Abstract
We established guiding principles based on the American Psychological Association (APA) Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Guide (APA Guidelines, 2013). It is a daunting task to assess over 600 B.A. and B.S. students, and more than 145 students who have declared a Psychology Minor. Their goals, life circumstances, and learning strategies vary widely. In setting our SLOs, we focused on foundational, yet exigent goals. We propose that these SLOs will serve students universally in the next steps of their lives following graduation. The SLOs focus on are:

Knowledge Base: Students will develop a working knowledge of major content domains.
Scientific Inquiry: Students will demonstrate scientific literacy and critical thinking.
Communication: Students will learn to write structured APA-style research reports.
Ethical and Social Responsibility: Students will identify and evaluate ethical issues of plagiarism and personal responsibility reflective of a diverse world.

The focus of the current year’s efforts was the development of a wide rubric, because adjunct instructors teach many of the courses across multiple studies. This rubric is based on the validated rubric we developed is based upon the validated measures of the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U; www.aacu.org). This organization has a variety of rubric templates that have free online access. The templates can be modified to correspond to an individual course, or for programmatic assessment.

We used one of the AAC&U rubric templates to apply to the student final project in Methods of Psychological Inquiry. The rubric style was first assessed in one of our other courses, and found to be effective and easy to implement. Meetings with the instructors of Methods led to a redesign to match the final project learning objectives. The rubric implementation occurred for first time in May 2018.

Method
The rubric we developed is based upon the validated measures of the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U; www.aacu.org). This organization has a variety of rubric templates that have free online access. The templates can be modified to correspond to an individual course, or for programmatic assessment.

We used one of the AAC&U rubric templates to apply to the student final project in Methods of Psychological Inquiry. The rubric style was first assessed in one of our other courses, and found to be effective and easy to implement. Meetings with the instructors of Methods led to a redesign to match the final project learning objectives. The rubric implementation occurred for first time in May 2018.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Psychological Inquiry</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Average 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APA style</strong></td>
<td>Writing strictly adheres to APA style.</td>
<td>No APA errors on headings, title page, running heads, statistics or major errors on reference page. Minor period or italics errors.</td>
<td>APA style was attempted, but multiple (2-4) major APA errors are present.</td>
<td>Multiple, repetitive, major (≥ 5) APA errors throughout the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Generates substantial additions based on feedback.</td>
<td>Meets required changes to project given feedback.</td>
<td>Limited development of project given feedback.</td>
<td>Makes simple, grammatical edits in response to specific feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background and Reference Material</strong></td>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal resources provided in a range (≥ 5) appropriate to project. Reference material is relevant to paper topic and integrated into project.</td>
<td>Sufficient number (≥ 5) of peer-reviewed journal resources, but majority only marginally relevant to topic. Reference material integrated into project.</td>
<td>Four or fewer resources from peer-reviewed journals, and/or resources from sources other than peer-reviewed journals. Reference material presented marginally.</td>
<td>Three or fewer resources that are marginally related to the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conveyance of Topic</strong></td>
<td>Synthesizes information, presents material in a grammatically precise manner. Clear flow of information that leads to a cohesive ‘story.’</td>
<td>Presents solid understanding of topic. Clear progression from one section to another with few grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Mastery of topic not conveyed well, though solid information is provided. Topic transitions show progression of information, but grammatical errors are common.</td>
<td>Material not conveyed with understanding. Flow of information is choppy or does not have good transitions to tie one section with another. Overall difficulty in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate Topic Critically</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates that topic material is not merely accepted as written, but that competing, challenging, or complementary information is compared and contrasted.</td>
<td>Presents solid, factual information with a variety of studies compared and contrasted.</td>
<td>Presents solid, factual information without analysis or consideration of variation across multiple studies.</td>
<td>Information is presented, but no analysis of connections across material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
The design of the rubric is not meant for course grading; instructors use other rubrics for grading. This rubric is designed to be implemented following grading of the final project. After grading is complete, the instructor can quickly assess student performance in each category of this program rubric. When this rubric was used in a trial course, assessment of 16 student projects took approximately 30 minutes. The efficiency of this assessment makes the task less cumbersome. In addition to content, we considered time and efficiency as particularly important criteria in the design of a program-wide rubric, because adjunct instructors teach many of the courses we assess.

Summary and Conclusions

- One major goal of this academic year was to formulate a rubric that would be instrumental across a variety of writing courses.
- After researching many styles of rubrics, the authors tried the AAC&U style in one class, found it straightforward to use, and that it provided instructive outcomes.
- Instructors in the focus course (PSYC 3140, Methods of Psychological Inquiry) were instrumental in designing specific details of the rubric.
- Important aspects of the rubric were:
  - Ease of use across many instructors
  - Consistency in interpretation of items assessed
  - Ability to translate the individual course rubrics into programmatic assessment
- Spring semester 2018 was the first trial of the rubric in the Research Methods course (results were not available at the time of the poster preparation).

Future Directions

- Expand the number of courses included in our assessments.
- Build rubrics to assess Capstone Laboratory writing course assignments.
- Meetings will continue with faculty to review assessment results and strategize toward students’ long-term retention of concepts, creative inquiry, ethics and communication.
- We continue to assess across-program student learning through pre-course surveys.

Reference
Social Science General Education Assessment for Introductory Sociology and Anthropology Courses

Julie A. Pelton, Samantha K. Ammons, and Regina E. Robbins
Department of Sociology & Anthropology, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

The goal of this project was to develop an assessment process for all social science introductory courses offered by the Department of Sociology & Anthropology. As introductory courses to the disciplines of sociology and anthropology, we expect that students will be introduced to the same basic skills and content in every section of social science courses approved for General Education. We created separate “department exams” for introductory sociology and anthropology courses. This poster addresses the sociology assessment exam only.

We reached out to and received sample exam questions from 3 instructors of Introduction to Sociology which we then used to construct a multiple choice department exam designed to evaluate a student’s basic sociological understanding of social interactions, critical thinking skills, methods of inquiry, and ability to communicate. The sociology assessment exam is used for three courses:
1. SOC 1010 Introductory Sociology
2. SOC 2100 Social Problems
3. SOC 2150 Sociology of Families

Using one exam for all three courses allows us to aggregate findings across all sections of these courses, decrease faculty workload, and ensure that all students are meeting social science learning outcomes.

We established an Assessment Committee in October 2017, created the sociology assessment exam in November 2017 and collected data in December 2017 – quite a tight timeline – as a result of the grant.

Student Learning Outcomes

General Education – Social Science
- Demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of interactions between human motivations, institutional forces, and/or social behavior;
- Use critical thinking and reasoning skills to analyze theories, perspectives, and/or concepts relative to the discipline(s) studied;
- Identify multiple methods and modes of inquiry and their appropriate application; and
- Communicate ideas and explain concepts and analyses using the language of the discipline(s).

Multiple Choice Exam

The sociology assessment exam included 26 questions. Multiple measures were used to assess each social science SLO and reflect core sociological concepts and abilities appropriate for an introductory course as stated by program level learning outcomes.

Interpretation of Results

We reported partially meeting our proficiency target for SLO 1 because students met or partially met that standard on two of the three question subsets. We did not meet our target for SLO’s 2-4 for this assessment cycle. During a conversation with the full faculty about sociology general education assessment results, the following interpretations were offered:

- Looking at the subsets for SLO 1, we can see that students enrolled in introductory sociology courses have a better understanding of social structure and socialization than they do of inequality as assessed by this exam. Instructors should ensure they strengthen discussions of inequality as an important institutional force in society.
- General theoretical perspectives measured by SLO 2 should be embedded throughout the course for better understanding rather than covered at the beginning of the semester alone.
- Quantitative literacy skills are a central part of sociology and should be strengthened in introductory courses. Instructors need to cover hypotheses, hypothesis testing, qualitative/quantitative research, and the difference between independent and dependent variables.
- Introductory sociology instructors should work together to ensure that the sociological perspective is taught similarly across course sections.

Next Steps

While we are disappointed that general education SLOs were not met this semester, we also recognize that this was a pilot phase in our assessment process. After discussing results, faculty identified the following steps to promote continuous improvement:

- Use same exam Spring 2018 to ensure results are representative
- Acknowledge areas of strength and address areas in need of improvement in our instruction
- Evaluate quality of exam questions
- Ensure assessment method can work uniformly and effectively across all sections of these courses
- Test the examination for validity and reliability
- Increase instructor participation in general education assessment and student response rate for the assessment exam

References

Fake News Assessment

In order to educate others about finding authoritative information, educators and information professionals must have the ability to separate fact from fiction. Candidates will practice effective information evaluation by identifying one fabricated news story and one legitimate news story covering similar topics (examples: 2017 election, climate change, Taylor Swift’s latest boyfriend, etc.)

Part A) Candidates will write a three page reflection that compares and contrasts these news stories. The reflection will include:

- APA Citation for each news story
- Scope and key details in each news story (including false details)
- Discussion about the information medium (video, article, social media post, blog post, etc.) for each story
- Hypothesis about the motivations for the fabricated story (fake news only)
- Two ways to be responsible consumers of information (if it is a fake news story—what will you do about it?)

Part B) Candidates will use Smart Art (Word) to create a visual that demonstrates three steps that they took in order to validate or invalidate information in each case (comparison chart, table, infographic).

Student Learning Outcomes

SLO 1) Candidates in the BS in Education; Library Science programs demonstrate their ability to integrate technology and the theories that underpin its design, application, and use.

Understanding Fake News, particularly within the broader context of digital citizenship, is mandatory for library science candidates. Fake News is directly tied to the theories that underpin technology design application and use. Library patrons increasingly look to online sources for information and librarians are tasked with helping them identify reliable sources.

SLO 2) Candidates in the BS in Education; Library Science programs demonstrate their ability to respond to the needs of a diverse and global society, including the needs of underserved groups.

Lack of access to resources and training has led to a knowledge divide in society concerning understanding of technology trends, uses, and implications. Library Science candidates must learn how to provide instruction and spread awareness about Fake News in order to narrow this divide and to keep people from being manipulated and/or misled.

References


Interpretation and Next Steps for Program Improvement

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Target</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Approaching Target</th>
<th>Below Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Target</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching Target</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Target</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that students performed very well on this assignment; overall, Reflection about this data and performance focused on the following:

- Contemplation about whether or not SLO’s were accurately measured and met through this assessment
- Identification and discussion of the weakest scoring category: validation
- Consideration about whether or not there is need for more rigor in the assignment
- Deliberation about whether or not the assignment demonstrates students’ understanding of the definition and nuances of the topic
- Examination of the rubric and determining its effectiveness in gathering targeted data.

Solutions specific to SLO’s

SLO 1: Candidates in the BS in Education; Library Science programs demonstrate their ability to integrate technology and the theories that underpin its design, application, and use.

- Global beginning of April 2018; high efficacy network the project data specific to the assignment.
- Other discussion with Information Technology (ASLC) library, University Manager for Information Technology (ASLC), and Library Science Instructional Technologist (ASLC) to explore data specific to the assessment.

Library faculty agreed to meet in Summer of 2018 to discuss incorporating reflections that requires students to more visual artifacts that provide additional context, overview, and more informative presentation of their information gathering process. Additionally, discussion of possible increasing on additional categories within the static (specific to methodology our underpinned teaching) summation.

SLO 2: Candidates in the BS in Education; Library Science programs demonstrate their ability to respond to the needs of a diverse and global society, including the needs of underserved groups.

- In the case meetings, traditional wisdom: Federally funded grants focus on what their is a high potential for information. Furthermore, the focus of the concept was that the assessment was included in the “constructive” category because of adequate additional criteria. Therefore, it is difficult to determine the accuracy of this mapping.

During the 2018 summer meeting, library science faculty will investigate ways to review the rubric by including more specific criteria to ensure that more accurate data may be gathered. They will also discuss options for increasing the use of rubrics to ensure that the faculty is consistently using the same criteria.

Solutions for other issues:

- Incorporate more specific direction and verification within the assignment criteria to create a more rigorous information validation process
- Add an additional assignment criteria requiring a thoughtful and well supported definition of Fake News
- Change the point ranges in each rubric category to more accurately reflect percentage ranges for grades
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Overview of the Project

Preparing teacher candidates for the reality and complexity of K-12 schooling is of vital importance to our society. The UNO Teacher Education Department has been continuously focused on programs to develop the highest quality of teachers who can positively impact student achievement. This project was focused on the development and piloting of a Key Assessment (SLO) for the Teacher Education Department for a course titled TED 2400 Planning for Effective Teaching. The SLO pertains to teacher candidates’ abilities to plan for the needs of diverse learners in the classroom.

Planning is an essential function of effective teachers and therefore, our course is designed with various topics all aimed at supporting the planning process to best meet the needs of learners. While some of our department SLOs are based on field experience performance, in this initial coursework, we believe assessing the knowledge and dispositions for those interested in teaching is an appropriate measure to gather. Planning for instruction which meets the needs of diverse learners is an aspect of our program which will be expected through graduation and into our candidates’ teaching careers.

Creating a valid and reliable assessment to measure our students’ knowledge and dispositions will not only be important for program improvement, but also in reviewing, refining, and reflecting about our work as instructors. Initial steps in drafting and collecting stakeholder input for this assessment began spring semester 2017. This grant supported our continued efforts to revise, pilot, and analyze our preliminary data and make informed decisions about our next steps towards finalizing our early program key assessment for teacher education. Data collected represents the analysis lesson planning performance of 85 teacher candidates in five sections (elementary, 2 secondary) of TED 2400 during spring 2018.

Student Learning Outcomes

Student learning outcomes for this degree program are based on the professional standards established by the Interstate Teacher Assessment & Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards developed and adopted by the Council of Chief State School Officers.

Those addressed for this assessment are:

InTASC Standard #1: The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that physical, intellectual, emotional, and social factors influence the development and learning of all students.

InTASC Standard #2: The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to create inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to realize high standards.

InTASC Standard #3: The teacher works with others to create learning environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interactions, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

InTASC Standard #4: The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous standards to objectives and clearly stating the expected student outcome of instruction, (b) considering how and when to assess student learning through evidence-based assessment, and (e) creating an environment that supports motivation, engagement, and productivity. The second purpose of the lesson plan assessment is to expose candidates to the instructional cycle of planning, implementing, assessing, and reflecting as a professional practice of successful educators.

Data, Summary, and Conclusions

As a group of instructors, we analyzed results from TED 2400 teacher candidates (N=85) on their demonstration of lesson planning knowledge and skills. Both individual and group data results (see left) were analyzed by course instructors.

Student strengths were in aligning content standards to objectives and clearly stating the objective of the lesson. Identified areas of improvement were mainly found in the instructional input (I Do, We Do especially) and anticipatory set of the lesson. One area we analyzed more deeply was assessment. With a lower mean and higher standard deviation compared to the other indicators, our group made contextual comments about the data and the coursework implications.

Future Direction

Based on student and instruction and our analysis of inter-rater reliability of scoring, our group has committed to the following next steps:

1. Collaborative modifications and modifications to the alignment of our assessment practices and the rubric instructions. These modifications and modifications to the alignment of our assessment practices and the rubric instructions.

2. Double or multiple scoring of the lesson plan rubric to be done simultaneously by different instructors. These modifications and modifications to the alignment of our assessment practices and the rubric instructions.

3. Re-score the lessons plans with the rubric and the rubric instructions.


5. Re-score the lessons plans with the rubric and the rubric instructions.