Option B: General Education Student Learning Outcome Assessment
The Department of Biomechanics is a new department and the Bachelor’s in Biomechanics is only two years old. BMCH 1100 was offered for the first time in Spring 2018. Many options were considered to assess the four student learning outcomes (SLOs). After consideration, one assignment was chosen to assess the SLOs.

Timeline
- Fall 2017: Draft complete, draft reviewed by admin, faculty, students
- Spring 2018: Instructor accepted final draft, assessment administered

Assessment Assignment
Analysis of an Ethical Situation Assignment Description
This assignment asks you to build upon your ethical reasoning you have been developing throughout the semester. An ethical situation that has occurred in history will be assigned to you. This ethical situation will have already had an outcome. You will compose an analysis statement in which you make your audience aware of the ethical situation/question related to the situation. You will need to articulate a clear analysis of the course of action taken and what else could have been done. The argument and support should be logical and factual, stemming from credible sources. Opinions and feelings are not suitable for an ethical argument.

While you may organize the analysis in a way you believe most effectively communicates your message, please include the following three main structural components:
1. Brief background introduction to your topic, including any definitions, seminal works, or essential stakeholders relevant to your topic.
2. A one-sentence statement of why this ethical situation matters followed by elaboration (please be sure to bold the one-sentence statement so it can be easily found)
3. An analysis of the course of action taken and additional action that could have been taken

It is also important to keep in mind that you will need to fulfill the following:
1. An understanding of one of the three approaches/genres to ethics: deontological, consequential, or practical ethics.
2. How to consider multiple ethical perspectives on a given topic.
3. How the outcome of this situation has contributed to society’s understanding, growth, and well-being in context of that situation.
4. Your understood ability to interpret, critically evaluate, and explain the significance of the arguments of others and yourself.

Analysis statements should be no more than three-pages, single spaced, 1 margined, with 12-point font. At the top of the first page, please write out the ethical situation/question you are responding to, in order for the reader to understand the context. Statements should be turned in on Canvas electronically. For additional details, please review the assignment instructions on Canvas.

Glossary (definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric)
- Ethical Reasoning: reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students’ ethical self identity exists as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.
- Critical Thinking: a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.
- Philosophical argument: abstraction, or series of statements, used to persuade someone or to present reasons for accepting a conclusion.
- Human condition: ethical events, situations, and/or dilemmas that make up human existence (e.g., How is an ethical situation impacting a particular group of people? What is the issue, how is it addressed?)

Proficiency Target
The proficiency target was set at a score of 70%. This is the minimum grade needed to pass the course. It was expected that 80% of the class would hit this proficiency target.

Results
Twenty-one students were administered the assessment and all 21 completed the assignment. The average total score on the assignment was 87.1%, with no students scoring below a 70%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students &lt;70%</th>
<th>SLO #1</th>
<th>SLO #2</th>
<th>SLO #3</th>
<th>SLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score: 86.1% 86.3% 90% 89.5%
Score Range: 100-67.5% 100-66.7% 100-66.7% 100-75%
Proficiency Rate: 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100%

After the assessment was complete, students commented that the rubric was hard to follow. A survey was administered to the students for immediate feedback (n=17).
- Students said they understood the rubric, one said they did not, and everyone said they partially understood.
- Format and introduction (SLO #1) sections were most understood.
- Least understood sections were SLO #2 & 3
- Feedback centered on simplifying the language

Next Steps for Program Improvement
- Review exceptional assignments from students in the Spring 2018 section
- Evaluate these same sample assignments as why they were exceptional
- Revise the rubric based upon the evaluation and the student feedback, mainly simplifying the language
- After administration a second time, evaluate the rubric by having two faculty score the same papers
- Continue revision of the rubric until inter-rater reliability is found
Description of CSCI 1200

Increasingly, computer science is getting recognition as the third pillar of science alongside theory and experimentation. It enables the study of theoretical models of phenomena too complex, costly, hazardous, vast or small for experimentation.

The CSCI 1200 course examines how computation pervades and enables modern scientific discovery by supporting data collection, modeling, analysis and visualization, a new paradigm known as computational and data-enabled science and engineering. The projects and exercises in the course are geared towards helping students develop the basic skills needed for building computational models.

Natural Science Course SLO(s)

The SLOs for each general education area have been determined by the UNO General Education Committee. There are four natural science SLOs:

- SLO1: demonstrate a broad understanding of the fundamental laws and principles of science and interrelationships among science and technology disciplines;
- SLO2: demonstrate a broad understanding of various natural and/or physical phenomena that surround and influence our lives;
- SLO3: describe how scientists approach and solve problems including an understanding of the basic components and limitations of the scientific method; and
- SLO4: solve problems and draw conclusions based on scientific information and models, using critical thinking and qualitative and quantitative analysis of data and concepts in particular to distinguish reality from speculation.

List of Measures Developed

- Project Proposal: For this class, students will combine what they have learned about the problem solving process and the way computers work in order to propose an app that could help solve a real world problem of their choosing.
- Individual Project Report: This report focuses specifically on the creation of a computer application through the collaborative and iterative process of programming.
- Project Presentation: The last step of the project is to present their app to the classmates.
- Assignment - Tell a Data Story: This task requires students to manipulate data that they have selected, create a computational artifact in the form of a data visualization, and write about the artifact and its possible interpretations.

Student Learning Outcomes

Rubric (For SLO1 & SLO2 Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO1: Student must get 8 points or above from two measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The selected abstraction includes mathematical and/or logical concepts and serves to manage complexity of the program. AND The response indicates that an abstraction was developed and provides an accurate description with specificity of the purpose of the abstraction. The response explains how the abstraction manages complexity of the program due to the inclusion of the abstraction in the program or explains how the program would function without the abstraction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The selected abstraction includes mathematical and/or logical concepts and serves to manage complexity of the program. AND The response indicates that an abstraction was developed and provides an accurate description with specificity of the purpose of the abstraction. The response explains how the abstraction manages complexity of the program due to the inclusion of the abstraction in the program or explains how the program would function without the abstraction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results (or Timeline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Date Range</th>
<th>Number of Students Assessed</th>
<th>Percentage of Students who Meet/Exceeded Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 – Measure one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section A</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section B</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2 – Measure two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section A</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section B</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3 – Measure one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section A</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section B</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4 – Measure two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section A</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>65.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI 1200- Section B</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>65.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

- According to the assessment results shown in Section II, the results of SLO1, SLO2 and SLO3 meet the SLO Proficiency Target (at least 75% of all students assessed will meet or exceed the proficiency threshold noted above). Thus, no action will be taken as a result of this assessment for SLO1, SLO2 and SLO3.
- For SLO4, based on the assessment results, the status of Gen Ed SLO4 is only partially met; CSCI 1200- Section A was only 65.22% and CSCI 1200- Section B was 87.5%.

This is because the ‘Assignment - Tell a Data Story’ was given as an extra-credit assignment for CSCI1200- Section A, and 8 out 23 students didn’t submit the assignment (all orange bars in the left histogram).

Since the result of the other assignment for SLO4 (Presentation - Social Impact, Market Research, and References) were positive, we decided not to implement any changes in the course contents. However, this assignment will be moved to earlier in the curriculum from Fall 2018.

Jong-Hoon Yoon and Harvey Siy
Department of Computer Science, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182
Gen Ed SLO’s for Autobiographical Reading and Writing

Daniel Wuebben, Imafedia Okhamafe, Todd Richardson
Goodrich Scholarship Program, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Rubric (Instrument)

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition

For this SLO, we are especially focused on evidence from the writer’s artifact that shows understanding of personal narrative as a method for comprehending and responding to the human condition.

2. Recognize, articulate, and explore how various humanists/artists have responded to the human condition

This SLO is about how students articulate how other humanists/artists have responded to the human condition. We acknowledge that this particular SLO is not likely to be displayed in autobiographies, but is achieved in various other writing assignments in which students respond to an author’s text.

3. Comprehend and evaluate how humanistic/artistic expression contributes to individual and/or socio-cultural understanding, growth and well-being

For this SLO, we are especially interested in how well the writer’s own autobiography shows some kind of socio-cultural understanding, growth, and well being.

4. Use relevant critical, analytic, creative, speculative, and/or reflective methods

For this SLO, we are especially interested in how well the writer’s artifact displays an ability to express meaning through use of descriptive scenes, offer reflections on impactful events, and tries to make sense of how specific experiences may have broader consequences.

As we read each of the 15 artifacts, we scored them as either “exemplary” “proficient” or “developing” in each of the four areas.

Description of the Assessment

HUMN 1200 satisfies part of the Humanities and Fine Arts distribution requirements and is a required course for incoming students in the Goodrich Scholarship Program. The official course description describes it as a course in which “students are exposed to multicultural perspectives” and which “helps students to write effectively by focusing on their own personal experience and by examining a variety of autobiographical writings.” The proposed assessment asks: How does writing about a subjective, personal experiences help students develop the fundamental academic skills they need to successfully compose objective, academic arguments? What aspects of HUMN 1200 promote resiliency, problem solving, and creative thinking? How can practicing and studying autobiographical writing create an entry point and result of literacy research?

The goal of this assessment is to understand how activating and practicing these threshold concepts may or may not map onto the four Gen Ed SLOs and furthermore, how high-stakes deliverables for this course (the 20-page Autobiography) display achievement of SLOs and course performance.

Proficiency Target

At this time, we have set the following targeted proficiency level for each SLO:

- SLO #1: 80%
- SLO #2: 50%
- SLO #3: 80%
- SLO #4: 80%

Results (or Timeline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Assessed</th>
<th>Percentage of Students who Met/Exceeded Threshold Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 12/15, 12/15, 12/15 Total: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 8/15, 8/15 Total: 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 14/15, 14/15 Total: 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 10/15, 10/15 Total: 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include description of Mini-Grant Fund option:

B – General Education Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Interpretation and/or Next Steps for Program Improvement

This grant supported a conversation about the writing assignments and the impetus for sharing the assignment handouts we give to explain the 20 page assignment (attached). In addition to better understanding how students are presented with the assignment, the assessment project helped each of us to think about how the autobiography functions as a response to what we have asked students to do in the prompt.

The grant also forced us to think about how our own rubrics for grading differed from the rubric we developed to assess the 4 learning outcomes. Seeing how the learning outcomes could or could not be displayed, especially SLO #2, made us consider how we might revise the final autobiography so students are required to show the ways they engage with other humanists.

Finally, the grant gave us the opportunity to make a plan for future assessments that will satisfy the general education learning outcomes but, in addition, to think about what other kinds of writing skills we want our freshman cohort to develop in their first year courses.

Student Learning Outcomes

Gen Ed SLOs Addressed in Rubric:

1) demonstrate an understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition;

2) recognize, articulate, and explore how various humanists/artists have responded to the human condition;

3) comprehend and evaluate how humanistic/artistic expression contributes to individual and/or socio-cultural understanding, growth, and well-being; and

4) use relevant critical, analytic, creative, speculative and/or reflective methods.

Results (or Timeline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Assessed</th>
<th>Percentage of Students who Met/Exceeded Threshold Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 12/15, 12/15, 12/15 Total: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 8/15, 8/15 Total: 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 14/15, 14/15 Total: 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4 – Measure one</td>
<td>15, 10/15, 10/15 Total: 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include description of Mini-Grant Fund option:

B – General Education Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Interpretation and/or Next Steps for Program Improvement

This grant supported a conversation about the writing assignments and the impetus for sharing the assignment handouts we give to explain the 20 page assignment (attached). In addition to better understanding how students are presented with the assignment, the assessment project helped each of us to think about how the autobiography functions as a response to what we have asked students to do in the prompt.

The grant also forced us to think about how our own rubrics for grading differed from the rubric we developed to assess the 4 learning outcomes. Seeing how the learning outcomes could or could not be displayed, especially SLO #2, made us consider how we might revise the final autobiography so students are required to show the ways they engage with other humanists.

Finally, the grant gave us the opportunity to make a plan for future assessments that will satisfy the general education learning outcomes but, in addition, to think about what other kinds of writing skills we want our freshman cohort to develop in their first year courses.

Student Learning Outcomes

Gen Ed SLOs Addressed in Rubric:

1) demonstrate an understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition;

2) recognize, articulate, and explore how various humanists/artists have responded to the human condition;

3) comprehend and evaluate how humanistic/artistic expression contributes to individual and/or socio-cultural understanding, growth, and well-being; and

4) use relevant critical, analytic, creative, speculative and/or reflective methods.

Include description of Mini-Grant Fund option:

B – General Education Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
Women’s & Gender Studies (WGS) WGST 2020: Introduction to WGS (Humanities)

Karen Falconer Al-Hindi, WGS/Geography/Geology; Maria Arbelaez, WGS/History;
Peggy Jones, WGS/Black Studies; Bridget Sandhoff, WGS/Art History

College of Arts and Sciences, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Student Learning Outcomes & Description of the Assessment

GEN ED SLO #1: Demonstrate an understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition.

WGST SLO #1: Students learn to analyze texts and other artistic media through a gendered lens, and become familiar with major themes and developments in gender theory. The course immerses students in feminist, queer, and gendered analysis used to understand and respond to the human condition. The instructor demonstrates and students practice throughout the course as they read and discuss assigned books, view and interpret film representations, and engage with popular media.

GEN ED SLO #2: Recognize, articulate, and explore how various humanities/artists have responded to the human condition.

WGST SLO #2: Students examine works drawn from 1890 to the present, in a wide range of humanities fields. Woven through the study of this material is an appreciation for the limits imposed and opportunities provided by dynamic constructions of gender. For instance, while students read about and discuss the 1940s, they might view and analyze women’s and gender issues in contemporary film representations of the period ("Rose the Riveter" and the women’s baseball league), as well as women’s poetry and literature.

GEN ED SLO #3: Comprehend and evaluate how humanistic/artistic expression contributes to individual and socio-cultural understanding, growth, and well-being.

WGST SLO #3: Students analyze commonalities and learn to distinguish diverse standpoints in a variety of humanistic works. They learn about the material and experiential basis of diversity among people’s experiences, and reflect on their own experiences in light of the texts and creative works studied in the course.

GEN ED SLO #4: Use relevant critical, analytic, creative, speculative and/or reflective methods.

WGST SLO #4: Students appreciate the literary, historical, linguistic, and philosophical bases through which gender inequality is created, maintained, and contested. They can identify women’s contributions and connect current media representations to these important precedents. They replace basic thinking about gender with more complex, nuanced interpretations.
Option D: General Education Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment
Description of the Assessment

The English Humanities General Ed Assessment Committee met on May 4, 2017 to decide on a rubric to use for assessment of the courses taught which count for university general education credit. The rubric identifies two categories: Unsatisfactory and Competent. It was also decided that the artifacts assessed would be final essays or projects, as it was deemed that these artifacts would best demonstrate whether or not all SLOs are being addressed and met because they generally best demonstrate the cumulative acquisition of the courses’ objectives. Before the formal assessment, the chair provided the committee with three examples of artifacts assessed with the rubric to help them prepare for the norming meeting, scheduled for September 1, 2017. At that meeting we normed five papers selected at random, looking to achieve agreement on each artifact’s standing for all four SLOs.

The Committee then met on October 13 to formally assess a random selection of artifacts from the above 16 English Gen Ed classes. There were 3 artifacts from each class (a total number of 48 artifacts), and each artifact received at least two readings or views from two different members. A third reading was required if an artifact had two initial assessments which differed in their assessment of one of the four SLOs.

Student Learning Outcomes

- Demonstrate an understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition.
- Recognize, articulate, and explore how various humanists/artists have responded to the human condition.
- Comprehend and evaluate how humanistic/artistic expression contributes to individual and/or socio-cultural understanding, growth, and well-being.
- Use relevant critical, analytical, creative, speculative and/or reflective methods.

Rubric (Instrument)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Reflective methods.</th>
<th>Articulation, gender identity, disability, aging, gender, information/communication, race/ethnicity, and cultural/affiliation themes in programs, websites, or employment.</th>
<th>Cultural understanding, gender identity, disability, aging, gender, information/communication, race/ethnicity, and cultural/affiliation themes in programs, websites, or employment.</th>
<th>Reflective methods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) A reminder that all faculty who teach a course that counts for Gen Ed credit must include the Gen Ed SLOs on their syllabus every semester. The Gen Ed Assessment Committee chair reminded all that an artifact is sent out to each and every instructor of a Gen Ed course containing the SLOs before the beginning of the semester and it's a simple matter of copying and pasting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Although each assignment in a given course is not required to fulfill all four SLOs, we need to be certain that all four SLOs are addressed at some point in each course. In other words, this can happen in a single assignment or over a series of assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Each and every assignment in all our Gen Ed classes needs to have well articulated assignment instructions. Examples of particularly good ones will be made available electronically to the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000-C 1 Academic humanities Courses</th>
<th>2000-C 1 Academic humanities Courses</th>
<th>2000-C 1 Academic humanities Courses</th>
<th>2000-C 1 Academic humanities Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of products assessed</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of products that met or exceeded SLO</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of products evaluated that met or exceeded SLO</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total points awarded</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of products that met or exceeded SLO</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of products evaluated that met or exceeded SLO</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation and/or Next Steps for Program Improvement

Committee members realized that having the assignment description was vital to understanding which SLO the assignment was designed to meet. The large number of humanities general education courses housed in the Department of English combined with the limited number of people able to serve on the committee meant that we had a relatively low number of artifacts we were able to assess in comparison with the number of artifacts collected (over 400 total artifacts). Committee members decided that the artifacts assessed would be final essays or projects. Subsequently, we determined that we should score all four SLOs at once.

Committee members found it difficult to assess SLO #1 for multimodal projects General Education Humanities SLOs and the subsequent rubric are very easy to use when looking at conventional, textual analyses or literary criticism essays or projects. It was most of a challenge to assess “humanistic/artistic” projects, particularly when it came to finding evidence of competency in SLO 1 ("Demonstrate an understanding which theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition."). Going forward, the committee suggests that faculty who assign creative works as a final artifact also incorporate a component (as part of the formal assignment or at some other point in the semester) that asks students to analyze and explain the creative, technical, and/or methodological choices made to produce the creative artifact.

Overall, the committee and the department were pleased to discover that the humanities general education courses offered in the Department of English fulfill all four humanities/fine arts SLOs as determined by the Office of General Education. It was discovered that the challenge of the assignments assessed, as well as the quality of the artifacts produced, was maintained across the courses regardless of the delivery method. That demonstrates that the Department of English has been able to maintain a high level of academic rigor even as many of our faculty members have created online versions of the traditionally “brick and mortar” course offerings.

Actions to be taken as the result of the General Education Humanities Assessment

1. A reminder that all faculty who teach a course that counts for Gen Ed credit must include the Gen Ed SLOs on their syllabus every semester. The Gen Ed Assessment Committee chair reminded all that an artifact is sent out to each and every instructor of a Gen Ed course containing the SLOs before the beginning of the semester and it's a simple matter of copying and pasting.

Reference