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Option A – Course Assessments
Name of the Course: CSCI 8910 Master of Science Capstone  
Program: Master of Science in Computer Science (MS-CS)

Author: Qiuming Zhu  
Department of Computer Science, College of Information Science and Technology, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

OBJECTIVES
The objectives of CSCI 8910 are to integrate coursework and experimental learning to enable the student to gain and demonstrate a broad mastery of knowledge, skill, and technique across the MS-CS curriculum.

Established Proficiency Target
Student learning in the CSCI 8910 course is essentially driven by problem analysis, information sharing, creative thinking and exploration, as it uses a seminar-based approach and relies heavily on interactions between the students and the instructor as well as among students themselves. Integrative learning is at the center of this course. A student must be able to write well, speak intelligently, communicate visually, develop a sense of aesthetics, and demonstrate creative expressions individually and in team. Skills for computational artifact development should go beyond nuts and bolts of a problem solution, and reach at a system’s level. The course is the singular opportunity to determine if the student has assimilated the various goals and expectations of his/her Master’s degree program in CS. It is also the key indicator for the curricular embodiment and convergence of the SLO assessment for the MS-CS program.

Results of One Administration of the Assessment
The following table refers to the total number of students who participated in the assessment (i.e., examination, product, performance) for each SLO measured by this program in fall 2016. If multiple SLOs are being measured by a single assessment tool, responses were reported together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # Students</th>
<th># Who Met or Exceeded Proficiency Score</th>
<th># Who Met or Exceeded Proficiency Score</th>
<th>Does % Met or Exceeded Meet Your Program’s Proficiency Target?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80% Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80% Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70% Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70% Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70% Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps
- The results of administered assessment will be reviewed and evaluated by the MSCS Graduate Program Committee in fall 2017 semesters.
- The rubrics will be revised after collecting feedbacks from the GPC and the students taking the course in fall 2017.

The Mini-grant support for this assessment project is acknowledged.
Multicultural Dispositional Self-Assessment: A Viable Tool for Teacher Training

Dr. Franklin T. Thompson
College of Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

ABSTRACT

The movement toward greater professionalization of teaching through assessment based accreditation was spearheaded by the National Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as a way to not only assess knowledge and skills but also to determine whether a person was the right match for the classroom. It is important to include the need for diversity and social justice when considering dispositions training (Mills, et al., 2017; Schneider and Kauer, 2015). Multicultural dispositions are less defined compared to the larger dispositions regarding the practice of disagreeing without being disagreeable (NCATE, 2008). In addition to NCATE, dispositions are supported by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, an agency that collaborates with state teacher licensing departments (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011). Critics contend that dispositions (a) are currently defined in non-scientific ways that allow for too much subjective interpretation (Borkos, Liston and Whitcomb, 2007; Damok, 2007; Dupins and Crac, 2010; Murray, 2010), (b) are closely tied to variables (e.g., academic exposure, moral development) that are too hard to control for (McKnight, 2004), and (c) cannot be dis-embedded from a larger set of environmental factors (e.g., parent involvement, peer pressure) that account for the total learning experience (Allal, 2007). Even when experts are conflated to reach consensus, this is followed by the fact that students benefit greatly from instruction that encourages an educator code of ethics that can be properly assessed (Bhanit, Chubbuck and Whipp, 2007; Dize, 2007). Despite the lack of mercurially sound assessment methods and tools, we must find creative ways to provide on-going constructive feedback for teacher candidates not only for skills and knowledge, but also dispositions development (Borkos, Liston and Whitcomb, 2007; Dupins and Crac, 2010; D’Cuciso, Bauter, and Wayda, 2017).

Method

Dispositional assessment accounts for 15% of a student’s grade in TED 220. This study investigates the student self-reflected portion of this assessment. The design of the study included a pre and post surveys of the race and human relations perceptions of education majors. Students utilized a 5-point (1) I totally agree, (2) I partly agree, (3) I’m neutral, (4) I partly disagree, and (5) I totally disagree) to answer 24 selected multicultural disposition statements found on the Multicultural Dispositions Index (MDI), and 127 disposition statements taken from the Multicultural Dispositional Self-Assessment (MDSA). Both instruments were upgraded and improved upon by way of a pilot program and new student and peer input.

The following was included to (a) help account for potential social desirability bias (e.g., a tendency to respond in ways to gain the approval of others) and (b) maximize validity and subject anonymity: 1. Anonymous responses – students used a 4-digit number as an identifier; 2. Survey responses were received via a secure on line submission process; 3. The grade given for the exercise was done on a pass/fail basis (with 1 being very strongly disagree, and 5 being very strongly agree) to answer 24 of these items that showed a moderate effect size. The correlate that showed the most change with a large effect size was: (7) I am a leader among my peers.

Analysis

Student Testimonial

“I admit to a slightly defensive attitude after the first few classes. The things you were talking about were very different from what I have previously been exposed to. However, as the semester went on, I began to see a different perspective on the topic of race and discrimination, white privilege, minority groups, and multicultural dispositions that I had never seen before. I felt that my eyes were being opened to an entirely different reality that was there all along despite my blindness to it.”

Conclusions and Future Directions

The results of this study demonstrate that (1) Students are not intimately well-constructed multicultural dispositions. (2) Critical instructional efforts over the span of a semester can help students reach higher levels of multicultural awareness, (3) Race and human relations are impacted by both traditional and not-so-obvious institutional inputs, (4) Dispositions can be used to assess changes in student perceptions across a program of study, which allows them a better opportunity to determine whether or not education is an appropriate professional match, and (5) When students are given the opportunity to participate in the assessment of their own learning, the buy-in they have about multicultural education is greatly enhanced.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Pretest Mean Score</th>
<th>Posttest Mean Score</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifying Missing Links in Race and Human Relations. Multicultural dispositional pretest-to-posttest growth was greatest in certain “missing link” areas: (1) Opposite and competing truths sometimes coexist; (2) Power & privilege is often left out of our conversations; (3) I can work with the opposite gender; (4) I possess sound reasoning abilities; (5) It is important not to be a Pollyanna thinker; (6) I actively work on my weaknesses.

Multiple Benefits: The adoption of a dispositional approach to teacher training encourages education majors to critically reflect and move beyond feel good multicultural education. Dispositional benefits go far beyond simply making minority students feel more included. Majority group students, too, reported that multicultural dispositions helped to broaden their horizons. Whether or not such optimistic findings would be found for non-education majors is a separate study that must be undertaken.
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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this course is to introduce students to the fields of speech-language pathology, audiology, and education of the deaf/hard of hearing. The course provides an overview of normal development of speech, language, hearing, and the disorders of human communication in children and adults. Students develop a basic understanding of the anatomical, physiological, neurological, cultural and social bases of communication and communication disorders. Emphasis is placed on the interaction of these factors in children and adults who live with developmental or acquired communication disorders.
Because human communication is applicable across all settings and the life-span, this course develops students’ ability to recognize, understand, and respond to human communication disorders and differences in a socially and culturally sensitive manner, irrespective of the setting in which it is encountered. The General Education SLOs required development of a new tool to evaluate performance on a targeted capstone assignment for the class, which is intended to reflect students’ integration of course content and targeted knowledge and skills in Social Sciences and Diversity in the U.S. population. The grant supported development of a scoring rubric designed to reflect students’ performance on the objectives.

OUTCOME MEASURES
Using a Capstone Activity as Outcome Measure
Through the capstone activity students engaged with small groups throughout the semester, developing a public service announcement that could alert a target audience to the importance of prevention, identification, and treatment of communication disorders, and appropriate responses to individuals who exhibit communication differences or disorders. One aspect of students’ performance was assessed on how the PSA addresses the Social SLOs and Diversity SLOs as stated in the syllabus. The rubric was designed not as a grading rubric but as a program assessment rubric. The PSA assignment provided the source for analysis.

RESULTS

Conclusion and Future Directions
Development of the rubric, grading adaptations as needed, and using this as an ongoing reflection of performance data will allow for summative data to be generated. Further, this will facilitate inclusion of the assignment/project and application of the rubric in the dual-degree course, when it is introduced in the Internship Education sequence.
SPED 1500: INTRODUCTION TO SPECIAL EDUCATION
Analyzing literature for portrayals of individuals with disabilities

Philip Nordness, Ph.D., and Miriam Kuhn, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders, College of Education

Assessment Description
The Introduction to Special Education course is designed to help students explore issues and perspectives related to children, adolescents, and young adults with a variety of ability and disability experiences. Within the general education framework, this course addresses student outcomes related to the social sciences and diversity in the U.S.

One of the major assessments in the course is a book review assignment, in which the students have to read a children’s book, popular book or classic piece of literature that involves a character with a disability, is about a person with a disability, or was written by an individual with a disability. The purpose of this assignment is to help students understand the nature of a disabling condition as expressed through literature.

Student Learning Outcomes
Targets for assessment included course level SLOs in the areas of Social Sciences and Diversity in the U.S. Students will:

- Use critical thinking and reasoning skills to analyze theories, perspectives and/or concepts relevant to disabling conditions.
- Recognize and articulate differences, expectations, and/or challenges experienced by one or more underrepresented groups.
- Explain ways in which identity is developed and how it is transmitted within and by members of the group or groups.

Proficiency Target
The goal is for 90% of our students to be proficient across each of the five categories assessed using the rubric.

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrayal of individuals with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with social/physical environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation of plot themes learn in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #3, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results (n= 77)

- Use critical thinking and reasoning skills to analyze theories, perspectives and/or concepts relevant to disabling conditions.
- Recognize and articulate differences, expectations, and/or challenges experienced by one or more underrepresented groups.
- Explain ways in which identity is developed and how it is transmitted within and by members of the group or groups.

Interpretation
The grant supported the development of a rubric for assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs) in the areas of Social Sciences and Diversity in the U.S. on a literature review assignment. The rubric was used to assess the performance of 70 students in two sections of the course in the Spring 2017 semester.

The target rate of 90% or more of the students falling within the proficient range was met for three of the five categories on the rubric, while students fell below the target rate in two of the five categories on the rubric.

While initial results of the assessment are encouraging, these findings point to areas that may be strengthened in our approach to teaching this course:

1. Refine and clarify the expectations for choosing a piece of literature and completing the assignment. Discuss each category of the rubric in class, providing examples as needed for clarification.
2. Make the connections among theory, course content, and real-life applications more concrete for students through the provision of examples from popular culture (e.g., movies, commercials, news, social media) and think-alouds.
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Option B –
General Education
Course Assessments
General Education Course-Level Assessment:
Biol 1020 Principles of Biology
Claudia Rauter, Donald Rowen, Mark Schoenbeck, and Jeremy White,
Department of Biology, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

The primary goal of developing the assessment was to determine:
1) How well do students in the biology course, Principles of Biology (BIOL 1020), achieve the student learning outcomes (SLOs) of a GenEd-approved course in the General Education Distribution Area Natural & Physical Sciences (Table 1)?
2) How effective are the changes we are making to the course to teaching the course?
3) How do these changes in the course affect students’ learning of the 4 SLOs?

SLOs 1 and 2
Assessed with 20 key questions from the four lecture exams (i.e., 5 questions per exam) and determined for each question how many students were able to answer it correctly.

Example Key Question:

New traits can evolve, because:

a) Traits change for the good of the species.
b) Natural selection can predict future environmental conditions.
c) Mutation and sexual reproduction produce new alleles or genotypes.
d) New traits do not evolve, they are always present; just hidden.

SLOs 3 and 4
Selected two laboratory exercises:

• one lab exercise from the field of molecular biology to address the student learning outcomes (SLOs) of a GenEd-approved course in the General Education Distribution Area Natural & Physical Sciences Approved Courses with detailed description of how BIOL 1020 Principles of Biology meets these SLOs.

Topic of Lab 9: Paternity analysis

• one exercise from the field of organismal biology to address the student learning outcomes (SLOs) of a GenEd-approved course in the General Education Distribution Area Natural & Physical Sciences Approved Courses with detailed description of how BIOL 1020 Principles of Biology meets these SLOs.

Topic of Lab 10: “Human evolution based on replicates of fossil skulls” and “Change of allele frequency in response to predation using a computer simulation”.

Rubric (Instrument)

SLOs 1 and 2: Multiple choice question: correct or false
SLOs 3 and 4: Set the proficiency level at 70% of the maximum score.

Proficiency Target

SLOs 1 and 2: 70% of the students answer each of the 20 questions correctly.
SLOs 3 and 4: 70% of the maximum score for each lab exercise.

Results

SLOs 1 and 2
Overall, the students answered the key questions correctly. However, the percentage of students answering the key questions correctly was much higher than the percentage of students receiving a passing grade in the corresponding exams.

Table 1: Results for combined SLOs 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exam 1</th>
<th>Exam 2</th>
<th>Exam 3</th>
<th>Exam 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 70% at exam</td>
<td>(N=90)</td>
<td>(N=90)</td>
<td>(N=90)</td>
<td>(N=90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLOs 3 and 4
A very high percentage of students scored in both labs 70% or higher.

Table 2: Results for combined SLOs 3 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lab 9</th>
<th>Lab 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of students (N=133)</td>
<td>Percent of students (N=122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 90%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 85%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 70%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation and Next Steps for Program Improvement

SLOs 1 and 2
To determine the reason for the discrepancy between the high percentage of correctly answered key questions and the low percentage of students receiving a passing grade in the corresponding exams, we are currently examining which exam questions students answered correctly and which ones incorrectly.

SLOs 3 and 4
The very high percentage of students scoring in both labs 70% or higher could be explained by the fact that the students were allowed to work in groups, although they had to answer the questions using their own words. Further, the students were allowed to ask for help from the laboratory instructor.

Adjustments of Assessment Tool

Based on our experience of the first administration of our assessment tool, we decided to make the following adjustments:

• We will include questions in the final exam that are similar to the questions in the lab exercises. This will allow us to assess each student’s understanding of the SLOs 3 and 4.
• Instead of using 5 key questions on each of the four lecture exams, we will include the 20 key questions in the final exam which will cover the most important concepts of biology and simultaneously address the GenEd SLOs. This change will allow us to assess retention and understanding of the material, while making the administration of the assessment logistically easier.

Program Improvement

We used the development of an assessment tool for the GenEd SLOs for BIOL 1020 Principles of Biology to review our course specific student learning outcomes. Consequently:

• Change of the course content regarding organismal biology (i.e., evolution, biodiversity, and ecology) is currently being implemented. We are changing the course content from a traditionally shortened version of a corresponding Biology course for majors (e.g. BIOL 1750 Biology II) to a shortened version of an Environmental Science course (e.g. BIOL 1330) with focus on major organismal biological concepts and why these concepts are relevant to humans. Using an environmental science approach will allow us to embed biological concepts in a context that is more accessible to students as well as match course content better with the GenEd SLOs.
• Consideration of structural change by splitting the course into two courses: a course consisting of lecture with a discussion section and a laboratory course with its own course number. Currently, lecture and laboratory are part of the same course. The addition of a discussion section would add more active learning opportunities to the course thus supporting students’ learning of key concepts and practice of critical thinking. In the laboratory, this structural change would allow us to conduct short experiments and therefore give students, especially non-science majors, the opportunity to gain research experience.

While developing our assessment tool, we explored the literature on how to write assessments questions in general and in particular multiple-choice assessment questions. We were thus currently reviewing and are revising our exam questions for the course.
Instructor Driven Assessment with Flow Disaggregation, Guessing Adjustments, and Nationally-Normed Results

Department of Economics / Assessment of ECON 2200 & 2220 General Education Social Science SLOs

Goals:
1. Questions must be application based
2. Instructors must be provided valuable and customized feedback; the report should reflect the true amount of learning that occurred in each topic area.
3. Assessment must not incentivize instructors to ‘game’ the system (e.g. giving questions to students, using easy questions).

Solution:
1. Select 15 questions from the nationally-normed Test of Understanding in College Economics (TUCE) and map them to the UNO Gen Ed Social Science SLOs.
2. Administer a pre-test in all sections of micro- and macroeconomics (14 sections in total each semester).
3. Disaggregate (Walstad and Wagner, 2016) and adjust the results for guessing (Smith and Wagner, 2017); provide a report to each instructor.
4. Sum across all instructors to provide the administrative result.
5. Automate the process with software (Smith, 2017).

Walstad and Wagner (2016)

Walstad and Wagner (2016) suggest comparing each student’s response on the pre- and post-test on each item (question). From this, four learning types are created.

Smith and Wagner (2017)

Smith and Wagner (2017) shows that the amount of guessing varies by exam thus the original Walstad and Wagner disaggregation can be misleading.

Because there is more pre-test guessing than post-test guessing, subtracting the pre-test from the post-test does not find the change in learning.

However, the learning types can be adjusted to account for guessing:

\[ \hat{\mu} = \frac{\hat{nl} + \hat{rl} - 1}{n - 1} + \frac{n\hat{nl} + n\hat{rl}}{n(n - 1)^2} \]

\[ \hat{\gamma} = \frac{\hat{nl} - \hat{rl} - 1}{n - 1} \]

\[ \hat{\alpha} = \frac{n\hat{nl} + \hat{pl} + \hat{zl} - 1}{n(n - 1)^2} \]

Where \( \mu \) is stock knowledge, \( \gamma \) is true positive learning (accounting for guessing), \( \alpha \) is true negative learning (accounting for guessing), \( 1/n \) is the probability of guessing correct, and \( rl, nl, pl \) are as previously defined.

Instructor Level Report

Each instructor receives a report showing the amount of true positive (\( \gamma \)) and negative learning (\( \alpha \)) that occurred in their section of the class. The national averages at the item (question) level are provided for comparison purposes.

Administrative Results

The instructor results are aggregated to the course level using a weighted-average based on student observations. These values are then shared with the department and the assessment committee.

Resources


Questions? Contact Ben Smith at bsmith@unomaha.edu
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Wrong

Post-test

Right

Wrong

\( \hat{nl} \)

\( \hat{nl} \)

\( \hat{rl} \)

\( \hat{zl} \)

Where \( rl \) is unadjusted (raw) retained learning, \( nl \) is unadjusted negative learning, \( pl \) is unadjusted positive learning, and, \( zl \) is unadjusted zero learning.

Aggregated across all students at the question level, each learning type represents the percent of the class exhibiting the specified learning type (summing to one).

TUCE and map them to the UNO Gen Ed Social Science SLOs

Learning Outcome Requirements

Instrument (TUCE)

Results for Instructor i

Sum over i Instructors

Administrative Results


Questions? Contact Ben Smith at bsmith@unomaha.edu

Where \( \gamma \), \( \alpha \), and \( f \) are the ECON 2200 averages aggregated to the SLO. \( \gamma_i \), \( \alpha_i \), and \( f_i \) are the national averages.
The English Social Sciences Assessment Committee met on December 8, 2016 to create a rubric to use for assessment of ENGL 2280 Introduction to Language and ENGL 3610 Introduction to Linguistics in spring 2015. The rubric identified four categories of competency: Unsatisfactory, Low Developing, High Developing, and Competent.

Student Learning Outcomes

- 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 relevant to the discipline(s) studied.
- Identify multiple methods and modes of inquiry and their appropriate application.
- Communicate ideas and explain concepts and analyses using the language of the discipline.

Before the formal assessment, the committee met on March 1 to norm two papers, achieving consensus. Generally, members scored papers within 1 point. We felt satisfied with the norming results.

The Committee then met on March 10, 2017 to assess final papers. There were 6 papers from ENGL 2280 and 23 from ENGL 3610. Each paper received at least two readings from two different members. A third reading was required of one SLO of one paper from ENGL 2280 because the two initial scores were more than 1 point apart. A larger number of ENGL 3610 papers (12) required a third reader because there was more than a 1 point difference in scores.

The Committee members realized that having the assignment description was vital to understanding which SLO the assignment was designed to meet. Because we were forced to collect papers at the last minute, we had a relatively low collection of artifacts. Additionally, all the artifacts collected were final papers; subsequently, we determined that we should score better all four SLOs at once, which seemed clearer to the conclusions drawn. We will be prepared for future assessments not only by virtue of advanced notice but also by collection from multiple sections of the same course.

Committee members discussed the value of having an expert in the field represented by the papers assessed present during the assessment. Only one member of the assessment team was an expert in the field being assessed (e.g., Linguistics). The rest of the members did not feel confident about some of their readings because of a lack of expertise. Particularly, social scientists often use multiple modes of inquiry (e.g., outside sources, surveys, etc.). Given that Linguistics has a foot in two worlds (English and Social Sciences), it requires an expert to help members understand what they are reading for and whether it is competent.

Using a 4-point rubric proved counter productive to the assessment process because of the lack of experts reading papers. Because they lacked expertise in the subject area, members tended to shift toward the middle when scoring artifacts. This drifting may also have come from the fact that members did not (or did not know to) determine what constitutes competency in terms of an SLO. While we did norm ourselves, members continually expressed uncertainty due to a lack of expertise. In the future, we might be able to invite colleagues from Sociology as readers, compensating them for their efforts.

Disagreement among members occurred mainly when assessing the third SLO because as mostly humanities specialists, members were unfamiliar with the use of multiple modes of inquiry and methods in social science research. Inviting some colleagues from Sociology might be one way to address this issue.

Department of English

Table of Student Products Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Total # of Products Assessed</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Proficiency Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessing Humanities and Fine Arts SLOs & Innovative Pedagogies

Martina Saltamacchia,
History Department, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

Goal of the project is the assessment of the achievement of Humanities & Fine Arts Student Learning Outcomes in the General Education course HIST 1000: World Civilizations taught by Prof. Saltamacchia in Fall 2017 employing three different pedagogical styles:

a) HIST 1000 - section 005: World Civilization I (ca. 57 students) - traditional lecture with two tests and final exam;
b) HIST 1000 - section 007: World Civilization I (ca. 57 students) - traditional lecture with two tests and final exam plus 2 sessions of short Reacting to the Past (RTTP) role-playing simulations;
c) HIST 1000 - section 009 - TLC: World Civilization I (ca. 25 students) – course consisting of three Reacting to the Past (RTTP) role-playing simulations, each 1-month long.

The assessment aims to evaluate whether the partial (section 007) or extensive (section 009) use of non-traditional, innovative pedagogies allows students to achieve General Education Course SLOs. Comparison with a class where only traditional pedagogies are employed (section 005) should also highlight possible correlations between the different pedagogies utilized and the degree of achievement of the SLOs.

Student Learning Outcomes

General Education – Humanities & Fine Arts

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

Timeline

February 2017
Creation of rubric for program assessment
August-December 2017
Administration of assessment & collection of results in three classes HIST 1000
September 2017
Poster presentation on the project
December 2017
Analysis and evaluation of results
January 2018
Formulation of next steps

Humanities & Fine Arts SLOs Rubric

Criteria
Competent
High Developing
Low Developing
Unsatisfactory
Description
Demonstration of understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition.
Demonstration of high understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition.
Demonstration of comprehensive understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition.
Demonstration of low understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition.

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

Proficiency Target

The observation conducted is twofold: on the one hand, it aims at assessing whether 80% of the students of each class achieve the SLOs (corresponding to the level "competent" in the rubric above); on the other, results obtained in the three classes are compared, with the aim of drawing preliminary conclusions regarding their effectiveness in helping the students achieving the SLOs.

References

Measuring Student Learning Outcomes in an Introductory Psychology Class

Stephanie Jesseau, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Introduction

In order to earn a degree, all University of Nebraska-Omaha (UNO) students must take at least nine credit hours from two disciplines in the social sciences. Psychology 1010 is the only psychology course that fulfills this general education social science distribution requirement. In addition, Intro Psych is a prerequisite to all other higher-level courses in psychology at UNO. There are four student learning outcomes (SLOs) that all courses at UNO that fulfill a social science distribution requirement should achieve (see below). In Spring 2017, I implemented several assessments intended to measure these SLOs in Intro Psych. These included pre-post-tests, and online essay assignments. Results of these assessments and future directions are discussed below.

Background

Introductory Psychology is a both a blended and a flipped class, with students listening to online lectures and completing online homework before coming to class. During class time, students work in groups to solve problems related to the week’s content, and also participate in group discussions and answer questions using a classroom response system (e.g. “clickers”). I will use the results of my assessments to determine which SLOs students have more or less difficulty with, and I will adjust in-class time to focus on SLOs (and topics within the SLOs) that students found to be the most challenging.

Student Learning Outcomes for the Social Science Distribution Requirement

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

Assessment Tools

Pre-Post-Tests

On the first day of Intro in Spring 2016, students were given a 40-item multiple choice pre-test in order to assess prior knowledge. Those same questions (the post-test) appeared throughout the course on unit exams. Four unit exams were administered during the semester, and results were compared with pre-tests. This allowed me to measure both growth as well as proficiency.

Online Essay Questions

Over the course of the semester, 14 online essay assignments were administered to students. Questions were graded by 3 graduate student teaching assistants using rubrics I created, and I used those grades to determine whether students were achieving student learning outcomes.

Proficiency Targets

Proficiency targets were set at 70%. I examined student performance compared to the proficiency target across individual questions as well as aggregate scores for each SLO. SLOs were further broken down by question type (essay vs. multiple choice questions).

Results

On average, the class performed above my 70% target for each SLO, with percentages of 78%, 76%, 76%, and 73%, respectively (see Figure 1). This demonstrates that overall, Intro-Psych students are exceeding my performance standards. However, when looking at the data broken down by metric (i.e., multiple choice vs. essay questions), there are a few areas that warrant attention. For example, the multiple choice post-test average for SLO 4 across 25 questions was below the 70% threshold (68.2%, see Figure 2). In addition, while students did well across all 14 essay assignments (overall average of 81.6%), the average for SLO 3 was only 68% (see Figure 3).

I also examined individual essay and multiple choice questions to see if there were increases in scores from the pre- to post-test. In 4 of 40 multiple choice questions, there was no statistically significant increase from pre- to post-test (multiple choice only). If topics that students performed poorly on are deemed essential, they will be specifically targeted in class. While I will focus on any item that had an average score below my proficiency target, I plan to pay particular attention to topics relating to SLO 4, since that is the SLO that students struggled with most in terms of the multiple choice questions, and SLO 4 also had the lowest average score overall (see Figure 1). By focusing my efforts on areas students had the most difficulty, I can better ensure that all students are meeting, and hopefully exceeding the SLOs that are essential to general education at UNO.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Overall, Introductory Psychology students exceeded the proficiency targets I set for each SLO. I am planning a major revision of the class over the next year, and I will use the individual item performance data to inform my decisions about what to focus on during in-person class time, as well as reconsider how important certain topics are to the class as a whole. Specifically, I will re-examine questions where students did not average at least 70% (both multiple choice and essay), and questions where students did not demonstrate a statistically significant increase from pre- to post-test (multiple choice only). If topics that students performed poorly on are deemed essential, they will be specifically targeted in class. While I will focus on any item that had an average score below my proficiency target, I plan to pay particular attention to topics relating to SLO 4, since that is the SLO that students struggled with most in terms of the multiple choice questions, and SLO 4 also had the lowest average score overall (see Figure 1). By focusing my efforts on areas students had the most difficulty, I can better ensure that all students are meeting, and hopefully exceeding the SLOs that are essential to general education at UNO.
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Option C – Program Assessments
Grant Benefits and Next Steps

Program-level assessment grant benefits to the UNO MAcc program:

a) The professional development and interaction with other grant recipients helped us revise our rubrics with a focus on assessment rather than grading. The rubrics are now written for assessment but can be modified to use for course grading.

b) The grant process helped us reevaluate our program SLOs. We needed to do this because of recent program changes. However, we were able to think carefully about program versus course-level learning outcomes and changed one of our SLOs specifically to make it more program-focused.

c) Designing rubrics for learning goals that are to be used across graduate accounting core courses will increase assessment efficiency, effectiveness, and consistency of assessment analyses. Sharing these rubrics with the students will also help us better communicate our expectations with the students and should improve learning.

d) The rubrics will help us think more strategically about the learning activities and experiences in our graduate accounting courses so that we consider how we can emphasize and help students develop critical skills and knowledge throughout the program.

e) The grant experience exposed us to valuable assessment resources and allowed us to connect with and benefit from interactions with others doing program assessment at UNO.

Next steps:
The Accounting Graduate Program Committee (AGPC) serves as the MAcc program assessment committee. The March 2017 revisions in the program learning goals and rubrics are based on the results of the grant work presented herein.

- Continue to annually monitor assessment results (rolling 5-year window) and address any program and/or rubric changes needed, particularly as the newly revised rubrics are applied during the next several years.
- Modify the assessment plan to include
  - Assess Goals 1 and 3 each term using Macc comprehensive exams and assessment embedded in one required course, respectively
  - Assess Goals 2, 4-1, and 4-2 in multiple graduate accounting core courses to emphasize skills development
  - Respond, as needed, to revisions to the AACSB Accounting Accreditation standards.
- Share grant and related assessment research results to strengthen UNO’s culture of assessment
Aviation Institute Program Assessment Development for the Bachelor of Science in Aviation – Air Transport Administration Concentration

Dr. Scott Tarry, Dr. Rebecca Lutte, and Mr. Scott Vlasek
Aviation Institute, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Abstract
The Aviation Institute has been working on a revised assessment plan for the Air Transport Administration concentration of the Bachelor of Science in Aviation degree program. We have identified seven student learning objectives (SLOs) for the program and have begun to assess three of them: Critical Thinking, Written Communication, and Empirical Analysis.

We proposed using this grant to continue work on the assessment tools and rubrics for the other SLO: Oral Communication, Engagement with Industry, Knowledge of Salient Trends, and Working in Teams. This work is part of the assessment plan we have developed for the re-accreditation of our program by the Aviation Accreditation Board International (AABI) and for UNO’s Academic Program Review process.

AVN 3700 – Transportation Analysis and AVN 4990 – Capstone in Air Transportation
Oral Communication - students give presentations of their research designs in 3700 and their capstone projects in 4990. We need to develop a process for capturing the presentations digitally and assessing them with an appropriate rubric. This assessment tool falls into the performance domain.

AVN 4200 – Internship in Aviation
Engagement with Industry - students produce a report related to their internship experience. We need to develop a process for assessing the report and analyzing student progress. This assessment tool falls into the product domain.

AVN 4990 – Capstone in Air Transportation
Knowledge of Salient Trends – students will complete a comprehensive exam. We need to develop a comprehensive exam to assess student knowledge of technological, economic, regulatory, and social trends that have shaped the air transportation industry in the past and will influence its future. This assessment tool will fall into the examination domain.

AVN 3090 – Airport Development and Administration
Working in Teams – students will work in teams to develop an airport development plan. We need to revise aspects of the assignment and identify appropriate rubrics for assessing student team effectiveness and efficiency. This assessment tool will fall into the product domain.

Oral Communication
- We adapted the AAC&U oral communication rubric to create a tool that can be used to assess oral communication in AVN 3700 Transportation Analysis and AVN 4990 Air Transportation, which serves as our capstone seminar.
- Students in AVN 3700 give short presentations as they develop elements of their research designs.
- The rubric can be used to guide the students during the semester and to assess their progress at the end of the semester when they present their research designs.

Working in Teams
- We adapted the AAC&U teamwork rubric and created a student survey tool to collect data from the students.
- Our plan is to have each student complete the survey as part of a self-reflection and then complete the survey for each teammate.
- We began with AVN 3090 Airport Planning and Administration in mind for this assessment since the course is based almost entirely on a semester-long team planning project.
- Our hope was to implement the assessment in Spring 2017, but the development of the rubric and working with a new adjunct instructor delayed our effort.
- We believe the rubric and survey can be used more broadly as tools for helping students improve their collaboration skills and for measuring progress in this area across our program.

Knowledge of Salient Trends
- The test was administered to students in AVN 4990, at the end of the Spring 2017 semester.
- Rather than focusing on the results of the exam to assess student learning in this area, we decided (after consulting with Connie Schaffer) to use what we learned from the pilot to develop a rubric to guide future students as they prepare for and take the field exam.
- The rubric will be used to assess student learning when the exam is administered in Spring 2018.
- The process of vetting the rubric has been valuable since it has forced us to collectively determine what we really mean by salient trends and core concepts.

Engagement with Industry
- Our effort began as an assessment of five years’ worth of reports submitted by students who have completed AVN 4200.
- We discovered that the reports were actually of little use for assessing the proposed SLO since the student work and the SLO were not well aligned.
- While the result of this effort is not an assessment of student learning, we believe we have identified some deficiencies in our approach to the internship course (AVN 4200) and our other professional development efforts.
- We plan to make some initial changes to our curriculum and develop an appropriate assessment tool, which will be implemented in the coming academic year.
### Description of the Assessment

We propose to assess the student learning outcomes of the BS in Computer Science degree using the CS Capstone Project course CSC4970. The primary purpose of the course is to engage students in applying CS knowledge to solve real-world problems by delivering team-based implementations of software systems. Capstone clients are from the IT industry, as well as nonprofits and academia. Examples of CS capstone projects are shown here.

### Rubric

The SLOs are evaluated in the CS Capstone class using the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>All project requirements are implemented and there are no invalid test cases for each project requirement.</th>
<th>All project requirements are implemented and there is at least one valid test and one invalid test for each requirement.</th>
<th>Most project requirements are implemented and there are no invalid test cases for each requirement.</th>
<th>Most project requirements are implemented and there is at least one valid test and one invalid test for each requirement.</th>
<th>Some project requirements are implemented and there are no invalid test cases for each requirement.</th>
<th>Some project requirements are implemented and there is at least one valid test and one invalid test for each requirement.</th>
<th>None of the project requirements are met or implemented.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO1</td>
<td>Socio-technical context of the project is discussed in the report. All social, ethical, legal, security, or social issues relevant to this context are discussed and appropriately handled in this project.</td>
<td>Socio-technical context of the project is discussed in the report. All social, ethical, legal, security, or social issues relevant to this context are discussed and appropriately handled in this project.</td>
<td>Socio-technical context of the project is discussed in the report. All social, ethical, legal, security, or social issues relevant to this context are discussed and appropriately handled in this project.</td>
<td>Socio-technical context of the project is discussed in the report. All social, ethical, legal, security, or social issues relevant to this context are discussed and appropriately handled in this project.</td>
<td>Socio-technical context of the project is not addressed in the report.</td>
<td>Socio-technical context of the project is not addressed in the report.</td>
<td>Socio-technical context of the project is not addressed in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2</td>
<td>The project documentation as well as the communication with the client through the semester are handled at a level that is appropriate to each module type.</td>
<td>The project documentation as well as the communication with the client through the semester are handled at a level that is appropriate to each module type.</td>
<td>The project documentation as well as the communication with the client through the semester are handled at a level that is appropriate to each module type.</td>
<td>The project documentation as well as the communication with the client through the semester are handled at a level that is appropriate to each module type.</td>
<td>The project documentation as well as the communication with the client through the semester are not handled at a level that is appropriate to each module type.</td>
<td>The project documentation as well as the communication with the client through the semester are not handled at a level that is appropriate to each module type.</td>
<td>The project documentation as well as the communication with the client through the semester are not handled at a level that is appropriate to each module type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3</td>
<td>The design document follows the modular design principles, and there is a clear mapping of all project requirements to the design modules.</td>
<td>The design document follows the modular design principles, and there is a clear mapping of all project requirements to the design modules.</td>
<td>The design document follows the modular design principles, and there is a clear mapping of all project requirements to the design modules.</td>
<td>The design document follows the modular design principles, and there is a clear mapping of all project requirements to the design modules.</td>
<td>The design document does not follow the modular design principles.</td>
<td>The design document does not follow the modular design principles.</td>
<td>The design document does not follow the modular design principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO4</td>
<td>All project requirements are implemented and there are no invalid test cases for each project requirement.</td>
<td>All project requirements are implemented and there is at least one valid test and one invalid test for each requirement.</td>
<td>Most project requirements are implemented and there are no invalid test cases for each requirement.</td>
<td>Most project requirements are implemented and there is at least one valid test and one invalid test for each requirement.</td>
<td>Some project requirements are implemented and there are no invalid test cases for each requirement.</td>
<td>Some project requirements are implemented and there is at least one valid test and one invalid test for each requirement.</td>
<td>None of the project requirements are met or implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Learning Outcomes

1. Ability to implement and evaluate a computer-based system, process, component, or program to meet desired needs
2. Demonstrate an understanding of professional, ethical, legal, security, and social issues and responsibilities
3. Ability to communicate with a range of audiences
4. Ability to apply design and development principles in the construction of software systems of varying complexity.

These learning outcomes are derived from the student outcome(s) provided by ABET, the national body accrediting computing and engineering programs.

### Results

Data was collected from Capstone class in Spring of 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Who Participated in Kind-of-Program Assessment</th>
<th># Who Meet or Exceed Proficiency Score</th>
<th>% Who Meet or Exceed Proficiency Score</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Your Program’s Proficiency Target? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60.61%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpretation and Next Steps for Program Improvement

**Overall observations:**

No project earned a “Does not meet expectations” rating in any of the SLOs. Based on feedback from clients, students are generally competent with programming the software systems to meet desired needs.

**SLO1 and SLO4:**

The program is close to the proficiency target in SLO1 and SLO4. While every team was able to deliver a functional software system to the client, deficiencies point to a need to exercise more rigorous software engineering practices, particularly design and testing.

**SLO2:**

SLO2 is about having a deeper understanding of computer science as being connected to a larger socio-technical context with its associated organizational and ethical expectations. Students tend to focus on the software product itself and lose focus on the importance of the bigger picture.

**SLO3:**

Our students met or exceeded SLO3: the ability to communicate with a range of audiences. Clients were satisfied with the level and frequency of interaction with the students. Students also presented their projects in a public venue.

**Next Steps**

- Collect more assessment data in 2017-2018.
- Present the assessment data analyses and results at a CS Department faculty meeting in the fall. The feedback from CS faculty will be used to improve the SLOs, rubric and data collection mechanisms.
- Revisit the issues raised in articulating the SLOs, particularly whether to strengthen the focus on CS theory over software engineering practice.

### References


Redesigning Programmatic Assessment: An Accreditation-Driven Approach

Daniel B. Kissinger, Ashley Blount, Abby Bjornsen-Ramig, Ann Luther, & C. Rick Richards

Department of Counseling, College of Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68192

Description of the Assessment

Introduction

The UNO Counseling Program’s clinical mental health (CMHC) and school counseling (SC) concentrations have been accredited for over 20 years by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The program is the first agency for counseling education programs. In 2008, CACREP ushered in a new “culture of assessment.” In doing so, CACREP-accredited programs needed a paradigm shift to work across the matrixes and related differences between accredited core curriculum and specialization curriculum standards (i.e. student-learning outcomes/SLOs). To address this transition, the counseling faculty worked to re-design its programmatic assessment plan. This plan involved the use of LiveText, an assessment management platform, as the new assessment platform. Specifically, LiveText allowed instructors to create analytic rubrics targeted to individual SLOs in a way that systematically gather data over the course of multiple semesters. With this data, individual and aggregate data reports specific to SLOs can be created for faculty and our accreditors.

Community

This project illustrates the sustained effort and commitment required of the UNO Counseling faculty to assess SLOs in accordance with CACREP-accredited programs in CMHC and SC. These efforts are critical to the professional reputation of the department and university, and can have significant influence on the licensure and career goals of our graduates (i.e. State Licensure Licensed Mental Health Professional, Managed Care credentialing, U.S. Veteran’s Administration requirements for caring for vets).

Settlement

Our program mandate requires clear indicators of how SLOs are demonstrated, assessed, and used on an ongoing basis for program improvement and development. To that end, all SLO-related reports generated through LiveText will be provided to the discipline faculty members. In turn, each faculty member will create an executive summary review of their analysis of the assessment as a learning tool, the utility of the rubric for scoring SLOs, and the utility of the data and insights learned to the counseling program development and improvement. The Department Chair (DC) will then create an Exhibit Center within LiveText to archive the executive summaries and other data reports consistent with CACREP mandates.

Project Goals

Ultimately, our assessment process move the knowledge and skills of the core counseling faculty in creating new and revised assessments and scoring rubrics could verify student attainment of SLOs. The first step in this process, however, was a full re-design of the curriculum map guiding all three graduate counseling programs. This process is outlined in the next section. Specifically, each faculty member proposed a new or revised assessment tool (i.e. assignment) and assessment rubric. These items were placed and scored in LiveText (now Via). From these rubrics, outcome data was gathered, analyzed, and utilized to evaluate student attainment of SLOs for program improvement and development.

Specific goals include:

1. Create or revise assessment tools and scoring rubrics within LiveText that address SLOs consistent with department’s revised curriculum map.
2. Gather, assess, and utilize outcome data from rubrics in order to verify student attainment of required SLOs of each assignment.
3. Utilize SLO data as part of revised department program assessment plan.
4. Demonstrate the UNO Counseling department’s ongoing commitment to creating a sustainable culture of best practices and assessment to our students, accrediting body (CACREP), local/professional communities.

Timeline of Steps

Identify courses to pilot new or revised CACREP-aligned assessment tools/SLOs. (December 2016) Create new or revised assessment tools/SLOs within LiveText, assess SLOs, and analyze data via LiveText at completion of Spring 2017 semester. (Spring 2017) DC will generate course and faculty department reports on student SLO performance based on spring 2017 data for purposes of program improvement and development. (Summer 2017) DC will generate final report regarding all LiveText-generated SLOs and place an emphasis on Final Fall 2017 faculty retreat/workshop for integrated data for program improvement and development. (Fall 2017) Faculty data/assessment reports specific to the department’s CACREP mandate for developing and maintaining an intentional, organized link between the department’s core and specialization standards (i.e., SLOs). (Fall 2017)

To support faculty efforts, the department chair will facilitate professional development which may include: participation in activities through the Center for Faculty Excellence, conference attendance, invited guests to department meetings/events, and/or purchase of assessment resources. (Fall 2017)

Initial Step: Curriculum Map Re-Design

CACREP Common Core Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #</th>
<th>Description of the Core Counseling Program</th>
<th>Proficiency Target &amp; Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>- Philosophy and values of the counseling profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>- Understand professional roles and functions, and their relationship to society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>- Understanding the impact of personal, occupational, and cultural-historical experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>- Roles and functions of counselors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>- Communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6</td>
<td>- Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7</td>
<td>- Learning principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.8</td>
<td>- Demonstrate the UNO Counseling Program's ongoing commitment to creating a sustainable culture of best practices and assessment to our students, accrediting body (CACREP), local/professional communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric Design/Matrixes

Using CACREP standards (SLO4s) as the baseline, and based on the re-designed curriculum map, faculty first utilized LiveText and Program specific matrices to provide a sustainable framework for rubric design. While CACREP has 5 core areas, the example below illustrates only one core curriculum area. (see document below).

Rubric Design

Rubric Design has been a collaborative effort, with faculty receiving vital assistance from the COE’s Livestix/ disclosed Coordinator (Kim Gangwish), COE assessment coordinator, and Associate Dean. The department instituted a rubric vetting process to ensure consistency across programs. The examples below show how CACREP SLOs are being evaluated.

Assessment/Program Improvement & Development

Following data collection, faculty utilized LiveText data to assess SLOs, with specific attention given to understanding the data in relation to program improvement and development (a key CACREP requirement). Following completion of the fall, the faculty meets to discuss findings in the department over individual course/concentrations specifically. This confirms the department’s new assessment program. The document below is the formal document used by each faculty member to assess the rubric/SLOs data in the respective course(s).

Counseling Department

Annual Data Review Template

Name of Reviewer(s): ______________________
__________________
__________________
__________________

date_2017/2018

Description of the assessment tool(s) in use in the program:

The purpose of the Professional Identity Project is to explore one’s professional life and how it comes to be the kind of counselor that one is. It has been developed to be an ongoing examination of our personal/professional development and the beliefs that influence our work with clients. The focus is on the personal and professional identity of each counselor. The project is designed to help counselors understand the factors that influence their professional identity and the impact that these factors have on their practice. The project also serves as a way for counselors to reflect on their practice and to identify areas for improvement. It is a continuous process that involves self-reflection, self-awareness, and self-acceptance.

Students will develop a portfolio in order to better reflect on their personal/professional identity and begin their professional journeys to build their identities through the counseling program. Students are assessed at biannual points throughout the counseling program.

Alignment of the assessment to the CACREP Core Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CACREP Core Standard</th>
<th>Department of Counseling</th>
<th>Description of the Core Counseling Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>- Philosophy and values of the counseling profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>- Understand professional roles and functions, and their relationship to society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>- Understanding the impact of personal, occupational, and cultural-historical experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>- Roles and functions of counselors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>- Communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6</td>
<td>- Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7</td>
<td>- Learning principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.8</td>
<td>- Demonstrate the UNO Counseling Program's ongoing commitment to creating a sustainable culture of best practices and assessment to our students, accrediting body (CACREP), local/professional communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of assessment data in program improvement:

Rubric Design has been a collaborative effort, with faculty receiving vital assistance from the COE’s Livestix/ disclosed Coordinator (Kim Gangwish), COE assessment coordinator, and Associate Dean. The department instituted a rubric vetting process to ensure consistency across programs. The examples below show how CACREP SLOs are being evaluated.
ENGLISH MA Program Assessment

G. Travis Adams, Kristin Girten, Ramon Guerra, and Lisa Knopp
English Department, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO #1</th>
<th>Students will demonstrate a professional sense of Genre and Culture and History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric or artifact measured</td>
<td>MA Comprehensive Exams from 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment method</td>
<td>Committee members will develop a rubric (we will be adapting the value rubrics from the Association of American Colleges and Universities—see attached), members and readers will then have a norming session before reading and scoring artifacts from 1-4, with each artifact being read by two readers (three if the first two scores differ by more than one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs Assessment Domain</td>
<td>Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element or artifact measured</td>
<td>MA Comprehensive Exams from 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When and by whom administered</td>
<td>Fall 2016, by MA Assessment Committee plus two additional graduate faculty in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will demonstrate a professional application of Critical Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs Assessment Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element or artifact measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When and by whom administered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubrics

Scoring Guide

Process

Scoring Session

Results

SLO #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts Measured</th>
<th>Assessment Categories</th>
<th>Total Measures</th>
<th>Measure Requiring 2nd Reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Artistic | 46 | 64 | 7.9 | 54.4%
| Cult & Hist | 51 | 52 | 6.2 | 39.4%
| Shaw of Voice | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |

SLO #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Category</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Framework</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of Interactions</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Artifacts Measured | Assessment Categories | Total Measures | Measure Requiring 2nd Reader |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Artistic | 46 | 64 | 7.9 | 54.4%
| Cult & Hist | 51 | 52 | 6.2 | 39.4%
| Shaw of Voice | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |

Decisions and Actions

SLO #1 Decisions:
Scores are below our program’s expectations, and the artifacts scored do not meet our proficiency target. Comprehensive exams from 2015 were used for this assessment, while SLO #1 was not approved by our Graduate Program Committee until 2016. Thus, we assessed artifacts that could not have been deeply connected to SLO #1. This is an opportunity to shape culminating activities and other aspects of our program to better reflect the values imbedded in SLO #1.

Actions:
- Faculty will consider SLO #1 when writing future comprehensive exam questions to more directly engage students in demonstrating each component of SLO #1
- The program will make students aware of SLO #1 throughout their program of study
- SLO statements will be added to course syllabi, the MA Handbook, and the program website
- Our Graduate Program Committee and assessment committee will consider alternative artifacts for assessing SLO #1. Alternatives include seminar projects and portfolios.

SLO #2 Decisions:
The scores for two rubric categories and overall averages are below our program’s expectations. Artifacts scored do not meet our proficiency target. Artifacts were drawn only from half of all MA seminars offered in fall 2016. Artifacts do not fully represent work from the range of seminars offered in this semester. Artifacts assessed were not necessarily written by student at the end of their MA work. Readers expressed particular challenges evaluating Interpretive Frameworks and Inquiry and Community of Interpreters portions of the rubric; assessing these elements requires familiarity with these elements that faculty may not possess outside areas of specialization.

Actions:
- For SLO #2, we will collect artifacts from students that have completed 18 or more credit hours
- Graduate Program Committee and Department Chair will communicate the importance of faculty submitting artifacts for assessment
- Assessment committee will clarify language on the rubric for SLO #2
- Graduate Program Committee and assessment committee will consider assessing SLO #2 on rotating basis to align readers and artifacts from specific areas (language studies, creative nonfiction, literature, etc.)

Grant Support
The Program Level Assessment grant provided stipends to the assessment cohort and to readers. Grant funding helped the English MA program:
- Refine SLOs, develop rubric
- Create scoring/norming guides
- Recruit additional readers
- Conduct assessment for two of our four program SLOs

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 a sample of artifacts.

Grant funding allowed us to have a wider range of faculty involved in assessment. This made our assessment efforts stronger and we were able to assess more faculty. This made our evaluation more reliable. The scores for two rubric categories and overall averages are below our program’s expectations. Artifacts scored do not meet our proficiency target. Artifacts were drawn only from half of all MA seminars offered in fall 2016. Artifacts do not fully represent work from the range of seminars offered in this semester. Artifacts assessed were not necessarily written by student at the end of their MA work. Readers expressed particular challenges evaluating Interpretive Frameworks and Inquiry and Community of Interpreters portions of the rubric; assessing these elements requires familiarity with these elements that faculty may not possess outside areas of specialization.
Program Mission

- The Athletic Training Program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha is committed to prepare students for successful careers or advanced academic studies in the field of athletic training by providing comprehensive and progressive studies leading to national certification as an athletic trainer. Our students acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of clinicians ready to fulfill critical roles in shaping the future of healthcare delivery to physically active populations. The Athletic Training Program provides resources and opportunities for the growth and development of dedicated practitioners, reflective scholars, and responsible citizens through diverse didactic and clinical experiences, based on the competencies set forth by the National Athletic Trainers’ Association (NATA).

Student Learning Objectives

- SLO #1: Students will graduate as highly-qualified candidates for entry-level positions or advanced academic or professional study in the field of athletic training.
- SLO #2: Students will be able to work in a diverse healthcare environment and be recognized as an integral member of the broader healthcare community.
- SLO #3: Students will appreciate, practice, and advance evidence-based medicine in a variety of clinical settings and provide effective, high quality patient-centered care.

Assessments Updated

- Master’s comprehensive examination part 1
- General medical observation athletic training student evaluation form
- Evidence based practice implementation survey
- Revised rubric of evidence based-practiced presentation
- Revised rubric for case-study and systematic review assignments

Methods

- 150 question examination.
  - Include multi-select, Hotspot (Figure 1), and drag and drop style questions.
  - Match the percentage of questions from each domain in the comprehensive exam to the current BOC exam.
  - 3 certified ATs carefully read through each question and answer choice to ensure each question was readable, appropriate and tested the intended content area.
  - Convert from paper to computer-based examination.

Results

Table 1. Percentage of test questions from each domain of athletic training from the previous examination, BOC examination and updated new examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Previous Exam</th>
<th>BOC Exam</th>
<th>New Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injury and Illness Prevention and Wellness Promotion</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination, Assessment and Diagnosis</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate and Emergency Response</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Intervention</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Administration and Professional Responsibility</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Domain scores from the new comprehensive examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th>Min-Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injury and Illness Prevention and Wellness Promotion</td>
<td>80.5±7.6%</td>
<td>69.4-95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination, Assessment and Diagnosis</td>
<td>83.3±6.3%</td>
<td>73.7-93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate and Emergency Response</td>
<td>80.2±19.6%</td>
<td>58.7-91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Intervention</td>
<td>74.8±7.8%</td>
<td>62.3-90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Administration and Professional Responsibility</td>
<td>77.6±11.7%</td>
<td>54.4-93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>79.0±5.1%</td>
<td>70.9-89.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

- Update the comprehensive exam as necessary with results from the item analysis from the Spring 2017 results.
- Administer new comprehensive examination to the undergraduate students in the Fall 2017 and graduate students in Spring 2018.
- Correlational analysis between the BOC examination domain scores and the comprehensive examination domain scores to identify the correlation between the two tests.
- Use correlational analysis to identify areas of weakness in curriculum.
Learning Concepts, Inquiry, Communication, and Ethics Across the Psychology Major

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

ABSTRACT

The Psychology Department has long recognized its role in student learning as a Major with approximately 600 B.A. and B.S. students. 145 more via a Minor, and many more through GenEd and special interest courses. We have become increasingly attuned to assessment of learning, and adherence to the guiding principles for Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as emphasized by the American Psychological Association (APA; APA Guidelines, 2013). SLO goals adopted by the Department in 2016 are as follows:

- 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.

We recently began to increase our efforts in assessment of these SLOs and aim for continuous strengthening of those efforts.

Method

Our initial plan was to expand our assessment into our intermediate courses (PSYC 3130 Statistics, and 3140 Research Methods) using pre-test/post-test measures. In consultation with faculty conducting these courses, we realigned the goals to assess students with a pre-test on the first day of courses, and eliminated the post-test. We added in a lower-level (PSYC 1020 Lab) and a higher-level (PSYC 4234) course in the assessment measures. This strategy allows us to examine students’ learning of targeted concepts as they advance through the major.

Qualtrics was used for all measures. We provided instructors with a handout for the students that included a brief explanation, the link and a QR code to the survey. Instructors distributed the survey on the first or second day of class and provided time for the students to complete it within class. Most students completed their answers within 5 to 10 minutes. Most questions were multiple-choice, with some categorical and open-ended questions included.

Data were collected from 325 students in Fall 2017 classes (121 in 1020 Lab; 123 in 3130 Stats; 66 in 3140 Methods, and 15 in 4234 Capstone Lab).

Results

- **Statistics Knowledge**
  - 1. Student response for each course to the question: Assuming an alpha level of .05, is the following finding statistically significant: F(1,23) = 9.2, p = 0.0477
    - Despite increases in correct responses, less than half of students at any level were able to correctly interpret this question.

- **APA Knowledge**
  - 2. Student responses for each course to the question: Which of the following does NOT include a proper APA citation?
    - Results suggest that students demonstrate increased mastery of APA style knowledge as they move across the curriculum.

- **Self-Confidence Levels**
  - 3. Percent of students who gave a positive response (e.g., “agree” or “strongly agree”) to the prompt: Entering PSYC XXXX, I am confident in my ability to . . .
    - No students in the capstone course reported confidence in conducting statistical analyses.

Future Directions

- Expand the number of courses included in our assessments.
- Build rubrics to assess Research Methods writing course assignments.
- Begin formulating rubrics for upper-level laboratory writing courses.
- Establish meetings with faculty to review assessment results and strategize toward students’ long-term retention of concepts, creative inquiry, ethics and communication.
- We are presenting a related poster at the Society for Neuroscience Conference in November, 2017.

Reference

Program-level SLO Assessment: New Directions

Dr. Samantha K. Ammons, Dr. Lissette Aliaga-Linares, Dr. Alecia D. Anderson, Dr. T. Lynne Barone, Dr. Daniel N. Hawkins, Dr. Jay A. Irwin, Dr. Mary Ann Powell, Dr. Regina Robbins & Katherine Kroeger

Department of Sociology & Anthropology, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

Our team began program-level assessment revision discussions in summer 2016 and we continued to meet periodically throughout the 2016-2017 academic year. Through these discussions, we reaffirmed the skills that we expect our graduating seniors to master and identified gaps in our current program-level assessment plan.

We then redesigned two assessment tools we were already using, designed new ways to measure and assess student learning for our program, and began forming an assessment database that will allow us to triangulate data and conduct a more fine-tuned analysis of our program.

- 18 new questions added to our senior exit survey
- Revised senior thesis paper rubric & pilot tested it
- Researched existing poster rubrics and created a new rubric to assess senior thesis posters
- Pilot tested poster rubric in spring 2017
- Designed eight vignettes to capture student understanding of the sociological imagination
- In spring 2017 we pilot tested the vignettes in two sections of Senior Thesis and one section of Intro to Sociology
- Created a vignette rubric
- Began merging assessment data together into a master database

Program-level SLOs

Students graduating with a sociology major are able to articulate the role of sociology & anthropology in contributing to our understanding of social and cultural reality, such that the student will be able to apply the sociological imagination, sociological and anthropological principles, and concepts to her/his own life. (1c)

Students graduating with a sociology major will develop important technical skills, such that the student will be able to:
- do (social) scientific technical writing that accurately conveys data findings (4b)
- explain and present research findings (4c)

Students graduating with a major in sociology will see the relevance of sociology & anthropology in community engagement, such that the student will see:
- the utility of the sociological and anthropological perspectives as one of several perspectives on social reality (10a)
- the importance of reducing negative effects of social inequality (10b)
- the value of speaking publicly about sociological and anthropological issues (10c)

Instruments & Rubrics

Vignette Example

The Miller family has been living within a mile or two of a coal-fired power plant for about 10 years when they receive an EPA report detailing high levels of pollution in the mail. The report doesn’t say that these pollutants cause cancer but they are suspected of having significant negative effects on fetal and child development. Perhaps this explains why the youngest Miller child has such severe asthma. The Millers love this neighborhood – they know their neighbors and this house is the only one their children have ever lived in. Plus, it is the only neighborhood in town they can afford rent for a single-family home. The family comes from a working class background and both parents have full-time jobs.

Will the Millers stay in this house or move? Imagine that you are explaining it to a friend or family member. Be sure to explain what factors will impact the Miller’s decision and why.

Poster Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing (1)</th>
<th>Proficient (2)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title &amp; RQ</td>
<td>Title and research question is too narrowly focused or too broad.</td>
<td>Title and research question are focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background &amp; Rationale</td>
<td>Not clearly presented or well-constructed. Sources are not relevant and/or not cited correctly.</td>
<td>Clearly presented and well-constructed. Relevant sources are cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods &amp; Analysis Plan</td>
<td>Methods and analysis are inadequately developed and/or inappropriate for topic.</td>
<td>Methods and analysis are adequately developed, explained, well, and appropriate for topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion is inadequately summarized. Research question is not fully answered.</td>
<td>Discussion is adequate and answers the research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Design</td>
<td>Sections arranged oddly and/or tables, graphs or figures were inadequately used.</td>
<td>Adequate organization of sections and tables. Graphs or figures were adequately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Appearance</td>
<td>Poster is not very appealing (too much or too little white space; inappropriate text size; colors or graphics detract).</td>
<td>Poster is mostly appealing in terms of use of space, text size, graphics or colors used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>0-9 = Developing</td>
<td>10-14 = Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficiency Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Program-level SLO address</th>
<th>Proficiency Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Thesis Paper</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Target is that 70% of students are considered to be proficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Exit Survey</td>
<td>1a, 10a, 10c</td>
<td>Target is that 70% of students will agree or strongly agree with statements in exit survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Thesis Poster</td>
<td>4c</td>
<td>A score of 10-14 is considered proficient. Target is that 70% of students are considered to be proficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignettes</td>
<td>1c, 10a, 10c</td>
<td>A score of 9 or greater is considered proficient. Target is that 70% of students are considered to be proficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revisions & Data Collection Timeline

Fall 2017
- More student exit survey from Survey Monkey to Qualtrics & continue collecting data
- Use revised senior thesis paper rubric to evaluate a sample of papers
- Finish revising five of the vignettes
- Use newly created poster rubric to evaluate a sample of student posters; note needed revisions

Spring 2018
- Pilot test vignettes in senior thesis sections and selected Intro to Sociology & Intro to Anthropology sections
- Apply vignette rubric to vignette data & note needed revisions
- Continue collecting student exit survey data & using senior thesis paper rubric on a sample of a student thesis papers

Next Steps for Program Improvement

- Finish revisions of new assessment tools and rubrics
- Plan how and when to systematically gather assessment data from all introductory sections and senior thesis sections using Canvas
- Present a revised program-level SLO assessment plan to our Department & obtain approval
Program Assessment of the Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders

Elizabeth M. Leader-Janssen, Ph.D., Kristine D. Swain, Ph.D., & Jessica L. Hagaman, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

Description of the Assessment

The Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders in the College of Education worked on program assessment for our graduate program in special education. According to our accrediting body, Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) we must have program assessments that all graduate students will complete.

Data Based Decision Making Project

During this semester, you will complete a project that integrates the knowledge and skills that you have learned during your graduate program. You will be implementing this project and writing a paper that describes the project. Include the following components:

Description of the Student: Provide an objective 1-paragraph description of the student that includes information regarding the student’s eligibility for special education services. IEP components that are relative to the project, and other necessary background information will be much detail as possible. Please select a pseudonym for your student to maintain confidentiality.

Baseline Data: At least one IEP goal that will be the focus of this project. All IEP goals need to include the components of audience, behavior, condition, and degree of criterion. All goal should include the four components: audience, behavior, condition, and degree of criterion and the level of performance.

Baseline Data and Data Collection: Collect baseline data prior to implementing an intervention. There are a number of data collection procedures that may be used for establishing a baseline, as well as for monitoring the student’s response to the intervention selected. A minimum of one weekly data point for 8 weeks of intervention is necessary for the project. The student’s response to intervention is assessed during each of the two 8-week time blocks. If the data indicate that the student is showing adequate progress during a 4-week time block, the intervention is continued during the next 4 weeks. If the student is not exhibiting adequate progress, the intervention is either modified or a new evidence-based intervention is selected.

Intervention and Procedures: Describe the intervention you have chosen to implement in great detail so it could be replicated. Be sure to include the procedures you use to implement it.

Evidence-Based Research Synthesis: Read two articles (from the past 10 years) that support the intervention for the IP goal that you selected, and submit a 3-4 page synthesis. Your synthesis should include a clear description of the intervention, evidence of its effectiveness, and the reference for the journal articles using APA 6th edition guidelines.

Data Analysis: Annotate the data collected to determine effectiveness of the intervention. Reflect upon the strengths and weaknesses of your intervention based on the data. If you modified or adapted your intervention in an attempt to achieve unique needs of the learner, describe these modifications.

Recommendations: Based on the data collected, determine recommendations for future instruction. If an intervention was effective, discuss the possible reasons. If the interventions were ineffective, describe possible alternate evidence-based interventions that you might try in order to meet the long-term goal.

GSMART-PLS: Submit your lesson plan that incorporate the evidence-based intervention(s) you selected. A lesson plan format is found within this document. You will have an additional assignment description for the lesson plans.

Student Learning Outcomes

Graduate students in Special Education will:

1. understand how exceptions may intervene 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 to foster individual 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 in 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.

Data-Based-Decision Making Project Rubric

Timeline for Implementation

• The DBDM project is being piloted during fall 2017.
• Two graduate program faculty members will evaluate each project. An evaluator’s guide will be created to assist in the evaluation.
• Any revisions will be made and the DBDM will be implemented in spring 2018.

Next Steps for Program Improvement

Data from the DBDM project will be reviewed each semester at a special education program meeting.

Inter-rater reliability will be examined during the 2017-2018 year with additional training utilized as needed to increase reliability.

Key course assessments will be compared with the end of the program DBDM project.

Data will be shared with stakeholders for input and discussion for program improvement.
Teacher Education Graduate Capstone Presentation Assessment

Dr. Kathy Danielson, Dr. Kathy Peterson and Dr. Becky Pasco
Teacher Education; COE, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Description of the Assessment

The Teacher Education (TED) Graduate Capstone Presentation assessment is embedded in the Graduate Capstone course taken by all TED Graduate degree-seeking candidates in the final semester of their academic program. The assessment is aligned with current teaching and content standards specific to the candidates’ education/learning environment to ensure relevance and support application of new learning. The presentation format of the assessment requires candidates to collaborate with colleagues and develop and lead initiatives on behalf of individuals or groups of children and youth in their professional learning communities.

Student Learning Outcomes

Teacher Education (TED) Graduate candidates will:
• Demonstrate their ability to apply key learnings from their individual graduate program/coursework by critically examining their current practice and designing evidence-based instruction/programming for an identified student(s) in their school/learning environment.
• Demonstrate their ability to integrate new knowledge, expand their skills, and collaborate with colleagues by creating a professional presentation for peers highlighting the use of culturally relevant assessments that have a high impact on student learning.

Rubric

Proficiency Target

Based on the Capstone Graduate Capstone Presentation Rubric, candidates must meet the criteria for “Target” on 6 of 7 indicators in the rubric.

Results (or Timeline)

• Fall 2017 and Spring 2018
  Pilot of Instructions and Rubric
• Summer 2018
  Data Analysis/Revisions by TED Graduate Capstone Committee composed of TED Faculty, TED Department Chair, TED Assessment Coordinator, Professional Community Member, and TED Graduate Student Representative.
• Fall 2018 and Spring 2019
  Data Gathering and Data Analysis by TED Graduate Program Chairs for program improvement and accreditation

Interpretation and/or Next Steps for Program Improvement

• Review of Pilot Data by TED Graduate Capstone Committee
• Review of Pilot Data by TED Graduate Programs Committee
• Use of Feedback to revise Graduate Capstone Assessment Instructions and Rubric

References

Women’s & Gender Studies (WGS) Program Assessment

Karen Falconer Al-Hindi, WD/Geography/Geology; Kristin Girten, WGS/English; Peggy Jones, WGS/Black Studies; Tammie Kennedy, WGS/English

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

Description of the Assessment

For SLO#1 (Students will demonstrate critical thinking about women’s and gender issues), the Senior Seminar Capstone course research paper will be evaluated by the use of the corresponding rubric to determine evidence that the student displayed the ability to analyze gender in the context of a real-world problem (categories, roles, relations, identities, etc.).

For SLO#2 (Students will demonstrate critical thinking about human diversity), presentations graded by program faculty will be evaluated by the use of the corresponding rubric to determine evidence of the student’s ability to accurately interpret current research in the field and communicate the salient points effectively in an oral presentation (especially pertaining to women’s, gender, and sexuality issues).

For SLO#3 (Students will demonstrate personal development and leadership), the student’s electronic portfolio (that includes: Two research or creative activity projects/papers completed prior to the senior seminar, resume, and the final senior seminar paper) will be evaluated by the use of the corresponding rubric to determine if the desired elements are present. Student leadership and engagement in both the on-campus and off-campus communities also may be considered as part of the portfolio. The portfolio will be made available to students for use in their career development or advancement.

Student Learning Outcomes

1. Students will demonstrate critical thinking about women’s and gender issues.
2. Students will demonstrate critical thinking about human diversity.
3. Students will demonstrate personal development and leadership.

Rubrics

WGS SLO#1: Students will demonstrate critical thinking about women’s and gender issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Target</th>
<th>Description of the Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency Target</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate critical thinking about women’s and gender issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubrics will be used to evaluate the students’ ability to analyze gender in the context of a real-world problem (categories, roles, relations, identities, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubrics will be used to evaluate the students’ ability to accurately interpret current research in the field and communicate the salient points effectively in an oral presentation (especially pertaining to women’s, gender, and sexuality issues).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficiency Target

Proficiency is a minimum score of 75% (using our rubric); target is all students earning 80% or better.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO#1</th>
<th>Artifact: Paper</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Proficiency Target met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO#2</th>
<th>Artifact: Presentation</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Proficiency Target met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%, 85%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO#3</th>
<th>Artifact: Portfolio</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Proficiency Target met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%, 100%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps for Program Improvement

The WGS Assessment Subcommittee (WGAS) has separated course grades from assessment. Prior to Fall 2016, course grades were used as data in assessment. Beginning in Fall 2016, the WGAS applied specific, faculty-developed rubrics to each of the SLOs. All three SLOs have been refined further (since January 20, 2017) with the specification of learning objectives.

Using the Fall 2016 data, the WGAS normed the rubrics and generated ideas for their revision. Revised rubrics were used in the Spring 2017 round of program assessment. Further revision of the rubric for SLO 2 is underway.

The committee is pleased to see that proficiency targets were met for each SLO. However, the WGS program has high expectations of its students; the WGAS does not expect the proficiency targets to be met each year. The WG Committee (a larger body than the WGAS) will review the results in the Fall 2017 term; in addition, this report will be shared with the entire WGS faculty.
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Description of the Assessment
The purpose of this project was to create assessments for General Education (GenEd) courses that are adaptable for a class of 25 or 100 students. In most UNO departments, the Natural and Physical Science GenEd courses are large and serve non-science majors. This project developed instruments for assessing all four of UNO’s General Education SLO’s (relevance and focus) within two GenEd courses, one taught for the Geography/Geology Department and one for the Teacher Education Department. The two courses were instructed by Dr. Carol Engelmann and provided a unique framework to test materials in small courses while considering the context of most GenEd courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>General Education SLO</th>
<th>Assessment Content</th>
<th>Time of Implementation</th>
<th>Actions to Take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Examination</td>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>Examination on board</td>
<td>End of Spring 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Essay</td>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Beginning Spring 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper Analysis</td>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>End of Spring 2017</td>
<td>Create new assessment, rubric and use for feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation project and Poster Presentation</td>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>Product (poster or paper)</td>
<td>End of Spring 2017</td>
<td>Frequently revise existing assessment, rubric and use for feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Where Assessment Administered
Spring 2017 GEOL 1010: Environmental Geology
Spring 2017 GEOL 1104-001 Earth System Science Lab
Fall 2016 TED 1100: Inquiry-based thinking in STEM

Proficiency Target
80% of students rated as proficient

Student Learning Outcomes

Examination for SLO 1:
Successful students will demonstrate a broad understanding of the fundamental laws and principles of science and interrelationships among science and technology disciplines.

Performance Essay for SLO 2:
Successful students will demonstrate a broad understanding of various natural and/or physical phenomena that surround and influence our lives.

Performance Essay and/or Oral Presentation for SLO 3:
Successful students will describe how scientists approach and solve problems, including an understanding of the basic components and limitations of the scientific method.

Performance Written Paper and/or Oral Presentation for SLO 4:
Successful students will 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.

Assessment Tools for SLO #1-3
We created 2 different tools to assess SLO #1-3. One tool simultaneously assesses all three SLOs and is based on a video or reading activity focused on a scientific problem. The second tool is a series of rubrics to assess a reflection paragraph or a short answer. Students could watch videos independently or in class and complete follow-up questions delivered through a Learning Management System (such as Canvas). The video tested as part of this grant covered volcanic hazards, how scientists investigate volcanoes, and threats posed by volcanoes to human societies. The examination included questions that addressed SLO #1 specific to volcanoes, SLO #2 focused on the interactions with humans, and SLO #3 how scientists approach solving scientific problems. The questions were completed by students outside of class and provided assessment feedback on SLOs #1-3.

Results
The grant supported the development of several assessment tools that can be adapted to a variety of STEM general education courses beyond Geology and Earth System Science.

Assessment Tools for SLO #4
The team determined that SLO #4, which asks students to draw conclusions based on evidence, is best assessed using a laboratory activity which is common to most natural science general education courses. Lab activities often involve collecting and/or assessing data to draw conclusions about a specific scientific problem. A rubric was developed to assess how well students could identify the scientific problem, use appropriate data to determine an answer to the scientific problem and ultimately draw a conclusion based on available evidence. The rubric distinguished between proficient, developing and novice for each of the criteria, providing additional feedback to students about where they fit in the learning spectrum. The rubric is adaptable to most lab activities that involve data collection and interpretation. For example, a lab activity on the Cryosphere and a student performance-based assessment presentation was tested as a pilot and it was successful.

Although the rubric is applicable to many natural science lab activities, instructors may need to modify some lab questions to explicitly ask students to articulate a problem, conclusion, etc. for purposes of using the assessment rubric. Modifications will likely be minimal and should improve the quality of the lab while specifically addressing SLO #4.

Video Assignment Example

The assignment serves as a template for any Natural Science GenEd course on-line assessment that focuses on a major scientific problem. The following example questions from the assessment demonstrate a variety of higher-level questioning.

Mr. Pimentel’s Environmental Impact/Environmental Hazards Course in the Philippines

MTN-100: The Path of A Killer Volcano

Possible SLO 4 Questions for On-line Assessment Content knowledge questions on volcanology
According to your solution, which is happening at the plate boundary that causes the existence of these volcanic islands in the Philippines, such as Lusong time for Mt. Pinatubo?
6.1 Mt Pinatubo was formed due to a god existing between the plates. The volcano was a god that would protect its people, so the indigenous people were safe from danger.
6.2 The people living on Mt. Pinatubo were always safe because the volcano is a god. Mt. Pinatubo was not going to erupt because it had not erupted in such a very long time.
6.3 Even though all the people living on the base were evacuated, not everyone should leave because the volcano is a god. Mt. Pinatubo was not going to erupt because it had not erupted in such a very long time.
6.4 Even though all the people living on the base were evacuated, not everyone should leave because they still need to work in the fields.

Possible SLO 4 Questions: Questions on how volcanoes impact our lives
Which group of people on the site still didn’t evacuate because of the danger posed by Mt. Pinatubo from the second tool? Some on the site may think more than one group or not match any group. Your choices:

a. Villagers
6.5 Villagers did not know it was dangerous. Villagers should not have stayed on the slope of the volcano.
6.6 Villagers did not evacuate because they didn’t think it was dangerous.

b. Military Officers
6.7 They were afraid of the Montana people because they were not able to predict when the volcano would erupt.

Data interpretation
6.8 Orders were given to evacuate. These orders were not given to the Montana people because they were not residents of the area.
6.9 Orders were given to evacuate. These orders were not given to the Montana people because they were not residents of the area.
6.10 Villagers did not evacuate because they did not want to leave.

Possible SLO 4 Questions: Questions on scientific approach and methods used to science and their limitations
The scientific method is taught as a list of steps. The scientists follow the steps in order to answer a scientific problem. How would you define the scientific method?

The scientific method is a series of steps followed in order to answer a scientific problem. The steps are: 1) make observations, 2) create a hypothesis, 3) test the hypothesis, 4) draw conclusions, 5) refine and test the hypothesis, and 6) publish the results.

Critical thinking/draw conclusions
6.11 The scientists did not identify all the potential hazards. They should have identified all the potential hazards before they continued their research.
6.12 The scientists did not identify all the potential hazards. They should have identified all the potential hazards before they continued their research.
6.13 The scientists did not identify all the potential hazards. They should have identified all the potential hazards before they continued their research.

Rubic Example – SLO #4
This rubric is designed for assessing student competence with lab activities, undergraduate research or presentations, or undergraduate research products such as posters or papers.

Next Steps for Program Improvement
Assessment tools will be refined during Fall 2017 in GEOL 1170 (~20 students) and TED 1100 courses. If possible, assessment tools will be tested in a larger section of GEOL 1170 (~80 students). Assessment tools will be available to other natural science GenEd instructors for modification to fit within the context of their courses.