2016-17 Assessment Mini-Grant Posters
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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 infall2016. If multiple SLOs are being measured by a single assessment tool, responses were reported together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Total # Students</th>
<th>Who Met or Exceeded</th>
<th>Who Met or Exceeded</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%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

ASSESSMENT TOOLS CREATED
1. The design and development of scoring rubrics for the SLO assessment in the CSCI 8910 course, and
2. The data collection, summarization, and analysis of the student performance in the CSCI 8910 course, and the data integration toward the development of the SLO assessment report for the MS-CS program.

Next Steps
- The results of administered assessment will be reviewed and evaluated by the MSCS Graduate Program Committee in fall 2017 semester.
- The rubrics will be revisited after collecting feedbacks from the GPC and the students taking the course in fall 2017.
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 definitions (Mills, et al., 2017; Schneider and Kruey, 2015). Multicultural dispositions are less defined compared to the larger dispositions definition (NCATE, 2008). In addition to NCATE, dispositional standards are supported by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, an agency that collaborates with state teacher licensing departments (Council of Chief School Officers, 2011). Critics contend that dispositions (a) are currently defined in non-scientific ways that allow for too much subjective interpretation (Borko, Liston and Whitcomb, 2007; Damon, 2007; Duplass and Cruz, 2010; Murray, 2007), (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 (Allah, 2007). Even scholars who are confidant of these agreements do not feel properly equipped to guide students benefit greatly from instruction that encourages an educator code of ethics that can be properly assessed (Burt, Chubbuck and Whipp, 2007; Dize, 2007). Despite the lack of meritlessly sound assessment measures and tools, we must find creative ways to provide on-going constructive feedback for teacher candidates not only for skills and knowledge, but also developmental dispositions (Borko, Liston and Whitcomb, 2007; Duplass and Cruz, 2010; DeGoncalves, Boger, and Wyoda, 2017).

Method

Dispositional assessment accounts for 15% of a student’s grade in TES 220. This study investigates the student self-reflected portion of the assessment. The design of the study included a pre and post survey of the race and human relations perceptions of education majors. Students utilized a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) to answer 24 selected multicultural dispositions statements found on the Multicultural Dispositions Index (MDI), and 12 dispositional 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 aid potential for self-disclosure bias (i.e., a tendency to respond in ways to gain approval of others) and maximization validity and subject anonymity:

1. Anonymity responses – students used a 4-digit number as an identifier;
2. Survey was voluntary in nature;
3. The grade given for the exercise was done on a pass/fail basis for completion of the task;
4. The importance of authentic reflective thinking for educators was addressed beforehand;
5. A pre-discussion of the importance of avoiding self-deception in survey research, as well as the need to provide honest answers and not just ones that instructors like to hear;
6. Someone-long thus given regarding the practice of disagreeing without being disrespectful and that there is not necessarily right or wrong to keep peace or get along; and
7. After receiving the treatment, i.e., critical pedagogical brand of multicultural instruction, students privately compared their pre and post scores and reflected on the difference between the two.

In addition to the above, several quality control questions were included as way to cross-check consistency of responses. Those included a chance to rate (a) the instructor’s attempt to encourage students to think for themselves and not just become a carbon copy of him, (b) whether or not students felt confident in their Mallorca’s statements, (c) whether or not students perform self-assessment is a worthy curriculum inclusion, and (d) personal and professional growth or lack thereof. Utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program, the following statistical analyses were conducted: (1) A summation of descriptive data, including student rankings of the dispositions and the impact the course had on personal and professional growth, (2) A paired-samples t-test analysis of pretest to posttest mean score differences to assess the impact of dispositional instruction, and (3) Several ANOVA analyses to estimate relationships between responses, pretest and posttest scores as they are potentially mediated by selected demographic attributes variables.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Critical and Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1. I am aware of the mental games that I can potentially play with others and myself</td>
<td>2.605</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2. I am aware of mental games I play with others or myself</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3. I can work with the elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.1. I can work with the elderly and the frail</td>
<td>3.647</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.204</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4. I can practice and participate in multicultural activities</td>
<td>3.647</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.204</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5. I can work with LGBTQ populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.1. I can work with LGBTQ populations and help them</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6. I am a good role model for kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6.1. I am a good role model for kids and hear</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.7. I can work with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.7.1. I can work with others and appreciate their cultural differences</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.8. I admit to a slightly defensive attitude after the first few classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.8.1. I admit to a slightly defensive attitude after the first few classes. and I am not quite sure</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.9. I can disagree w/o being disagreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.9.1. I can disagree w/o being disagreeable and I can work with the elderly</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.10. I can work with people different from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.10.1. I can work with people different from me and I can work with the elderly</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


discuss

Conclusions and Future Directions

Identification of 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 curriculums; (3) I can work with the opposite gender; (4) I possess sound reasoning abilities; (5) I am important not to be a Pollyanna thinker; (6) I actively work on my biases. All of these areas showed an increase in the multicultural dispositions posttest. The correlation showed the most change with a large effect size was: (7) I am aware of the mental games that I can potentially play with others and myself.

Multiple Benefits: The adoption of a dispositional approach to teacher training encourages educators to critically reflect and grow much further and feel good multicultural education. Dispositional benefits go beyond simply making minority students feel included. Major 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 the interaction of development, 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 language 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 taught. 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 Science and Diversity in the U.S. population. The grant supported development of a scoring rubric designed to reflect students’ performance on the objectives.

Methods

The course builds on weekly assignments toward the final semester project, which is a Public Service Announcement (PSA) regarding a specific communication impairment (e.g., stuttering, aphasia, TBI). The project is evaluated for grading purposes using a grading rubric and for purposes of the General Education Learning Outcomes, it is evaluated using the attached rubric. The General Education SLO rubric is not used as the basis for grading. The General Education SLO rubric is not used as the basis for assessment. The PSA assignment is assessed as a formative assignment. The course builds on weekly assignments toward the final semester project, which is a Public Service Announcement that could alert a target audience to 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 taught. 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 Science 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 addressed 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

Social Science SLOs: Option B – General Education Course-Level Assessment: SPED 1400; Spring, 2017

Kathy L Coufal, PhD
Special Education and Communication Disorders

Conclusion and Future Directions

Development of the rubric, grading assignments as needed, and using this in an ongoing collection of performance data will allow for summative data to be reported. This will facilitate inclusion of this assignment/project and application of the rubric to the dual-credit course, when it is tested in the General Education curriculum.
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 disability 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.

Rubric

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

Results (n= 77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #1</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of individuals with disabilities</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical issues</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #2, 3</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical issues</td>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #2</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #3</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #3</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation of plot themes learn in class</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately addressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome #5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Developing | 3 | 4%
| Not adequately addressed | 1 | 1% |
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Option B –
General Education
Course Assessments
Successful Student Learning Outcomes shall be able to do the following:

Natural and Physical Sciences: Demonstrate a broad understanding of various natural and/or physical phenomena that surround an ecosystem functions. These biological phenomena form the basis for making personal and public policy decisions about issues including health outcomes and influences on our lives.

Natural and Physical science. Students develop hypotheses, gather and analyze data, then draw conclusions based on their results. Students are also required to communicate their results and interpretations. By completing similar requirements, students are introduced to limitations introduced by variability. Students also need design experiments that allow them to test hypotheses. Students are expected to use basic statistical terminology and use statistical software. Students use these statistical tools to determine significance of hypothesis tests. Students are expected to describe their conclusions in a clear and logical manner.

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 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 logically easier.

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

• Change of the course content regarding organizational 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 organizational 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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nI</td>
<td>nI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong</td>
<td>Wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pI</td>
<td>zI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where nl 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).

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:

\[ \hat{\mu} = \frac{nI + nI - 1}{n - 1} + \frac{nI + nI}{n - 1} \]

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

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

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 \( pl, nl, \) and \( pl \) 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.

Each instructor compares their item level results to the national average and makes appropriate pedagogical changes in the next iteration of the class. As only the instructor and the assessment coordinator sees the instructor level reports, there is no incentive to ‘game’ the system.

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.

Smith 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>( \gamma )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>( \gamma_N )</th>
<th>( \alpha_N )</th>
<th>( f_N )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where \( \gamma, \alpha, \) and \( f \) are the ECON 2200 averages aggregated to the SLO. \( \gamma_N, \alpha_N, \) and \( f_N \) are the national averages.

Resources


Questions? Contact Ben Smith at bosmith@unomaha.edu
Description of the Assessment

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.

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.

Results (or Timeline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Total # of Products Assessed</th>
<th>Number of Products That Met or Exceeded Proficiency Target</th>
<th>Percentage of Products That Met or Exceeded Proficiency Target</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Proficiency Target Percentage of Products That Met or Exceeded Proficiency Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficiency Target

Documents were scored using a 1-4 competency levels. Documents scored with a 3 or higher were considered proficient.

Student Learning Outcomes

- Demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of interactions between human motivations, institutional forces, and 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.

Interpretation and/or Next Steps for Program Improvement

Committee members realized that having the assignment description was vital to understanding which SLO the assignment was designed to meet. 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 SL0s at once, which seemed unfair 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 drift toward the middle when scoring artifacts. This drifting may also have come from the fact that members did not or did not know how 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 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.

References


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 I taught with different pedagogies.

The assessment is conducted in the three different sections of the same HIST 1000 course 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 (RTP) role-playing simulations;

c) HIST 1000 - section 009 - TLC: World Civilization I (ca. 25 students) – course consisting of three Reacting to the Past (RTP) 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.

Students in the three classes are administered a short test on the second week of the semester (to account for possible discrepancies in the students’ entry levels) and another test on the last week of the semester. The tests are identical for the three classes and consist of the analysis and comprehension of an historical source or artifact that students are not familiar with. The tests are then evaluated with the ad hoc rubric created for this project.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>High Developing</th>
<th>Low Developing</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition</td>
<td>Demonstrates partial understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition</td>
<td>Demonstrates no understanding of the theories, methods, and concepts used to comprehend and respond to the human condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize, articulate, and explore how various humanists/artists have responded to the human condition</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete recognition, articulation, and exploration of the works of humanists/artists</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the recognition, articulation, and exploration of the works of humanists/artists</td>
<td>Demonstrates partial recognition, articulation, and exploration of the works of humanists/artists</td>
<td>Demonstrates no recognition, articulation, and exploration of the works of humanists/artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates complete understanding of the evolution of human thought and behavior through the ages</td>
<td>Demonstrates complete understanding of the evolution of human thought and behavior through the ages</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the evolution of human thought and behavior through the ages</td>
<td>Demonstrates partial understanding of the evolution of human thought and behavior through the ages</td>
<td>Demonstrates no understanding of the evolution of human thought and behavior through the ages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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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 (Introduction to Psychology I) 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%, 78%, 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 or 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 how each of them compared with my 70% target. The averages for 2 of 14 essay questions, and for 19 of 40 multiple choice questions did not reach the 70% target. I also performed paired t-tests on each of the 40 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 not a statistically significant increase in average scores from pre- to post-test, indicating that students did not learn these topics. Data for these comparisons and analyses are not presented here, but are available upon request.

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
Program SLOs & Assessment Measures

Before Assessment Mini-Grant:
- Six Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and multiple course-specific rubrics
- No changes in SLOs since 2009. Minor revisions and improvements to the assurance of learning process and assessment tools and rubrics.

After Assessment Mini-Grant:
- March 31, 2017: Major revision to MAcc Program SLOs and associated rubrics
- SLO and rubric revisions were driven by recent changes in the MAcc program including new Contemporary Business Environment courses and new degree concentrations.
- Four SLOs better address the relevant outcomes for graduate students and the implementation of common rubrics across multiple courses.

Revised MAcc Program Learning Goals (SLOs) and assessment measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students demonstrate</th>
<th>Assessment Measure</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: advanced accounting knowledge.</td>
<td>Rubric (revised 3/31/17)</td>
<td>Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: proficiency in analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing information (critical thinking). New Goal (3/31/17) replaces previous Goal 2</td>
<td>Rubric (adopted 3/31/17) applied to students' projects in multiple graduate accounting core courses</td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: understanding of ethical issues and consequences of ethical choices</td>
<td>Rubric applied to students' submitted case analyses</td>
<td>Product or Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4, Objective 1: effective oral communication skills in a formal presentation. (Renumbered from Goal 6 to Goal 4 as of 3/31/17)</td>
<td>Rubric (revised 3/31/17) applied to formal presentations in multiple graduate accounting core courses. Common rubric applied across core courses provides consistent program-level expectations and could be adapted for grading.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4, Objective 2: effective written communication skills. (Renumbered from Goal 6 to Goal 4 as of 3/31/17)</td>
<td>Rubric (revised 3/31/17) applied to assignments in multiple graduate accounting core courses. Common rubric applied across core courses provides consistent program-level expectations and could be adapted for grading</td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric Example – SLO 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completeness of Review</td>
<td>Response demonstrates mastery of the subject. All parts of the question are thoroughly answered</td>
<td>Response demonstrates satisfactory understanding if the subject based on adequate details and elaboration</td>
<td>Response demonstrates unsatisfactory understanding of the subject based on lack of details or elaboration. Substantial parts of the question are not answered fully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity of Facts and Perspectives</td>
<td>All facts, conclusions, and statements are accurate and valid. They also logically support the topic being discussed</td>
<td>Most of the facts, conclusions, and statements are accurate and/or valid. The majority of the facts, conclusions, and statements are incorrect and/or invalid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Higher-Order Cognitive Processes</td>
<td>Use of higher-order thinking such as understanding, applying, analyzing, or evaluating demonstrates depth and breadth of knowledge</td>
<td>Higher-order thinking skills such as understanding, applying, analyzing, or evaluating are evident but limited in nature. No or very little evidence of higher-order thinking skills such as understanding, applying, analyzing, or evaluating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Overall Learning Goal 1 Results:
- Exceeds Expectations on LG 1 if Exceeds Expectations on all 4 courses tested.
- Meets Expectations on LG 1 if neither Exceeds nor Does Not Meet Expectations.
- Does Not Meet Expectations on LG 1 if Does Not Meet Expectations on more than 1 course.

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.
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

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.
B.S. Computer Science Program Assessment

Sanjiv Singh and Parvathi Chundi,
Department of Computer Science, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182

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>Abilities Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Partially Meets</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>All project requirements are implemented and there are numerous solid tests and invalid tests 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>Not all project requirements have a corresponding implementation module. Or not all requirements have at least one valid and invalid test.</td>
<td>Not applicable or intractable implementation is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SLO2:</td>
<td>SLO2:</td>
<td>SLO2:</td>
<td>SLO2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>SLO3:</td>
<td>SLO3:</td>
<td>SLO3:</td>
<td>SLO3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SLO4:</td>
<td>SLO4:</td>
<td>SLO4:</td>
<td>SLO4:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficiency Target

At least 80% of students should be rated at “Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations” in each of the metrics.

Results

Data was collected from Capstone class in Spring of 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Total # Students</th>
<th>Who Participated in End-of-Program Assessment</th>
<th># Who Meet or Exceed Proficiency Score</th>
<th>% Who Meet or Exceed Proficiency Score</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Program's Proficiency Target?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33, 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.61%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</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.
- Revist the issues raised in articulating the SLOs, particularly whether to strengthen the focus on CS theory over software engineering practice.
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Description of the Assessment

The COUN 8250 course focuses on the development and implementation of effective counseling services. The course is designed to align with the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards. Students are expected to demonstrate proficiency in various areas, including ethical practice, professional orientation, and multicultural competence. The course emphasizes the integration of theoretical knowledge with practical skills.

Initial Step: Curriculum Map Re-Design

Using CACREP standards (SLOs) as the baseline, and based on the re-designed curriculum map, faculty first utilized Core and Program-specific matrices to provide a sustainable framework for rubric design. While CACREP has 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 Livest&via Coordinator (Kim Gangadharan), COE assessment coordinator, and Associate Dean. The department instituted a new vetting process to ensure consistency across programs. The examples below show how CACREP SLOs are being addressed.

Assessment/Program Improvement & Development

Following data collection, faculty utilized Livest&via 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 data, the faculty meets to discuss findings to inform the department over and individual coursework/requirements specifically. This culminates the department’s new assessment program. The document below is the formal document used by each faculty member to assess the rubric/SLO data in their respective class.

Final Step: Rubric Implementation

Implementation of an ongoing framework for rubric design.

Rubric Design

Rubric Design has been a collaborative effort, with faculty receiving vital assistance from the COE’s Livest&via Coordinator (Kim Gangadharan), COE assessment coordinator, and Associate Dean. The department instituted a new vetting process to ensure consistency across programs. The examples below show how CACREP SLOs are being addressed.

Assessment/Program Improvement & Development

Following data collection, faculty utilized Livest&via 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 data, the faculty meets to discuss findings to inform the department over and individual coursework/requirements specifically. This culminates the department’s new assessment program. The document below is the formal document used by each faculty member to assess the rubric/SLO data in their respective class.
The University of Nebraska does not discriminate based on race, color, ethnicity, national origin, sex, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, disability, age, genetic information, veteran status, marital status, and/or political affiliation in its programs, activities, or employment.

ENGLISH MA Program Assessment

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

Student Learning Outcomes

SLO #1: Graduating MA Students will demonstrate a professional sense of Genre and Culture and History

SLO #2: Graduating MA Students will demonstrate a professional application of Critical Approaches

Proiciency Target

For SLO #1 proficiency was a 3.0 or higher on a four point scale with a target of 80%.

For SLO #2 proficiency was a 3.0 or higher on a four point scale with a target of 80%.

Description of the Assessment

SLO #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric or artifact measured</th>
<th>MA Comprehensive Exams from Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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) and readers will then have a scoring 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>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric or artifact measured</th>
<th>MA Comprehensive Exams from Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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) and readers will then have a scoring 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>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

SLO #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric or artifact measured</th>
<th>Artifacts Measured</th>
<th>Assessment Categories</th>
<th>Total Measures</th>
<th>Measure requiring 2nd Reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult. &amp; Hist.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shr. of Voice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric or artifact measured</th>
<th>Artifacts Measured</th>
<th>Assessment Categories</th>
<th>Total Measures</th>
<th>Measure requiring 2nd Reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult. &amp; Hist.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shr. of Voice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubrics

Scoring Guide

Process

Scoring Session

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 Fall 2015 were used for this assessment, while SLO #1 was not approved by our Graduate Program Committee until Fall 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 rubrics
- 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 conversations as a cohort and with our Graduate Program Committee much richer and more likely to spark long-term programmatic change.
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>

Data from the item analysis from the Spring 2017 results.

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>

Figure 1. Breakdown of test question type of new comprehensive examination.

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.
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 from non-majors and students who completed the survey outside of regular class time were excluded from the analysis (remaining N = 270).

Statistics
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.

5. Percent of students who gave a positive response to the question: Assuming I don’t know the answer, I will answer “I don’t know” 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.

Correct Responses Across the Major

4. For some topics (psychology as a science) students started with a high level of understanding that was maintained across the major. In identification of both a statistical definition and a correct APA citation, students improved in higher-level classes with nearly 100% of students correctly answering these questions at the start of the capstone laboratory course. Students’ understanding of anecdotal evidence started slightly over 50%, but did not improve in higher-level classes. Their ability to identify statistical tests and interpretation of statistical concepts improved as students progressed through the major. However, less than 50% of students were able identify the correct answer to these statistics questions, no matter what class level they were in when they took the survey.

Summary and Conclusions
- Consultation with department faculty helped to clarify our assessment strategies.
- Survey style and online delivery of assessment minimized faculty workload and disruption to course curriculum.
- Surveys were formulated to include questions of facts and concepts that matched SLO goals.
- Different survey questions were used for each course. This allows for repeated use of surveys because students will not have encountered identical questions across classes.
- Students showed progress in areas such as knowledge of APA writing and scientific concepts.
- Students’ retention of statistical concepts needs improvement.
- We obtained IRB approval to allow presentations and publication of assessment strategies and results.

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.
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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 that 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
• Research existing poster rubrics and created a new rubric to assess senior thesis papers; pilot tested poster rubric in spring 2017
• Designed eight vignettes to capture students' 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 to be able to articulate the role of sociology and 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. 

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)
• present research findings (4c)

Students graduating with a major in sociology will see the relevance of sociology and 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; RI</td>
<td>Question is too narrow/ broad.</td>
<td>Question is focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background &amp; Rationale</td>
<td>Not clearly presented or well-constructed.</td>
<td>Relevancy and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods &amp; Analysis Plan</td>
<td>Methods are developed and appropriate.</td>
<td>Discuss research question and answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion is inadequately summarized.</td>
<td>Adequate organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Design</td>
<td>Sections are developed.</td>
<td>Adequate use of graphs and figures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>3-9 = Developing</td>
<td>10-14 = Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proficiency Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Program-level SLO addressed</th>
<th>Proficiency Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Thesis Paper</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Target is that 70% of students are considered to be proficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Exit Survey</td>
<td>10a, 10b, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignettes</td>
<td>1c, 10a, 10b</td>
<td>A score of 9 or greater is considered proficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revisions & Data Collection Timeline

Fall 2017
• Pilot new 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 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 Qualtrics
• Present a revised program-level SLO assessment plan to our Department & obtain approval
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 the project and writing a paper that describes the project. Include the following components:

- **Description of the Student:** Provide an objective 3-paragraph description of the student that includes information regarding the student’s eligibility for special education services. Include 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.

- **IEP Goal:** Identify an IEP goal that will be the focus of this project. The IEP Goal needs to include the components of audience, behavior, criterion, and degree of criteria. All goals should include the four components: audience, behavior, criterion, and degree of criterion.

- **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 4 weeks of intervention is necessary for this project. The student’s response to intervention is measured during each of the two 4-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.

- **Interventions and Procedures:** Describe the intervention you have chosen to implement in detail so it could be replicated. Be sure to include the procedures you used to implement it.

- **Evidence-Based Research Synthesis:** Find three recent (within past 10 years) empirical research articles on academic, peer-reviewed journal that supports each intervention for the IEP goal that you selected, and submit a 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.

- **Visual Representation of the Data Using Technology:** Data must be clearly graphed with a graph that includes baseline, the entire, weekly data points, both axes of the graph clearly depicted. Technology has been used to develop the graph of the data collected.

- **Data Analysis:** Analyze 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 an adopted intervention in an attempt to reverse the unique needs of the learner, describe these modifications.

- **Recommendations:** Based on the data collected, determine recommendations for future instruction. If the 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 reach the long-term goal.

- **Student Learning Outcomes**

  - Understand how exceptionalities may influence with development and learning and use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.
  - Create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments that respect individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-awareness.
  - Use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.
  - Use multiple methods of assessment and data sources in making educational decisions.
  - Select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.
  - Use foundational knowledge of the field and their professional Ethical Principles and Practice Standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.
  - 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**

![Data Based-Decision Making Project Rubric](image)

---

**Program Assessment of the Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders**
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Proficiency Target</th>
<th>Interpretation and/or Next Steps for Program Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS 1: Student Learning</td>
<td>Candidate provides examples of how instruction/programming fosters an equitable and accessible learning environment.</td>
<td>• Review of Pilot Data by TED Graduate Capstone Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS 2: Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>Candidate uses instructional strategies to meet the criteria for “Target” on 6 of 7 indicators in the rubric.</td>
<td>• Review of Pilot Data by TED Graduate Programs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS 3: Evidence-Based Decision Making</td>
<td>Candidate uses evidence-based decision making to foster student learning.</td>
<td>• Use of Feedback to revise Graduate Capstone Assessment Instructions and Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS 4: Open-Mindedness</td>
<td>Candidate is open-minded and critical in their decision making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS 5: Multiple Perspectives</td>
<td>Candidate uses a reflection framework that considers multiple perspectives related to teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS 6: Use of Formal and Informal Assessment</td>
<td>Candidate uses formal and informal assessments to track performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS 7: Reflection of Practice and Theory</td>
<td>Candidate describes interactions with students but does not reflect on his/her practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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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 as 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 may also 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.
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Option D – General Education Program Assessments
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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.

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 that focuses 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 inclusion questions included that addressed SLO #1- specific to volcanoes. SLO #2- focused on students’ own experience of volcanic phenomena, 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.

Rubric Example – SLO #4
This rubric is designed for assessing student competence in 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 1104 (70+ students) and TED 1100 courses. If possible, assessment tools will be tested in a larger section of GEOL 1104 (~80 students). Assessment tools will be available to other natural science GenEd instructors for modification to fit within the context of their courses.