

Core Curriculum Outcomes Assessment Summary Form

This form is to be completed by a representative from the Core Curriculum Assessment Sub-Committee. The information provided in this form will be used by University of Detroit Mercy to inform stakeholder groups about Detroit Mercy's commitment to the intellectual, spiritual, moral and social development of all undergraduate students as they navigate through the Core Curriculum. A PDF version of this completed form will be posted to the Academic Affairs Assessment website.

1. CORE OUTCOMES INFORMATION

Core Curriculum Area *

- ☒ Knowledge Area
- ☐ Integrating Theme

2. Enter the Knowledge Area or Integrating Theme of the Outcomes Assessed:

For example, KA-A1. Oral Communication or Integrating Theme 1 - Reading, Writing, & Research Across The University *

KA-C1: Physical Science

3. Form Completion Date: *

5/13/2021



4. Assessment Overview

Briefly share how the outcome identified above was assessed. Include semester and year, how student artifacts were collected, who performed the assessment, and what assessment tool was used. *

3 Artifacts (student-generated documents) were collected from 7 courses labeled as C1 in the Fall of 2020 and spanned 10 sections. • BIO 1210: General Biology I • BIO 2300/BIO 2310: Human Anatomy and Physics I • CHM 1030: Chemistry in Society • PHY 1080: History of the Universe • PHY 1600: General Physics I • SCIE 1030: Environmental Science 6 Faculty members were recruited and trained using the common rubric for C1: Physical Sciences, which was based on the AAC&U Values Rubric (see appended rubric). These faculty members were paired in teams of 2 and given 8-11 artifacts to score (total n= 26). Each artifact was scored individually on a scale from 0 – 4 (with an option of N/A being used for artifacts that did not allow students to demonstrate any learning within a specific outcome area). Both reader's scores were then entered into an excel spreadsheet and then averaged between the two readers' scores. Faculty members who had participated in the norming and scoring of student artifacts were invited to attend this follow-up discussion along with other faculty members who had taught C1 courses in Fall 2020.

5. Results, Planned Actions, and/or Actions Taken

Briefly summarize the assessment results and how they are being used. Include a summary of faculty discourse captured during the norming session, the rubric score and scale, an interpretation of the score, and plans to enhance student learning. *

The results were as follows: C1.1: Science Literacy was the cleanest outcome to assess and score for the readers. All scored documents (n=26) were given scores between 2 and 4, with the average mean of 3.3. C1.2: Empirical Methodology was the second cleanest outcome to assess and score for the readers with a large majority of documents (n=24) getting scores between 2 and 4. The mean rubric score for this outcome was 3.3. C1.3: Interdisciplinarity was significantly more difficult to assess, with a large number of artifacts (n=15) rated as "unable to assess" according to the scorers. A mean rubric score might be 3.2, but this was for only 11 of the 26 documents scored. C1.4: Ethical Boundaries was another difficult category to assess. A large number of artifacts were considered "unable to assess" (n=17) by our scorers. A mean rubric score might be 2.9, but this was for only 9 of the 26 documents scored. C1.5: Social Impact was equally difficult to assess based on the provided artifacts. A larger number of artifacts (n=13) were scored as "unable to assess" by our scorers. A mean rubric score might be 3.3, but this was for only 13 of the 26 documents scored. During our follow-up discussion faculty noted that scoring C1.1 and C1.2 was fairly straightforward in almost all of the submitted artifacts and that 3.3 for both categories met a threshold benchmark that they were satisfied with. Despite overall satisfaction, faculty members expressed interest in follow-up workshops where they, as group, could review the rubric before the next assessment cycle and arrive at a stronger consensus about key terms within the rubric (e.g., "literacy" and how they saw the application of empirical methodology being used within assignments). The inability to properly assess student learning outcomes C1.3-5 was addressed through two key recommendations from faculty members. 1.) Since proposals that were submitted and approved through the Core Curriculum Committee had included more than a single assignment/student artifact to address each of the 5 learning outcomes, faculty suggested that they be allowed to submit more than one document to show where and how students were demonstrating learning in their courses. A single artifact did not successfully capture student learning and, therefore, the assessment process provided only a piece of the picture during this assessment cycle. They were open to the possibility that a single assignment could hit multiple outcomes, but that few felt that a single assignment could hit ALL outcomes. 2.) Faculty members also suggested developing a worksheet that allowed them to connect assignments to learning outcomes. This worksheet could be completed before the semester in which they taught a C1 course to help them prepare for artifact submission.