



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 *

Integrating Theme 1 - Reading, Writing, & Research Across the University

3. Form Completion Date: *

8/20/2024



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. *

Integrating Theme 1 – Reading, Writing & Research Across the University is evaluated using nine learning outcomes. These outcomes were assessed using fifty-seven randomly collected artifacts from the nineteen course sections that satisfy IT1 and were taught in Winter 2023 and Fall 2024: ARCH 2220; BIO 4990 (2 sections); BUS 2310; CIVE 3450; ENGR 1080; ENL 3030; ENL 3080; HSA 4700; NUR 4500 (3 sections); PHL 3410; PYC 2500 (2 sections); PYC 3420 (2 sections); PYC 3430; and SWK 2050. Three artifacts were collected from each course instructor in January 2024 using the approved process for core-curriculum artifact collection. The artifacts were assessed by thirteen faculty members who had taught IT1 courses and who attended two different norming and scoring sections (due to scheduling difficulties).

The faculty members who attended the norming and scoring sessions were: Linda Slowik, Evan Peterson, Michelle Whalen, Aloha VanCamp, Eva Nyutu, Emily Dowgwillo, Linda Thiel, Enrique Ledesma, Michelle Andrzejak, Miao Qian, Isaac Pickell, Nassif Rayess and James Lynch. The norming sessions took place on February 27th and March 1st. The participating faculty were assigned the task of assessing two or three courses using the five-point rubric scale and enter their ratings on the common spreadsheet. The rubric includes a rating of NA which is used when the rater feels that an assignment did not address a learning outcome and thus the student was not given the opportunity to demonstrate learning attainment. A subgroup of the raters reconvened on Monday, May 6 to discuss the results. In attendance were Linda Thiel, Eva Nyutu, Linda Slowik, Enrique Ledesma, Aloha VanCamp, James Lynch and Nassif Rayess. There were several excused absences.

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 mean rubric dimension scores ranged from 2.8 to 3.3, which is indicative of upper milestone attainment. The dimensions with the highest scores of 3.3 were IT1.1 (Develop a purposeful writing process) and IT1.6 (Citing resources). The second highest score of 3.2 was for IT1.4 (Summarize main ideas). Receiving scores of 3.1 were IT1.2 (Comprehend and practice ethical methods) and IT1.8 (Demonstrate proficiency in standard written English). Learning outcomes IT1.3 (Develop and use comprehension strategies), IT1.5 (Employ research strategies) and IT1.7 (Develop rhetorical strategies for target audiences) received a mean score of 3.0. The dimension with the lowest score of 2.8 was IT1.9 (Writing scientific papers). It is important to note that these scores mask a relatively high number of NA ratings, particularly for IT1.9 (87 NAs or 75% of total). The learning outcomes with 25% or more NAs were IT1.2 (51 NAs or 44%), IT1.1 (40 NAs or 34%) and IT1.3 (39 NAs or 34%). The discussions that took place during the scoring and norming sessions and in subsequent discussions centered mainly on the situation with the NAs and how to address it. The following is a summary of the discussions:

- The evaluators felt that a single artifact is unlikely to effectively capture all nine learning outcomes and thus a portfolio of artifacts might be a better option. This should be communicated to the instructors at the time of artifact collection.
- IT1.9 (Writing Scientific Papers) states the following: When writing scientific papers, describe and apply basic empirical research methods, including research design, analysis of data and of causal relationships, and interpretation of results. A large number of courses deemed to satisfy the IT1 Integrating Theme are not designed to have students write scientific papers and thus cannot address the IT1.9 learning outcome. It is thus the recommendation of the evaluators that courses with NAs on IT1.9 not be subject to the Continuous Improvement process.
- IT1.2 (Comprehend and practice ethical methods) states the following: Comprehend and practice ethical methods to avoid plagiarism and infringements of copyright regulations. While practicing ethical methods can be easily gauged from a written artifact, comprehension of ethics might not be obvious. Some evaluators recommended adding a separate reflection assignment to address the issue of comprehension while others advocated focusing on whether students practiced ethical methods with comprehension being inferred.

- IT1.1 (Develop a purposeful writing process) states that following: Develop a purposeful writing process appropriate to the argumentative and analytic nature of academic work that includes generating ideas, focusing, drafting, and revising—revision being a process that involves reflection, editing, feedback and publishing for a particular audience. The stipulation in this outcome is that students are to submit a draft assignment, receive feedback from the instructor and revise accordingly. Submitting both the draft as well as the final version of the artifact might help reduce the numbers of NAs
- IT1.3 (Develop and use comprehension strategies) states the following: Develop and use metacognitive or alternative strategies in order to comprehend text and other resource content. Some evaluators felt that this outcome was hard to assess. There is no reliable mechanism to assess what strategy a student might have used to comprehend a text from reading the artifact. Also, properly assessing comprehension necessitates that the evaluator have access to the various sources and takes the time to read them. Even if that was possible, the fact that the evaluator might not have any background on the subject matter could be a major hinderance.
- In sum, the evaluators expressed a great deal of frustration with the learning outcomes discussed above because of lack of applicability as is the case with IT1.9 or because of how they were written.