



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 *

A1-Oral Communication

3. Form Completion Date: *

3/29/2024



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. *

The Communication Studies – CST 1010 Fundamentals of Speech course builds students' confidence in communicating with a live, immediate audience by emphasizing speech delivery skills, audience and adaptation, message organization, use of supporting material, and building of credibility. The CST 1010 course lays a solid foundation for students to effectively apply and further develop their oral communication skills within their major course of study.

This was the first round of assessment since the pilot program in 2020. The assessment used a rubric that varied from one used in the pilot program. The two full-time faculty and three adjunct faculty who teach the course were involved in every phase of the assessment. In the fall 2023 semester faculty made video recordings of student speeches that were used as artifacts for assessment. A total of 21 artifacts – three artifacts randomly selected from each of seven sections of the course – were submitted for evaluation. Faculty met for a norming and scoring session on February 15. Faculty evaluated sample artifacts and discussed the process of assessing and entering scores online. Faculty were paired up to evaluate the rest of the 21 artifacts on their own. All of the scoring/assessment of artifacts was completed by February 29. The faculty met on March 14 to discuss the process and the outcomes of the assessment.

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. *

Results, Planned Actions, and/or Actions Taken

Results showed that the overall mean rubric score was 3.2. All outcomes on the rubric scored above the 3.0 milestone, with the exception of outcome A1.5: Delivery Skills, which had an average of 2.8. Our scores are higher in the support area from the 2020 assessment. It's likely a result of added emphasis on supporting materials after discussing the 2020 assessment, in which that area was found needing improvement.

Faculty Observed several areas of strength, including use of supporting materials (outcome A1.6) and ethical purpose (outcome A1.2). It was also noted that audience analysis and adaptation (A1.3) was a strong point.

Areas in Need of Strengthening: The lowest mean score on the rubric was delivery skills, which scored 2.8. It was noted, however, that some of the artifacts received lower scores during assessment than the grades for those speeches during the semester. It was suggested that one reason for this may be the fact that evaluators were scoring the artifact on a screen, rather than in a room. It is much more difficult to gauge the speaker's delivery (and interaction with the audience) when watching after the fact on a screen. It is possible that this score is artificially low for the reason listed above.

Strategies for Improvement: Faculty were involved in lively discussion about the process, the rubric, and the outcomes. Faculty mentioned being impressed with specific elements of their colleagues' assignments and teaching and suggested that more discussions about pedagogy would be beneficial. It was suggested that we may want to add an extra emphasis on delivery skills in future semesters. Additionally, it was unanimously agreed that the rubric should be changed for future assessment. The "extemporaneous" component should be under the heading of delivery, not under the heading of organization.

With the goal of continuous improvement, all of the faculty agreed to meet in August for a focused conversation in which each colleague will bring suggestions for improvements in one or more rubric areas.