



## 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-A2: Written Communication

3. Form Completion Date: \*

8/7/2024



### 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 core curriculum knowledge area - A2: Written Communication includes strategies to comprehend text; summarizing main ideas; pre-writing activities; purposeful writing process; thesis statements and claims; strategy utilization to engage target audience; and appropriate use of research. In January of 2024 student artifacts were solicited from the 8 full-time and adjunct faculty who taught ENL 1310 - Academic Writing during the fall 2023 semester. Faculty members submitted the requested randomly selected artifacts: three from each of their course sections (one faculty member ended up submitting four artifacts, which I didn't realize until writing this report), resulting in 25 total student artifacts. Faculty attended a norming and scoring session in February of 2024 for inter-rater reliability using the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Rubric for A2 Written Communication. Faculty were paired up to assess a set of student artifacts and record the rubric scores in the A2 Written Communication Excel Scoring Sheet. Faculty attended a follow-up meeting to review all of the recorded rubric dimension scores and identify student strengths and weaknesses. The rubric contains seven-dimension areas that reflect the core outcomes for A2 Written Communication A four-point rubric scale was used (4=capstone, 3 and 2 = milestone, 1=benchmark) that also included NA for not applicable and a zero for when no evidence was present. A score of 3.0 was expected for each dimension area, indicating students' progression to the threshold of the upper milestone level.

## 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 set of randomly selected student artifacts yielded mean rubric dimension scores ranging from 2.8 to 3.4. Students were strongest in "strategies to comprehend text" (3.4), "pre-writing activities" (3.3), and "appropriate use of research" (3.3) where they had to develop and use metacognitive or alternative strategies to comprehend text and other resource content; engage in pre-writing activities that generate ideas and explore facts, feelings, and assumptions, while employing a process that fosters self- knowledge and further inquiry; and use appropriate research strategies with a variety of resources to support research papers and other academic arguments, including: analyzing sources for relevance to the argument, and synthesizing these sources into written work while avoiding plagiarism and infringements of copyright regulations. Students were not as strong in outcome area "strategy utilization to engage target audience" (2.8), where they had to use appropriate research strategies with a variety of resources to support research papers and other academic arguments, including: analyzing sources for relevance to the argument, and synthesizing these sources into written work while avoiding plagiarism and infringements of copyright regulations.

Some faculty submitted portfolios while others chose single assignments for artifacts; overall, faculty considered it better to assess students' work in the form of portfolios rather than one assignment that addressed all seven outcomes. Portfolios show how class assignments build off of each other to scaffold learning and understanding of all seven A2 outcomes.

Mean Score 3.4 for Learning Outcome A2.1: Develop and use metacognitive or alternative strategies to comprehend text and other resource content.

Mean Score 3.1 for Learning Outcome A2.2: Summarize the main ideas and key details of written texts and other forms of communication.

Mean Score 3.3 for Learning Outcome A2.3: Engage in pre-writing activities that generate ideas and explore facts, feelings, and assumptions, while employing a process that fosters self- knowledge and further inquiry.

Mean Score 3.0 for Learning Outcome A2.4: Develop a purposeful writing process appropriate to the argumentative or 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.

Mean Score 3.0 for Learning Outcome A2.5: Create a thesis statement or main claim and supporting claims for academic presentation and argument (on the basis of further inquiry.)

Mean Score 2.8 for Learning Outcome A2.6: Determine target audiences and demonstrate rhetorical strategies appropriate in form and tone to engage the audience using standard, discipline-appropriate academic language and documentation.

Mean Score 3.3 for Learning Outcome A2.7: Use appropriate research strategies with a variety of resources to support research papers and other academic arguments, including: analyzing sources for relevance to the argument, and synthesizing these sources into written work while avoiding plagiarism and infringements of copyright regulations.

There are four areas of focus I intend for faculty to include in their curricula. The first area of focus is rhetoric, which will help to address the lowest scored learning outcome A2.6. I also intend for all faculty to include reflection as a visible and meaningful component to our assignments; for each course to include some multimodal component, with composing rather than consuming being the goal; and for each course to include some kind of connection to students' home communities and/or the Detroit Mercy home community of Detroit. I am leaving these goals fairly open because there are a wide range of possibilities. I want faculty to choose how to include these four areas of focus and work them into their existing curricula.