

## 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-E2 Literary Experiences

### 3. Form Completion Date: \*

4/20/2023



### 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 learning outcomes of Knowledge Area E2-Literary Experiences were slated for assessment using E2 courses taught in Fall 2022; one course, ENL 2650, was taught in the Intersession of Winter 2023. A total of twenty-one artifacts were collected from seven offerings of the three courses: ENL 2350 Study of Fiction; ENL 2450 Study of Poetry; and ENL 2650 Study of Drama. A norming and scoring session were held on February 24, 2023 and attended by Megan Novell, Mary-Catherine Harrison, Rosemary Weatherston, Michael Barry and Stephen Pasqualina. The lead faculty facilitator was Amanda Hiber, and the co-facilitator was Nassif Rayess. The assessment work was divided in a way that every course was assessed by two faculty members. A follow-up meeting was held on March 30, 2023, to discuss the results of the assessment work, draw conclusions and share best practices. In attendance at the follow-up meetings were all faculty members who took part in the norming and scoring session except for Stephen Pasqualina who had an excused absence.

## 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 assessment work was successful albeit not straightforward. The faculty raised concerns during the norming session about outcome E2.4: Compare & Contrast Literary Theories (Compare and contrast literary theories as they complement, overlap with, or conflict with each other and with the perspectives of other disciplines). They felt that the all-encompassing nature of E2.4 made it difficult to capture in a single assignment. The faculty felt that such an assignment, if it is to be created, will limit the quality of instruction and make for a mechanical construct that is not conducive to the study of literature. After an extensive discussion that was echoed in the March 30 follow-up meeting, the faculty agreed that discussion and/or application of more than one theoretical approach in different assignments is sufficient to satisfy said outcome. Furthermore, the faculty decided that there is value in a multi-faceted understanding of what constitutes a theoretical perspective, which is relevant to outcomes E2.2 and E2.4. The functional implementation of these new understandings will be communicated by the Chair of The Department of English to the rest of the faculty (regular and adjunct) using clarifying language along with exemplar assignments and other best practices. As for the collection of artifacts, all classes used a portfolio model that collected multiple assignments. Artifacts were easily accessible and presented in a manner conducive to assessment, with the exception of one course that included a large number of files, hand-written assignments, and video links that did not direct to the target student assignment. The evaluators found it difficult to assess the artifacts from that course and for that reason assigned NA rankings across the five learning outcomes. In the future, it is recommended that instructors submit sequenced or multi-component assignments, e.g. a series of discussion board posts or in-class writing assignments, within a single file for ease of assessment. Overall, the assessment results were found to be very consistent from the two evaluators with no case where there was more than one-point difference. In sum, the assessment results excluding the NAs were:

E2.1 received an average of 3.4 with three NAs.

E2.2 received an average of 3.1 with five NAs.

E2.3 received an average of 3.2 with three NAs.

E2.4 received an average of 3.0 with five NAs.

E2.5 received an average of 3.2 with three NAs.