

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-E3: Aesthetic Experiences

3. Form Completion Date: *

4/25/2023



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 core curriculum knowledge area: E3 Aesthetic Experiences includes basic visual and aural literacy, historic development of artistic forms, artistic production and culture, interpretative possibilities of artistic productions, aesthetic principles and historic precedent, fine art, cogent arguments and critical principles. In January of 2023 student artifacts were solicited from the 15 full-time and adjunct faculty who taught core approved courses for E3 Aesthetic Experiences in Winter 2022 and Fall 2022 (ARCH 2220, CST 1120, ENL 2050, ENL 2550, ENL 3850, FINA 2000, MUSM 4000, MUS 2060, PHL 3050, TRE 1310, TRE 1500, and TRE 1610). Faculty members submitted the requested randomly selected artifacts: three from each of their course sections, resulting in 42 total student artifacts.

Seven faculty attended a norming and scoring session in February of 2023 for inter-rater reliability using the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Rubric for E3 Aesthetic Experiences. Faculty were paired up to assess a set of student artifacts and record the rubric scores in the E3 Aesthetic Experiences 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 eight-dimension areas that reflect the core outcomes for E3 Aesthetic Experiences. 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 2.9 to 3.7, exceeding the upper milestone threshold (3.0) for seven of the eight dimensions. Students were strongest in “basic visual and aural literacy” (3.7), “artistic production & culture” (3.5), “cogent arguments” (3.5), “critical principles” (3.5), and “interpretative possibilities of artistic productions” (3.4). Students were not as strong in outcome areas “historic development of artistic forms” (3.1) and “aesthetic principles and historic precedent” (3.0), where they had to comprehend the historic development of an artistic form and locate specific works within that tradition and evaluate works of art in light of aesthetic principles and historic precedent, respectively. The area in need of strengthening is “fine art” (2.9), where students are asked to distinguish works of fine art from products of popular and vernacular culture.

During the follow-up discussion session, faculty shared their thoughts about the process, the rubric, and their recommendations to improve student learning. Recommendations for rubric improvement included removal of the adverbs that describe the extent to which students demonstrate outcome attainment (e.g. fully comprehends, explicitly distinguishes, thoroughly formulates, and assiduously evaluates). Moreover, faculty suggested using a rubric with only three measurement categories: meets criteria at a high level, meets criteria, does not meet criteria, instead of the AAC&U VALUE Rubric scale of benchmark (1), milestone (2), milestone (3), and capstone (4).

A second concern with the rubric is statement of criteria. For example, the first criterion is phrased “Basic Visual and Aural Literacy.” This is not realistic for many E3 approved courses. Music and audio courses, for example, cannot purport to teach visual literacy. Painting/drawing courses, for example, cannot teach aural literacy. It should be revised to say “Basic Visual *or* Aural Literacy.” This is a minor tweak. It would still need to go through the Core Curriculum Committee. It would not likely result in a massive influx of new courses applying for inclusion in the E3 core knowledge area, nor would it result in a massive expulsion of existing E3 courses.

A third concern with the rubric is redundancy. There appears to be considerable overlap among the following criteria:

E3.2: Historic Development of Artistic Forms - Comprehend the historic development of an artistic form and locate specific works within that tradition.

E3.3: Artistic Production & Culture - Explain the relationship between artistic production and the culture in which it arises.

E3.4: Interpretative Possibilities of Artistic Productions - Discuss the multiple interpretative possibilities of any artistic production and how they change over time.

E3.5: Aesthetic Principles and Historic Precedent. - Evaluate works of art in light of aesthetic principles and historic precedent.

A fourth concern with the rubric is the implication of E3.6: Fine Art - Distinguish works of fine art from products of popular and vernacular culture. E3.6 is problematic because “it establishes a hierarchy based on privilege. The wording brings a bias toward the works that are included in the ‘canon’ which is created by the privileged few, those are those in power that define ‘fine art’ from ‘vernacular’. This outcome touches on being discriminatory, privileged and unequitable.”

Faculty expressed optimism that the process of assessment can enhance pedagogy and expressed delight at the pedagogical creativity of their colleagues’ assignments. Faculty recommendations included following through with the Core Curriculum Committee to make the stated revisions to the E3 rubric and contacting the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to facilitate interdisciplinary sessions that promote pedagogical exchanges.