

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-F1. Ethics

3. Form Completion Date: *

5/10/2023



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. *

F1 faculty were contacted to submit artifact in the fall of 2022. All artifacts were submitted before the end of the term. A norming and scoring session was held 2/16/2023 during which artifacts were assigned to pairs of F1 faculty. Artifacts were scored according to the F1 rubric and practical criteria that emerged from the norming and scoring session. Our reflection session was held 4/21/2023.

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. *

Preliminary note: Some of the F1 faculty expressed a preference for being informed with greater advance notice that the F1 assessment cycle was approaching. Some faculty collect written hard copy assignments that get thrown away before they realize that they should have held onto those assignments/artifacts.

Scores were generally high, ranging between 3 and 4. Students did especially well with F1.1 Basic Norms, although the different kinds of artifacts provided varying reflections of defining basic other-regarding norms (F1.1 and F1.2). For instance, some artifacts were multiple choice in which students simply identified other-regarding norms while other kinds of artifacts asked students to discuss those norms. Both reflected an ability to define them.

Most of the reflection session revolved around F1.4 - comparing and contrasting basic theories of moral reasoning by evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. While all the artifact did well, case-based assignments seemed to correlate with higher F1.4 scores. Our discussion raised questions about which kinds of cases (short, long, hypothetical, real, personal, 1st-person, 3rd-person) work best in this regard.

Overall, although the scores were very good, we agreed that we must be more intentional in crafting teaching modules in assignments that are specifically tied to the F1 learning outcomes. One suggestion, is that all F1 courses uniformly insert certain questions and assignments that guarantee that artifacts speak to learning outcomes in the most measurable way. This way, we may be able to guarantee that all F1 courses address all the outcomes. With greater intentionality about this we want to teach to these outcomes.