



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

C2 Social Sciences

3. Form Completion Date:

9/23/2022

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: C2: Social Sciences includes major ideas and theories, scientific methodology, implications, interdisciplinarity, and research findings. In January of 2021 student artifacts were solicited from the 18 full-time and adjunct faculty who taught the core approved courses in the fall 2020 semester (AAS 3100; ECN 2950, 2960, 3050, 4355, 4705; ENGR 3110; GEO 2110; HSA 4610; POL 1000; PYC 1000, 2500, 2600, 2650; SOC 1000, 2100) and later from the three faculty who taught courses in the winter 2021 semester. Twelve faculty members submitted the requested randomly selected artifacts: three from each of their course sections, resulting in 51 total student artifacts. On February 4th, 2021, the faculty attended a norming and scoring session to ensure interrater reliability using the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Rubric for Social Sciences. The artifacts were divided equally among three pairs of faculty reviewers. Each pair reviewed the set of assigned artifacts. The pairs then submitted scores to the scoring worksheet for tabulation. On March 18, 2022, the reviewers reconvened to debrief to identify students' strengths and challenges, and to reflect on the scoring process. The rubric contains five dimensions and a four-point scale: 4 as Capstone, 3 and 2 as Milestone, 1 as Benchmark, 0 for No Evidenced, and NA for Not Applicable.

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 3.0 to 3.6, meeting or exceeding the upper milestone threshold (3.0). The strongest areas for students were "major ideas and theories" (3.6) and "implications" (3.5), where students were able to identify major ideas and theories and their application in the social sciences and evaluate the implications of qualitative and quantitative methods and their results. Two additional areas of strength were: "interdisciplinarity" (3.3) and "research findings" (3.3). Students were able to recognize the relationship between the social sciences and other academic disciplines and distinguish the use and misuse of research findings from the social sciences in public life. An area in need of strengthening was "scientific methodology" (3.0), where students were expected to recognize how scientific methodology is used to study major areas of both personal and public life. Faculty noted that the collection of artifacts submitted did not address the full range of outcomes included in the rubric. If the assignment for a submitted artifact did not present students with the opportunity to demonstrate their performance level for a given outcome then reviewers were asked to assign an NA (not applicable). Nearly half of the submitted artifacts were rated with at least one NA in an outcome area. Faculty discussed the possibility of having a comprehensive or capstone assignment that would allow students to demonstrate their performance level for all five social science outcomes in a single assignment, but thought that a single assignment might pose a challenge for some courses. Having students submit a portfolio of work that covers all of the outcomes might be a better choice. Faculty felt that the outcomes were more aligned with graduate work and too ambitious for undergraduate courses, especially 1000 level courses. It was recommended that the dimensions be scaled for lower level undergraduate work. Faculty shared that the further they were from their discipline, the more difficult it was to assess artifacts. Faculty also noted that the "Interdisciplinarity" outcome was a challenge to implement. Recommendations included promoting the submission of portfolios, revisiting the outcomes and rubric for the social science knowledge area, and assigning reviewers to artifacts within their discipline.