

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: *

8/31/2020



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. *

At the end of the fall 2019 and winter 2020 semesters, the Director of the Writing Program (DWP, Joseph Paszek) collected 2-3 random student research papers from 11 sections of ENL 1310 (n=32, one file unable to be read). During the summer term, the DWP and two experienced ENL 1310 instructors normed for inter-reader reliability and read each student document using a 4-point rubric to assess the 7 approved learning outcomes for A2: Written Communication (the outcomes were recombined into 6 outcomes to help with assessment, see rubric). The 4-point rubric scale was: Needs Improvement (1), Sufficient (2), Good (3), and Exceptional (4). A fifth category (N/A) was reserved for documents that could not be scored using the rubric. Sufficient (2) was the expected threshold score for students who have met the base learning outcomes of the ENL 1310. Each document was read and scored by at least two of the three readers. Scores were then collected and compiled. If there was more than a 1-point discrepancy between the readers' scores, the score was discussed between the faculty readers until a point of agreement was met. Any smaller difference was simply averaged.

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. *

Out of the 6 re-combined outcomes, only 4 of the outcomes were assessable based on the artifacts collected (the student final paper): Reading & Summary; Argument; Language, Tone, & Style; and Citation & Documentation. The outcomes related to Research Process and Writing Process were scored as N/A by the readers this year because the documents did not have sufficient evidence to support any score or reliable assessment. On average, students scored above the threshold score of Sufficient in all categories with Reading & Summary (2.55) and Language, Tone, & Style (2.35) being the highest. Argument (2.26) and Citation & Documentation (2.15) scored closer to the lower threshold. The assessment group provided suggestions for improving student performance and learning in each category, but highlighted Argument as their central focus for the upcoming academic year. They suggested faculty incorporate assignments and activities that prompt students to think about contributing to a conversation. While students are not expected to be able to fully contribute something truly unique to the knowledge base of an academic discipline, they should be prepared to develop arguments or ideas that think about engaging with existing conversations in an "academic" way. Additionally, for improving learning in Citation and Documentation, the assessment group suggested providing students with more opportunities to practice citation (e.g., including small practice activities for citing the sources they chose for their research projects) and increasing expectations for the number and diversity of sources in their projects throughout the semester. Finally, they recommended that the Writing Program have faculty include either a student reflection that addresses the Research and Writing Process learning outcomes, a revision note, and/or a research narrative to allow for meaningful assessment of these two outcomes for the next assessment cycle.