



Annual Assessment Report for Co-Curricular Programs

The University Assessment Team advocates for the enhancement of student learning through purposeful, meaningful, and feasible student-outcomes assessment practices. The Assessment Team seeks to collaborate with programs, departments, and units to ensure that effective assessment of student learning occurs across the University. To assist in meeting this goal, the Team requests that you complete this Annual Assessment Report form to document student learning in your co-curricular program. A PDF version of this completed form will be posted to the Academic Affairs Assessment website. Please note that this Annual Assessment Report form should only be completed after you have an Assessment Plan for Co-Curricular Programs on file with the University Assessment Team. The plan is completed once and only updated when revisions have been made to components of the plan.

1. Co-Curricular Area: Service Learning

2. Assessment Cycle: 2022-2023

3. Student Outcomes - Enter the student outcome(s) you are reporting on in this assessment cycle? Feel free to complete a separate form for each outcome for which you are reporting.

SLO 1: Compassion - Students will develop compassion and be guided by that toward meaningful future engagement.

4. Institutional Outcomes - For which institutional outcome(s) do the reported student learning outcome(s) align?

SLO Outcome Alignment	Institutional Outcome
Yes	I. Jesuit & Mercy Values
Yes	II. Diversity & Cultural Awareness
	III. Critical Thinking & Problem Solving
	IV. Communication
	V. Professionalism
	VI. Lifelong Learning

5. Assessment Overview: Briefly share how the student outcome was assessed. Include semester and year, how student data were collected, who performed the assessment, and the assessment method/instrument/tool that was used.:

We assessed this outcome by recruiting focus groups from specific Departments/Schools. This strategy was implemented because of the difficulty in recruiting students for the focus groups last year. Targeting specific departments allows us to capitalize on the fact that Departments/Schools can motivate/require students to participate. For this first year, we worked with the College of Business Administration (CBA) and Criminal Justice Studies (CJS) Department both of which helped us recruit seniors from their Department/School. With the help of these departments, we were able to collect and analyze the results of 29 students who participated in an online survey that we created for the focus groups.



As in previous years, we asked open-ended questions of the students in the focus groups and utilized a rubric based on Blooms Taxonomy in the Affective Domain to determine a direct measure of where the students were in terms of the desired outcomes. We utilized the same questions for this outcome that we used in 2022.

6. Results, Planned Actions, and/or Actions Taken -Briefly summarize the assessment results and how you are using them to reinforce Detroit Mercy's mission and values, enhance co-curricular experiences, and improve student learning,

Students in the focus groups exceeded our target measure by a large margin. Of the 25 students who answered the questions related to compassion:

- 92% were coded at rubric level two or better. The target was 60%
- 76% at rubric level three or four. The target was 50%

We discussed this topic at a Community Engaged Learning Steering Committee meeting and affirmed the importance of this outcome. We recognize that this assessment provides an important measure of whether students' hearts are really being touched. Students can meet class requirement for reflection without having their biases challenged, but and Peter Hans Kolvenbach said in his now famous address at Santa Clara when he was Superior General of the Jesuits worldwide, "When the heart is touched by direct experience, the mind may be challenged to change."

The concern also surfaced in these discussions that we use the word "compassion" in the prompting question. Thus, we might be leading the student too much to the answers we want. As a result, we have obtained some questions that do not include "compassion" in the question and are testing these now for effectiveness.

Attachment(s):

None



Annual Assessment Report for Co-Curricular Programs

The University Assessment Team advocates for the enhancement of student learning through purposeful, meaningful, and feasible student-outcomes assessment practices. The Assessment Team seeks to collaborate with programs, departments, and units to ensure that effective assessment of student learning occurs across the University. To assist in meeting this goal, the Team requests that you complete this Annual Assessment Report form to document student learning in your co-curricular program. A PDF version of this completed form will be posted to the Academic Affairs Assessment website. Please note that this Annual Assessment Report form should only be completed after you have an Assessment Plan for Co-Curricular Programs on file with the University Assessment Team. The plan is completed once and only updated when revisions have been made to components of the plan.

1. Co-Curricular Area: Service Learning

2. Assessment Cycle: 2022-2023

3. Student Outcomes - Enter the student outcome(s) you are reporting on in this assessment cycle? Feel free to complete a separate form for each outcome for which you are reporting.

SLO 2: Societal Issues - Students will be able to identify the societal issues behind the need for the service they provide and explain how these issues (including racism) impact the need for the services provided.

4. Institutional Outcomes - For which institutional outcome(s) do the reported student learning outcome(s) align?

SLO Outcome Alignment	Institutional Outcome
Yes	I. Jesuit & Mercy Values
Yes	II. Diversity & Cultural Awareness
Yes	III. Critical Thinking & Problem Solving
	IV. Communication
	V. Professionalism
	VI. Lifelong Learning

5. Assessment Overview: Briefly share how the student outcome was assessed. Include semester and year, how student data were collected, who performed the assessment, and the assessment method/instrument/tool that was used.:

We assessed this outcome by recruiting focus groups from specific Departments/Schools. This strategy was implemented because of the difficulty in recruiting students for the focus groups last year. Targeting specific departments allows us to capitalize on the fact that Departments/Schools can motivate/require students to participate. For this first year, we worked with the College of Business Administration (CBA) and Criminal Justice Studies (CJS) Department both of which helped us recruit seniors from their Department/School. With the help of these departments, we were able to collect and analyze the results of 29 students who participated in an online survey that we created for the focus groups.



As in previous years, we asked open-ended questions of the students in the focus groups and utilized rubrics to determine a direct measure of where the students were in terms of the desired outcomes. We revised the questions used in the focus group process from the previous year (2022) in accord with feedback received from the 2022 focus groups. We found excellent new assessment questions in Eyler and Giles, *Where's The Learning in Service Learning?* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999) These questions were a part of an often-cited 1995 study of 1,100 students from 35 Universities across the US using funding from the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE.)

We utilized the coding rubric that was provided with the FIPSE survey questions and considered specific scores on two of the coding scales (Problem Locus and Solution Locus) to test whether we attained a positive outcome to our first measurement. Namely, we were checking to see if “students clearly identify societal issues that could realistically be impacting the service provided.”

- For Problem Locus, a rubric score of >2 indicated inclusion of systemic issues in their answer to discussion of the problem.
- For Solution Locus, a rubric score of >1 indicated inclusion of systemic issues in their answer to discussion of possible solutions.

Our second measurement was what percentage of students provided a “clear explanation of how racism impacts the need for the service provided.” We did this in two steps. First, we asked them to choose the top 1-3 most significant social problems facing people in the Detroit Metro area, and we asked them to explain their answer. Secondly, we asked them to answer, “What were the personal behaviors and/or social problems that the agency/school/community group that you worked with were trying to deal with?” and, “What can be done to address the root causes of the social problems at the agency/school/community group that you worked with?”.

6. Results, Planned Actions, and/or Actions Taken -Briefly summarize the assessment results and how you are using them to reinforce Detroit Mercy's mission and values, enhance co-curricular experiences, and improve student learning,

We successfully met the goal of having 60% of students clearly identify societal issues that could realistically be impacting the service provided because, of the 25 students who answered the questions related to systemic issues,

- 16 (64%) scored 3 or better on the “Problem Locus” Coding Category (indicating an understanding that systemic issues were a part of the problems that they discussed.)
- 22 (88%) scored 2 or better on the “Solution Locus” Coding Category (indicating that they addressed systemic issues when talking about possible solutions to the problem.)

The Community Engaged Learning (CEL) Steering Committee affirmed that this is a critical, positive result. The fact that these graduating seniors score so well in being able to identify societal issues that could realistically be impacting the service provided is an indication that they are not “blaming the victim,” but rather seeing that individuals who seek service are often dealing with deeper issues. This affirms the Mercy, Jesuit, Catholic values of recognizing the dignity of all persons and seeking justice.



We did very poorly on the second measure. Only one student explained how racism impacts the need for the service provided, and that was in answer to a question that offered racism as one possible issue among many. Five additional students, in answers to open-ended questions, mentioned things like “inequities,” or “discrimination,” or “disadvantages” as issues that contributed to the need for service, but none of them mentioned racism as a cause.

Part of issue might be the way we ask the question. What the students were saying is that racism is not the only issue impacting people in Detroit. That is certainly true. However, that fact that none of the students mentioned racism in the open-ended questions about social issues, indicated that work needed to be done.

Three adjustments have been made to increase students’ awareness about racism. First, we have begun to provide CEL faculty with resources to address racism and explain how it contributes to the need for services provided in the Detroit Metro area. We are also setting up a Sharepoint site to make those resource more readily available to faculty.

Secondly, CEL faculty expressed an interest in hearing more from students about how they perceive racism on campus, so that offered an opportunity to create and share a video in which students share their perspectives on this topic. That was done in the spring of this year.

Finally, we decided to create an accreditation process for CEL courses. CEL faculty will now have to apply in order for their course to obtain the CEL attribute. The criteria for acceptance as a CEL course will now include two criteria that will foster an awareness of racism. First, the instructors will have to provide evidence that they are aware of the issues that community partners are dealing with. Secondly, applications must provide “Compelling evidence that students ... will be prepared for an engagement that recognizes the equal dignity of all persons.”

Attachment(s):

None