

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 *

IT3 - Cultural Diversity

3. Form Completion Date: *

11/11/2021



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. *

Courses approved for Integrated Theme 3 - Cultural Diversity build students' basic knowledge of a variety of cultures and the issues and challenges experienced; promote the recognition of the interdependence of cultures and the intellectual and/or spiritual limitations of their own cultural assumptions and biases; and cultivate intercultural competence. This was the first-time assessing student learning of cultural diversity outcomes within the newly adopted core curriculum, using a newly developed rubric, and following a recently developed process. The assessment was conducted in winter semester of 2021 by faculty members who currently teach IT3 approved courses (see the full list by selecting the IT3 menu at <https://www.udmercy.edu/academics/catalog/undergraduate2020-2021/core/index.php>). Faculty attended a norming session for inter-rater reliability using the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Rubric for IT3 (an adaptation of the AAC&U Values Rubric). Fifty-eight randomly selected samples work (e.g. essays, exam items, presentations) from the Fall 2020 semester served as samples of student artifacts and were reviewed and scored by ten faculty members using a rubric. Scores were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet that generated a graphic representation of student progress in each dimension area. The four-point rubric scale was: benchmark (1), milestone (2), milestone (3), and capstone (4), with 0 and NA serving as options if needed. For IT3 approved courses, the mean score for each rubric dimension is expected to be at least 3.0, indicating progression from the upper milestone to the capstone, which reflects the combination of students enrolled in upper division and lower division courses from a wide array of disciplines (e.g. Economics, Engineering, Health Services Administration, Social Sciences, Language Studies, and Religious Studies).

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 2020-2021 rubric scores for all four dimension-areas were in the expected range of at least 3.0: cultural knowledge (3.0), cultural interdependence (3.1), cultural assumptions and biases (3.1), and intercultural competence (3.1). In the follow-up session, faculty discussed meaningful assignments that allow students to learn cultural diversity. Faculty who developed courses approved for IT3 found effective ways to teach cultural diversity. For example, in the HLH 2550: Population Health and Epidemiology course, students completed a culture and health project; in the ENGR 3110: Professional Practice of Engineering course, students participated in a diversity work-place role play scenario, and in the HUS 4410: Multicultural Understanding course students conducted interviews and wrote a paper resulting from their experiential and research-based approach to understanding the influences of culture and ethnicity on human experience. Faculty also noted the limitations of attempting to assess language studies artifacts that were not written in English. In some instances, faculty who submitted student artifacts were the only faculty qualified to assess those artifacts, which is not our preferred practice. Discussion among the interdisciplinary faculty resulted in statements of self-reflection in their teaching and inspiration to "borrow" pedagogical ideas from their peers. Plans for improvement include designing assignments that would cover more of the outcomes in one assignment as opposed to multiple assignments.