



### 1. CORE OUTCOMES INFORMATION

Core Outcomes Information

Knowledge Area

Integrating Theme 1 - Reading, Writing, & Research Across the University

### 3. Form Completion Date: \*

8/20/2024

### 4. Assessment Overview

Briefly share how the outcome identified above was assessed. Include semester and year, how

Integrating Theme 1 – Reading, Writing & Research Across the University is evaluated using nine learning outcomes. These outcomes were assessed using fifty-seven randomly collected artifacts from the nineteen course sections that satisfy IT1 and were taught in Winter 2023 and Fall 2024: ARCH 2220; BIO 4990 (2 sections); BUS 2310; CIVE 3450; ENGR 1080; ENL 3030; ENL 3080; HSA 4700; NUR 4500 (3 sections); PHL 3410; PYC 2500 (2 sections); PYC 3420 (2 sections); PYC 3430; and SWK 2050. Three artifacts were collected from each course instructor in January 2024 using the approved process for core-curriculum artifact collection. The artifacts were assessed by thirteen faculty members who had taught IT1 courses and who attended two different norming and scoring sections (due to scheduling difficulties).

The faculty members who attended the norming and scoring sessions were: Linda Slowik, Evan Peterson, Michelle Whalen, Aloha VanCamp, Eva Nyutu, Emily Dowgwillo, Linda Thiel, Enrique Ledesma, Michelle Andrzejak, Miao Qian, Isaac Pickell, Nassif Rayess and James Lynch. The norming sessions took place on February 27th and March 1st. The participating faculty were assigned the task of assessing two or three courses using the five-point rubric scale and enter their ratings on the common spreadsheet. The rubric includes a rating of NA which is used when the rater feels that an assignment did not address a learning outcome and thus the student was not given the opportunity to demonstrate learning attainment. A subgroup of the raters reconvened on Monday, May 6 to discuss the results. In attendance were Linda Thiel, Eva Nyutu, Linda Slowik, Enrique Ledesma, Aloha VanCamp, James Lynch and Nassif Rayess. There were several excused absences.

The mean rubric dimension scores ranged from 2.8 to 3.3, which is indicative of upper milestone attainment. The dimensions with the highest scores of 3.3 were IT1.1 (Develop a purposeful writing process) and IT1.6 (Citing resources). The second highest score of 3.2 was for IT1.4 (Summarize main ideas). Receiving scores of 3.1 were IT1.2 (Comprehend and practice ethical methods) and IT1.8 (Demonstrate proficiency in standard written English). Learning outcomes IT1.3 (Develop and use comprehension strategies), IT1.5 (Employ research strategies) and IT1.7 (Develop rhetorical strategies for target audiences) received a mean score of 3.0. The dimension with the lowest score of 2.8 was IT1.9 (Writing scientific papers). It is important to note that these scores mask a relatively high number of NA ratings, particularly for IT1.9 (87 NAs or 75% of total). The learning outcomes with 25% or more NAs were IT1.2 (51 NAs or 44%), IT1.1 (40 NAs or 34%) and IT1.3 (39 NAs or 34%).

- x IT1.1 (Develop a purposeful writing process) states that following: Develop a purposeful writing process appropriate to the argumentative and analytic nature of academic work that includes generating ideas, focusing, drafting, and revising—revision being a process that involves reflection, editing, feedback and publishing for a particular audience. The stipulation in this outcome is that students are to submit a draft assignment, receive feedback from the instructor and revise accordingly. Submitting both the draft as well as the final version of the artifact might help reduce the numbers of NAs
  
- x IT1.3 (Develop and use comprehension strategies) states the following: Develop and use metacognitive or alternative strategies in order to comprehend text and other resource content.