

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-D3 Religious Studies Electives

3. Form Completion Date:

9/9/2022

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: D3 Religious Studies Electives includes application of academic methods, critique of scholar-identified issues, and generation of research. In January of 2022 student artifacts were solicited from faculty who taught core approved courses in the fall 2021 semester (CAS 3000, 3530, 3800; HIS 3090; ISLM 3300; RELS 3055, 3061, 3400, 3530, 3800, 4230, 4320), some of which are cross-listed. All five faculty members submitted the requested randomly selected artifacts: three from each of their course sections, resulting in 21 total student artifacts. On February 14, 2022, faculty attended a norming and scoring session for inter-rater reliability using the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Rubric for D3: Religious Studies Electives. Faculty were paired up to assess a set of student artifacts and record the rubric scores in the D3 Religious Studies Excel Scoring Sheet. On March 22, 2022, faculty attended a follow-up meeting to review all of the recorded rubric dimension scores and identify student strengths and weaknesses. The rubric contains three-dimension areas that reflect the core outcomes for D3. A four-point rubric scale was used (4=capstone, 3 and 2 = milestone, 1=benchmark) that also included NA for not applicable and a zero for when no evidence was present. A score of 3.0 was expected for each dimension area, indicating students' progression to the threshold of the upper milestone level.

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 3.4 to 3.7, exceeding the upper milestone threshold level (3.0) and approaching the capstone level (4.0). The strongest area for students was "application of academic methods" (3.7), where students were able to employ one or more academic methods in the study of religion (literary studies, history, philosophy, feminist studies, psychology, sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, or theology) to examine one or more religious traditions in depth. Students demonstrated strength in the other two areas as well: with a mean score of 3.4 for "critique of scholar-identified issues" and 3.4 for the "generation of research". Students were able to outline and critique the issues as identified by scholars who have expertise in the religious traditions as well as the academic methods and generate research based on what has been learned about the religious traditions and the academic methods. Faculty were impressed with the level of sophistication and richness of assignments and students' level of performance. Students were described as having an increased interest in the content taught in upper level Religious Studies courses and the associated academic rigor. Faculty discussed instructional strategies for helping students attain excellence. For example, explicitly stating requirements for citations in written work, utilizing ungraded assignments to provide feedback to students, getting students to think about the big picture, and guiding students through inquiry-based learning (e.g. interacting, clarifying, questioning, and designing). To enhance student learning, faculty recommended developing more focused projects for students, reviewing existing assignments for clarity of expectations, and assigning creative projects that focus on critical thinking.