



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-D2

3. Form Completion Date: *

4/22/2026



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 D2: Religious Knowledge area includes three learning outcomes consisting of the following: D2.1 Origins of Religious Ideas and Rituals; D2.2: Role of Religion and Spirituality; and D2.3: Interdisciplinary Perspectives of Religion. Student artifacts or portfolios were solicited from the 10 faculty members (6 full-time and 4 adjunct faculty) who taught core approved courses for D2 Religious Knowledge in the Fall and Winter 2025 academic terms. The courses included: CAS 2150/RELS 2150; RELS 2001; RELS 2020 (two sections); RELS 2120; ISLM 2050/ RELS 2050; RELS 2030; RELS 2170; RELS 2180; CAS 2000/RELS 2000; RELS 2230; RELS 2240. Faculty members submitted randomly selected artifacts with one course submitting portfolios: three from each of their course sections, resulting in 27 total student artifacts/portfolios.

Seven faculty including the two facilitators and the co-facilitator attended a norming and scoring session in February of 2026 for inter-rater reliability. Faculty were paired up to assess a set of student artifacts and record the rubric scores in the knowledge area Excel Scoring Sheet. All seven faculty attended a follow-up meeting in March 2026 to review the recorded rubric dimension scores and identify student strengths and weaknesses. The D2 rubric contains three-dimension areas that reflect the core outcomes for each. 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. *

Assessment Process:

Several procedural issues affected the efficiency and accuracy of the assessment process:

Identification of cross-listed courses: some cross-listed courses are listed under three different numbers with three separate prefixes, so that they appear as three distinct courses in the Excel file and SharePoint folders rather than as a single course.

Sampling method: primarily captures the previous Fall semester data. This excludes courses offered in the Winter or those on a two-to-three-year rotation. This leads to a substantial range of courses never appearing in an assessment cycle.

Results: In the D2: Religious Knowledge area the set of randomly selected student artifacts/portfolios resulted in an overall mean rubric score of 3.2. For the artifacts/portfolios where there were scores, 3 students scored a 4.0 overall; 16 scored 3.0-3.8, and five scored between 1.2-2.7. Students were strongest in D2.2 Role of Religion and Spirituality where they had to "explain the role of religion and spirituality in human life and society, regardless of their personal beliefs". The overall outcome mean score was 3.4, with individual scores ranging from 1.5 to 4.0. Both D2.1 and D2.3 met the outcome 3.0 benchmark. D2.1 Origins of Religious Ideas and Rituals outcome scores ranged from 1.0 to 4.0 with a mean outcome score of 3.2. D2.3 Interdisciplinary Perspectives of Religion scores also ranged from 1.0 – 4.0 with an outcome mean score of 3.1.

Broadly, the results of the D2: Religious Knowledge assessment are positive. Based on the artifacts/portfolios reviewed, most students are successfully meeting the learning outcomes.

Areas in need of strengthening: There are notable inconsistencies in how submitted artifacts aligned with the rubrics. For example, in one course, the chosen paper assignment did not align with specific rubric criteria. Faculty agreed that the use of portfolios might be a better option for future assessments. Faculty have also noted that upon closer review, their assignment criteria do not always line up with the broad learning outcomes.

Suggested Actions:

Establish a Learning Outcome and Rubric Revision Process: The core curriculum learning outcomes have remained largely unchanged for over 10 years. A formal process should be implemented to revisit and update the verbiage of these outcomes to ensure they remain relevant and accurately reflect current subject expertise.

Improve Faculty Development and Support: Targeted workshops designed to assist faculty with the technical aspects of the assessment process should be implemented. These sessions should provide clear guidance on uploading assignments, selecting appropriate artifacts, and navigating the digital workflow.

Refine Rubrics and Artifact Selection: Reword rubric criteria to eliminate vague language and provide clearer, more objective scoring definitions. Instructors would benefit from guidance selecting and organizing artifacts that align with outcomes, and rethinking student instructions to ensure that the work submitted is both relevant and easily evaluated. Review course content to ensure it aligns with outcomes and rubrics. For example, some of the D3 assignments fulfill D2 requirements. Additionally, transitioning toward a portfolio-based assessment—rather than relying on isolated artifacts—may better demonstrate how students meet learning outcomes.

Administrative and Curricular Adjustments: A better process for indicating cross-listed courses within the assessment system to prevent redundant reporting should be developed. Additionally, certain courses may need to be reclassified to better reflect their requirements. For instance, some courses may better fulfill D2 requirements rather than D3 and vice versa.