



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 *

D-3 RELS Elective

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. *

1. Overview

D3: Religious Studies Electives contains three learning outcomes: D3. RELS 1: "Application of Academic Methods;" D3. RELS 2: "Critique of Scholar-Identified Issues;" and D3. RELS 3: "Generate Research."

Artifacts were solicited from seven full-time and adjunct faculty who taught in the Fall and Winter 2025. Their courses included: ISLM 3300/RELS 3055; CAS 3000/HIS 3090; RELS 4320; RELS 3610; RELS 4141; CAS 3530/ RELS 3530; RELS 2185; RELS 4140; RELS 4450; RELS 3375; CAS 3530/RELS 3530; RELS 4230. There was a total of 39 artifacts.

The D3 rubric contains three dimension areas that reflect core outcomes. A four-point scale was used (4=capstone, 3 and 2 = milestone, 1=benchmark) that also included NA for not applicable and a zero indicating no evidence. A score of 3.0 was expected for each dimension area.

Seven faculty including two facilitators and one co-facilitator attended a norming and scoring session in February of 2026 and were paired up to score artifacts. All attended a follow-up meeting in March 2026 to review the scores and identify student strengths and weaknesses.

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. *

2. Results

Most students are successfully meeting the learning outcomes.

There was an overall mean rubric score of 3.4. 10 students scored a 4.0 overall; 10 scored 3.0-3.7, and seven scored between 2.5-2.8.

Students were strongest in D3 RELS 1. The overall outcome mean score was 3.6, with individual scores ranging from 1.0 to 4.0.

Both D3. RELS 2 and D3. RELS 3 also met the 3.0 benchmark. D3. RELS 2 scores ranged from 1.0 to 4.0 with a mean score of 3.2. D3. RELS 3 ranged from 2.0 to 4.0 with a mean outcome score of 3.0. 2 sets of artifacts (6 total) scored NAs.

3. Problems in the Assessment Process:

Misalignment: Artifacts did not always align with the outcomes assessed by the rubrics. Portfolios might be a better option for future assessments.

Identification of cross-listed courses: Some cross-listed courses appear as three distinct courses in Excel and SharePoint.

Sampling method: The current method privileges the previous Fall semester, excluding many courses offered in the Winter or on a two-to-three-year rotation. Adjunct instructors may teach a course only once and not be available for artifact submission.

Technical interface: Spreadsheets are difficult to navigate and are not well aligned with the rubrics. The language of the rubrics is vague.

4. Suggested Actions:

Revise Learning Outcomes and Rubrics: Learning outcomes and rubrics have remained unchanged for 10 years. A formal process should be instituted to update them.

Improve Faculty Support: Many instructors have never been introduced to the Core Curriculum. They should be assisted in understanding it and the assessment process. A follow-up process should be developed to assist with course revisions.

Refine Rubrics and Artifact Selection: Reword rubric criteria to provide clearer guidance. Review course content to ensure it aligns with outcomes and rubrics. Stress the use of portfolios.

Administrative and Curricular Adjustments: Identify cross-listed courses to prevent redundancy. Reclassify some courses in more fitting knowledge areas.