UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY

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 *

IT4 Human Difference

3. Form Completion Date: *

6/18/2026

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 Integrating Theme area: IT4 Human Difference includes the complexities of human differences, group identities, and issues arising from inequity, prejudice and exclusion in contemporary societies.

In January of 2026 student artifacts were solicited from the 27 full-time and adjunct faculty who taught core approved courses for IT4 Human Difference Winter 2025 and Fall 2025 (AAS 2000, ENGR 1050, ENL 2750 & 2850, GEO 2110, HIS 2900 & 3480, HUS 4410, NUR 2100 &3256, PHL 4400, PYC 2500, 2650, 2750, 3410, 3420, & 3540, RELS 3610, 4140, & 4141 and WGS 2000).

Faculty members submitted the requested randomly selected artifacts: three from each of their course sections, resulting in 69 total student artifacts. Faculty attended a norming and scoring session in February of 2026 for inter-rater reliability using the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Rubric for IT4 Human Difference. Faculty were paired up to assess a set of student artifacts and record the rubric scores in the IT4 Human Difference Excel Scoring Sheet. 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 IT4 Human Difference. 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 3.3 to 3.6, transitioning from upper milestone to the capstone threshold (4.0). Students were strongest in "expression of interpersonal understanding" (3.6) and "evaluation of issues" (3.6), where they had to recognize that human differences are complex and varied and evaluate issues arising from inequity, prejudice and exclusion in contemporary societies, respectively. Students were not as strong in outcome area "interpretation of group identity formation" (3.3), where they had to interpret ways in which group identities are formed in a heterogeneous society. Artifacts were either single assignments or student portfolios of assignments. Four sets of artifacts did not provide an opportunity for students to demonstrate attainment of the learning outcome. These artifacts received N/A ratings for each outcome.

Overall, faculty were satisfied with the rubric dimension scores but would like to give more thought to which artifacts best represent student learning in their courses or if new assignments could be developed to better capture that learning. Faculty discussed the benefits of making explicit connections between core learning outcomes and specific assignments, noting how they could make stronger connections for students between outcomes and projects so that students could engage with the outcomes more directly (e.g. discussing the learning outcomes during project time or adding the outcomes directly into the project prompts). Faculty also recognized that more in-depth assignments such as research papers and extended response projects allowed students to demonstrate developing mastery of the outcome areas more clearly.