



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 *

Integrating Theme 5 - Personal Spiritual Development

3. Form Completion Date: *

4/20/2026



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 IT5 Personal Spiritual Development area includes four learning outcomes consisting of the following: IT5.1 Articulation of Ignatian and Mercy Charisms, IT5.2 Recognize Value of Human Person, IT5.3 Reflection, and IT5.4 Vocation and Mission Exploration. In January 2026, student artifacts/portfolios were solicited from the 14 full-time and adjunct faculty who taught core approved courses for IT5 Personal Spiritual Development in the Fall and Winter 2025 academic terms. The courses included CAS 2000 (one section), CAS 3000 (one section), CAS 3530 (two sections), CTA 3010 (one section), CTA 3020 (two sections), ENGR 3000 (two sections), HIS 3090 (one section), LEAD 2000 (three sections), NUR 2100 (four sections), NUR 3251 (three sections), PHL 3020 (one section), PYC 2620 (three sections), RELS 2000 (one section), RELS 3530 (two sections), RELS 4320 (one section), and SWK 3000 (one section). Faculty members submitted a total of 44 artifacts/portfolios. Nine faculty along with the lead facilitator and co-facilitator attended a norming and scoring session held in February 2026 to help calibrate/standardize the use of the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Scoring Rubric for IT5 Personal Spiritual Development and to ensure satisfactory inter-rater reliability of scores. Following this session, faculty were paired up to assess sets of student artifacts and record the rubric scores in the IT5 Personal Spiritual Development Excel Scoring Spreadsheet. Seven faculty and the lead and co-facilitators attended a post-scoring follow-up meeting on March 20, 2026 to review all scores on the Excel Scoring Spreadsheet and to (a) discuss the meaning of the scores, (b) identify student strengths and weaknesses as reflected in the mean scores for each outcome dimension across all courses, and (c) brainstorm ways of improving courses and the course evaluation process. The rubric contains the four aforementioned dimensions that reflect the core outcomes for IT5 Personal Spiritual Development courses. A four-point rating scale was used (1 = benchmark, 2 and 3 = milestone, 4 = capstone) that also included NA for Not Applicable (used when a specific outcome dimension did not apply to the scoring of an artifact/portfolio) and zero for No Evidence (used when evidence of student attainment of a specific learning outcome was not present in an artifact/portfolio). Mean rubric scores falling at or near the upper milestone level (i.e., mean rubric score of 3.0) were expected for all dimension areas across all courses evaluated.

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. *

Upon reviewing the scores assigned to student artifacts/portfolios, it was agreed among faculty that the evidence generally indicates that IT5 approved courses demonstrate satisfactory performance with respect to facilitating acceptable levels of student attainment of the four outcome dimensions. While all mean scores were deemed to be good across all courses and learning outcomes (mean = 3.0), areas of relative strength that were identified included IT5.1 Articulation of Ignatian and Mercy Charisms and IT5.2 Recognize Value of Human Person (means = 3.2) while an area of relative weakness was IT5.4 Vocation and Mission Exploration which obtained the lowest mean score (mean = 2.9).

When prompted to share their perceptions of the evaluation process and, particularly, the submission and scoring of artifacts and portfolios, attendees of the post-scoring follow-up meeting provided thoughtful feedback. The main points of comment included the following: (a) When initially called upon to submit student work for evaluation, it was unclear if the submission of a single artifact versus a portfolio was the better approach. There seemed to be agreement that portfolios were better as they allowed for broader sampling of student work in a manner that best ensured evidence of coverage of IT5 learning outcomes. It was suggested that more detailed instructions and guidance be provided to instructors to aid in the selection, formatting, and submission of materials. Ideally, such instructions should be given well in advance of when artifact submission needs to be completed so that instructors have sufficient lead time to compile relevant student work. (b) The inclusion of instructor grades and comments on submitted artifacts and portfolios introduced some challenges to effectively using the rubric to score student work. The lead and co-facilitators indicated that faculty scorers were expected to score the artifacts using the rubric as the primary lens of evaluation and to not give much weight to whether or not a student satisfied course specific requirements which may not have anything to do with the core curriculum learning outcomes associated with IT5 approved courses. It was also shared by the facilitators that some instructors try to be helpful to scorers by explicitly identifying how and where an artifact satisfies one or more IT5 learning outcomes and that such information may be useful but, nonetheless, should not be the sole basis under which a scorer evaluates an artifact or portfolio as having met a core learning outcome. (c) There was extensive discussion about how to score IT5.1 Articulation of Ignatian and Mercy Charisms with several attendees noting that the overt reference to the two religious systems can lead scorers to evaluate artifacts/portfolios in a manner that places emphasis on concrete mention of Ignatian and Mercy values in student work rather than on trying to identify evidence that students have actively experienced and engaged with those values. Some attendees took the discussion further by suggesting that the language of IT5.1 may be too restrictive because it excludes consideration of other forms of spiritual development that fall outside the Ignatian and Mercy traditions. It was suggested that it may be worthwhile to more formally review the language and implementation of IT5.1 with attention given to making revisions if deemed appropriate.

Actions that could be taken to improve upon instruction in IT5 courses include: (a) writing course syllabi so that learning outcomes are explicitly stated and are constructively aligned with course-specific activities and evaluative outcomes, (b) incorporating assignments that require students to actively link spiritual development to vocational/professional goals, and (c) making efforts to explore how Ignatian and Mercy values map onto the values of differing faith systems so as to enable non-Catholic students to fully engage in those values in their spiritual development.