



## 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-C2. Social Sciences

### 3. Form Completion Date: \*

8/27/2025



### 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: C2: Social Sciences includes major ideas and theories, scientific methodology, implications, interdisciplinarity, and research findings. In January of 2021 student artifacts were solicited from the 17 full-time and adjunct faculty who taught the core approved courses in the fall 2024 semester (ECN 1000, ECN 2950, ECN 2960, ENGR 3110, GEO 2110, HSA 4610, LST 2000, POL 1000, POL 2010, POL 3100, POL 4670, PYC 1000, PYC 2500, PYC 2650, SOC 1000, and SOC 2100). Fourteen faculty members submitted the requested randomly selected artifacts: three from each of their course sections, resulting in 60 total student artifacts. In February, faculty attended a norming and scoring session to ensure interrater reliability using the Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes Rubric for Social Sciences. Artifacts were assigned to the seven pairs of faculty reviewers. Each pair reviewed the set of assigned artifacts with included portfolios or single assignments. The pairs then entered their scores into the scoring worksheet for

tabulation. In March, the reviewers reconvened to debrief and identify students' strengths and challenges, and to reflect on best practices. The rubric contains five dimensions and a four-point scale: 4 as Capstone, 3 and 2 as Milestone, 1 as Benchmark, 0 for No Evidenced, and NA for Not Applicable.

##### **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 1.9 to 3.3, with one mean exceeding the upper milestone threshold (3.0), three means exceeding the lower milestone threshold (2.0) and one mean exceeding the benchmark threshold (1.0). The strongest area for students was "major ideas and theories" (3.3), where students were able to identify major ideas and theories and their application in the social sciences. The area most in need of strengthening was "research findings" (1.9), where students were challenged with distinguishing the use and misuse of research findings from the social sciences in public life. The remaining three areas could benefit from increased attention: "interdisciplinarity" (2.7), "scientific methodology" (2.4), and "implications" (2.1), where students are required to recognize the relationship between the social sciences and other academic disciplines, recognize how scientific methodology is used to study major areas of both personal and public life, and evaluate the implications of qualitative and quantitative methods and their results, respectively. Nearly twenty-five percent of the artifacts were rated with NA for the "implications" outcome and forty percent for the "research findings" outcome, indicating that the assignment for a submitted artifact did not present students with the opportunity to demonstrate their performance level for that outcome. This issue was noted in the last assessment cycle and faculty discussed the possibility of having a comprehensive or capstone assignment that would allow students to demonstrate their performance level for all five social science outcomes in a single assignment, but thought that a single assignment might pose a challenge for some courses. The practice of allowing submission of portfolios was implemented for this assessment cycle. Faculty commented that the outcomes were too ambitious for undergraduate courses, especially 1000 level courses. It was recommended that the dimensions be scaled for lower-level undergraduate work. Recommendations included revisiting the outcomes and rubric for the social science knowledge area before the next assessment cycle that includes C2: Social Science.