



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-D1 Philosophical Knowledge

3. Form Completion Date: *

4/2/2026



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 KA-D1 outcomes include the following: basics of argumentation, philosophy as a foundational discipline, central issues and diverse viewpoints in philosophy, and the rational assessment of positions. The sections of PHL 1000 that were assessed were from Fall 2025, Summer 2025, Winter 2025. 2 full time faculty (Beth Oljar and Kieran Aarons) and 1 adjunct faculty (Brian Fields) submitted a total of 18 artifacts across 6 different sections of Intro to Philosophy. 4 of our 5 full time faculty, plus 1 adjunct (Brian Fields) scored the artifacts, after attending the norming and scoring meeting to discuss the learning outcomes, and then the same faculty members met again to discuss the scores. The tool we used was simply the Core Curriculum Student Outcomes Rubric for KA-D1, which uses a 4 point scale to evaluate the artifacts. We expected a score of 3.0 for each dimension area.

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. *

We think that the learning outcomes have helped us be more mindful of our goals in PHL 1000, and we found it valuable to see what our colleagues are doing in their sections of Intro and how each of us understands the learning outcomes. We scored 3.8 or 3.9 on all dimensions of the rubric except for outcome D1.2, which is recognizing the role of philosophy as a foundation for other modes of inquiry, where we scored a 3.3. This was primarily due to different degrees to which instructors focused specifically on this outcome. After discussion of the scores, we realized that we could actually eliminate D1.2, since D1.3 (identifying central issues in philosophy) effectively covers D1.2. We also agreed that the word "Rationalize" in D1.5 does not convey what we mean by this particular dimension. If you look up the word "rationalize" you might find a definition like this: "to create logical plausible reasons to justify behaviors, decisions' or beliefs that are actually irrational, uncomfortable, or driven by hidden motives." That is how the word is typically used in English and is not what we want to convey. We think that "Justifying Positions" would be a better shorthand for this particular rubric dimension. I'm happy to do whatever needs to be done to make these changes.