

# LMC Comprehensive Program Review

## Instructional Units

2017-2018

Program/Discipline: Philosophy

The following provides an outline of the required elements for a comprehensive unit/program review for Instructional Programs and Units. Upon completion of this report, please upload your document in the unit/program review application data/documents tab.

### 1. Program Changes

1.1. How have your degree and certificate offerings changed over the last 5 years? ( e.g. new programs, discontinued or major changes to existing programs)

**They have not.**

1.2. What changes are you planning to your degree and certificate offering over the next 5 years? What is the rationale for the anticipated changes? Will these changes require any additional resources?

**While the degree/certificate offerings have not change, all required documents for a Philosophy AA-T have been submitted and approved by the board. The degree is on hold by the CSUs because of an issue with ASSIST. We expect the degree to be offered shortly.**

**The Philosophy AA-T was a stated goal of the department upon my arrive as outlined in need statement for a new philosophy hire. This is because the degree offers necessary accountable and organizational efficiency within the philosophy department. Students who will be successful with philosophy degree (such as students moving onto be lawyers) will need to transfer to complete their degrees, as there are no middle skill jobs in philosophy. The goal of the AA-T is to help students transfer effectively and efficiently into those programs that will help them achieve a high degree.**

### 2. Degree and Certificate Requirements

**Please review the data provided on all degree/certificate completions in your program, including locally approved College Skills Certificates from Fall 2012—Spring 2017.**

2.1. For each degree/certificate offered, map a pathway to completion of courses within the major in a maximum of 4 semesters, assuming a maximum of 6-10 units of major courses within a semester.

Use the following format:

**N/A**

Name of Degree or Certificate				
Semester	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4

<b>List Courses Needed for Degree or Certificate in each semester.</b>				
--	--	--	--	--

### 3. Frequency of Course Offerings

**Please review the data provided on frequency of all courses offered in your discipline in the last 2 years (Fall 2015-Spring 2017).**

3.1. If a course has not been offered in the past two years, but is required for a degree or certificate, please explain why it has not been offered, and what the plan is to offer it in the future.

**N/A**

3.2. If the course is not required for a degree or certificate, is the course still needed in the curriculum or is the department considering deleting it?

**All courses have been offered in the last two years.**

3.3. For the next two years, project how frequently your program intends to offer each course. Please provide a rationale for any major changes from the last 2 years that you anticipate.

Course	Estimated Number of Sections Offered by Semester			
	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
<i>Phil 100</i>	6	6	6	6
<i>Phil 110</i>	3	3	4	4
<i>Phil 120</i>	1	1	1	1
<i>Phil 122</i>	2	2	2	2
<i>Phil 130</i>	0	1	0	0
<i>Phil 132</i>	0	0	0	1
<i>Phil 133</i>	1	1	1	1
<i>Phil 140</i>	0	0	1	1
<i>Phil 142</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>Phil 150</i>	0	1	0	1
<i>Phil 151</i>	1	0	1	0
<i>Phil 210</i>	1	1	1	1
<b>Rationale for any Major Changes</b>				
The major change in offerings for the philosophy department will be introducing the necessary philosophy AA-T program courses. This means phasing in Phil 120 and 210 into a semester cycle. We also would like to phase in Phil 140 to replace Phil 142. We will also offer two rotations: our art classes Phil 150 and 151 will rotate and our history classes Phil 130 and 132 will rotate.				

## 4. Existing Curriculum Analysis

### 4.1. Course Outline Updates

Please review the data provided on the status of COORs in your discipline. (Note: This data does not reflect courses submitted after May 2017.) For each COOR that has *not* been updated since Spring 2012, please indicate the faculty member responsible for submitting the updated COOR to the Curriculum Committee by April 18, 2018.

Course	Faculty Responsible for COOR Update
<i>Phil 133</i>	Edward Haven and Ryan Hiscocks
<i>Phil 122</i>	Edward Haven

### 4.2. Course Offerings/Content

How have your courses changed over the past 5 years (new courses, significant changes to existing courses)?	The philosophy AA-T program required the introduction of a number of new courses: Phil 120, 130, 132 and 210. In this process we updated/created replacements for a number of our course to fit with the program: Phil 100, 110, 140.
How have these changes enhanced your program?	By making these changes the department will align more closely with CSU and other community college through the ADT program allowing students a smooth transition to other institutions. This has also allowed us to update our course to match with our guiding PSLOs.

## 5. New Curriculum Analysis

**5.1. If you are creating new degrees or certificates in the next 5 years: (Indicate N/A if no new degrees or certificates are planned.)**

What additional courses will need to be created to support the new degree or certificate?	None
What significant changes to existing course content would need to be made to support the new degree or certificate?	None

## 6. Advisory Board Update (For all CTE TOP coded programs)

Give an overview of the current purpose, structure, and effectiveness of your Advisory Board. Include: membership, dates of last meetings over the past two years.

## 7. Assessment Effectiveness:

### 7.1. Course Level Assessment

Please review the data provided on assessment status of courses in your discipline in Cycle 1 ( 2012-2017).

7.1.1. If there were any courses that were not assessed in Cycle 1, please explain why they were not assessed.

N/A

7.1.2. If a course was not assessed in Cycle 1 because it was not offered, what is the future of that course?

- a. Delete the course
- b. Market/promote the course to gain enrollments
- c. Other

N/A

7.1.3. Course level assessment should be meaningful, measurable and manageable. Overall, reflecting on the course level assessment, please rate the degree to which you feel your assessments meet these 3M's.

Meaningful:

1	2	3
The assessment was not meaningful in collecting data or information that supported course improvement or pedagogical changes.	<b>The intent was understood, but the outcome fell short of meeting the objective of course assessment, which is to improve student learning. The changes to the course or pedagogy to support the course were not clear.</b>	Changes were made to the course content or delivery to improve course effectiveness. The process promoted pedagogical dialog within the department, and changes were adopted accordingly.

Measurable:

1	2	3
The data collected did not inform teaching and learning.	<b>The assessment produced some measurable information, but created more questions than answers.</b>	Results were straightforward and easy to interpret. The course of action to improve the course or its delivery was clear from the data that was collected.

Manageable:

1	2	3
Assessment was not manageable.	The assessment process was somewhat manageable, but posed	<b>The assessment was easily scaled across the department so that</b>

	challenges to implement across the program.	<b>full- and part-time faculty could participate with meaningful outcomes.</b>
--	---	--

7.1.4. What changes in the assessment process itself would result in more meaningful data to improve student learning?

**The CLSO review needs to be worked into the fabric of the department, to engender meaningful conversations of the material. However, as of a year ago, none of the adjunct knew what an CSLO was, let alone how to render assessment. So the process of incorporating them into this practice has begun, and we are hopeful that with a new cycle, we will be able to set a tone and habit which will create meaningful, measurable and manageable assessment across the whole department.**

7.1.5. Share an outcome where assessment had a positive impact on student learning and program effectiveness.

**In the recent review of the Phil 122, the question was raised about what resources we use, and provide for the students, because philosophy research has its own sources, databases and requirements for what is considered reputable work. Out of this conversation, the department assembled a list and assigned Edward Haven the task of working with the library to create resources page we could all use for our students. These sources are already providing a meaningful starting point for student work and I am already seeing the impact in my student's quality of work.**

## 7.2. Program Level Assessment

7.2.1. In 2016-2017, units engaged in program level assessment. **Please submit all Program Level Assessment Reports using the link provided.** Describe one important thing you learned from your program level assessment.

**N/A**

7.2.2. What was the biggest challenge in conducting program level assessment?

**N/A**

7.2.3. What resource needs, if any, were identified in your program level assessment?

**N/A**

## 8. Course Success/Retention Analysis

**Please review the data provided on course retention and success, which has been disaggregated by as many elements as district can provide in their SQL Report**

One of our college goals as stated in our Integrated Plan is to “Increase successful course completion, and term to term persistence.” Our Equity Plan identifies African- American and low income students as disproportionately impacted in terms of successful course completion. (Foster youth are also disproportionately impacted on this indicator, but numbers are too small to disaggregate by discipline/program) Please indicate how well students in these groups are succeeding in your discipline.

	African-American	Low Income Students	All students in program/discipline
<b>Completion Rate (program/discipline)</b>	73.2% (FA 16) 76.5% (SP 17)	81.3% (FA 16) 77.4% (SP 17)	84.4% (FA 16) 80.9% (SP 17)
<b>Success Rate (program/discipline)</b>	53.7% (FA 16) 54.4% (SP 17)	62.6% (FA 16) 61.3% (SP 17)	65.6% (FA 16) 64.3% (SP 17)

8.1. In looking at disaggregated data on success/retention, is there anything else that stands out? **Our overall course success rate is low; but we have also seen an influx of Veteran seat counts. The numbers doubled from 2014 to 2017. The headcount of unknown gendered students also saw an increase from 2014 to 2015, with the growth remaining linear, as well as the students with disabilities have shown a higher completion rate today, and consistent growth, since 2014. We are unsure of the reason for the trends, but we will continue to monitor and record these trends, so to better understand the cause and expectations it may indicate for future success rates for all students.**

8.2. What are some strategies that might help students, particularly African-American, foster youth, and low income students successfully complete courses in your discipline? What resources would be needed to implement these strategies?

**Considering that the overall success is low, we could do more to discuss the measure of success that we, as philosophy faculty, set for our students overall. Focusing on low income students (which will intersect with African-American and foster youth students), offering affordable textbook options will help students past the financial barriers. For this reason, the Philosophy department is participating in the Zero Textbook Cost Degree grant. The department could use an increased department budget so that the department can print copies of Open textbooks from outside publishers.**

**For students who are African-American, it would be useful to work more black or African philosophies into our courses as well as issues/discussions around race. This dovetails nicely with the textbook issue, because if the textbook offered more philosophy from outside the traditional canon discussing more current issues students might engage with the material more. However, acquiring that material will take time and copyrights, which will cost the department money. An equity mini-grant might be a great solution.**

## 9. Goals

**9.1. Review your program's goals as listed in response to the final question of your 2012-2013 Comprehensive Program Review posted in the Data Repository of the PRST.**

Highlight some of the key goals that were achieved over the past 5 years. What were the key elements that led to success?	No 2012-2013 Comprehensive Program Review in the PRST
Were there any goals that did not go according to plan? What were the key elements that impeded the progress on these goals?	No 2012-2013 Comprehensive Program Review in the PRST

**9.2. Consider the College's Strategic Directions along with our Integrated Planning Goals listed here:**

College Strategic Directions 2014-2019	Integrated Planning Goals
<b>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</b>  <b>2. Strengthen community engagement and partnerships.</b>  <b>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness.</b>  <b>4. Invest in technology, fortify infrastructure, and enhance fiscal resources.</b>	<b>1. ACCESS:</b> increase access through enrollment of students currently underserved in our community.  <b>2. IDENTIFYING PATHWAYS:</b> Increase the number of students that define a goal and pathway by the end of their first year.  <b>3. COLLEGE-LEVEL TRANSITION:</b> Increase the number of students successfully transitioning into college level math and English courses.  <b>4. PERSISTENCE &amp; COMPLETION:</b> Increase successful course completions, and term to term persistence.  <b>5. EQUITABLE SUCCESS:</b> Improve the number of LMC students who earn associates degrees, certificates of achievement, transfer, or obtain career employment.  <b>6. LEARNING CULTURE:</b> Enhance staff, faculty and administration's understanding and use of culturally inclusive practices/pedagogy, demonstrating empathy and compassion when working with students.

List 3 – 5 longer term (5 year) new goals for your program. For each goal, pick 1 – 2 College Strategic Directions and/or 1 – 2 Integrated Planning Goals to which your new goal aligns.

Goals	Aligned College Strategic Direction(s)	Aligned Integrated Planning Goal(s)
-------	--	-------------------------------------

<p><b>Goal 1: A stainable cohort of students graduating with the Philosophy AA-T</b></p>	<p>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</p> <p>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness.</p>	<p>4. PERSISTENCE &amp; COMPLETION: Increase successful course completions, and term to term persistence.</p> <p>5. EQUITABLE SUCCESS: Improve the number of LMC students who earn associates degrees, certificates of achievement, transfer, or obtain career employment.</p>
<p><b>Goal 2: Increase student awareness and declaration of philosophy as a major, provided support for their success, focusing on underserved groups.</b></p>	<p>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</p> <p>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness.</p>	<p>1. ACCESS: increase access through enrollment of students currently underserved in our community.</p> <p>2. IDENTIFYING PATHWAYS: Increase the number of students that define a goal and pathway by the end of their first year.</p>
<p><b>Goal 3: Offer all philosophy courses with zero cost, completing the Zero Textbook Cost Degree promise</b></p>	<p>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</p> <p>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness.</p>	<p>1. ACCESS: increase access through enrollment of students currently underserved in our community.</p> <p>4. PERSISTENCE &amp; COMPLETION: Increase successful course completions, and term to term persistence.</p>
<p><b>Goal 4: Increase faculty knowledge of “nontraditional” philosophies and issues, including but not limited to Asia, African, Black, Chicano and Feminist.</b></p>	<p>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</p>	<p>5. EQUITABLE SUCCESS: Improve the number of LMC students who earn associates degrees, certificates of achievement, transfer, or obtain career employment.</p> <p>6. LEARNING CULTURE: Enhance staff, faculty and administration’s understanding and use of culturally inclusive</p>



		practices/pedagogy,
--	--	---------------------

**OPTIONAL****9.3 Resource needs to meet five-year goals**

<b><u>Faculty/Staff Resource Request</u></b>			
Department/Unit Goal - Reference #		Strategic Objective - Reference #	
Department/Unit Name		Position Name/Classification	FTE
Position Type			
<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty R/T <input type="checkbox"/> Classified <input type="checkbox"/> Manager <input type="checkbox"/> Student	<input type="checkbox"/> On-going/Permanent <input type="checkbox"/> One-time	<input type="checkbox"/> Operations (Fund 11) <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/>	
Justification:			

<b><u>Operating Resource Request</u></b>	
Department/Unit Goal - Reference #	Strategic Objective - Reference #
Department/Unit Name	Resource Type
	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment <input type="checkbox"/> IT Hardware/Software <input type="checkbox"/> Supplies <input type="checkbox"/> Facility Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Service/Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Other
General Description	
Justification:	

--

<b><u>Professional Development Resource Request</u></b>	
<b>Department/Unit Goal - Reference #</b>	<b>Strategic Objective - Reference #</b>
<b>Department/Unit Name</b>	<b>Resource Type</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Materials/Supplies <input type="checkbox"/> Online Learning <input type="checkbox"/> IT Hardware/Software <input type="checkbox"/> Other
<b>General Description</b>	
<b>Justification:</b>	