

PROGRAM REVIEW Fall 2022

Program: Philosophy

Division: Arts and Humanities

Date: October 28, 2022

Writer(s): Jeremiah Bodnar

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Jeremiah Bodnar

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Uses: This Program Review will be used to inform the campus and community about your program. It will also be used in creating Division Summaries, determining College Planning Priorities, and allocating resources. The final use is to document fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Please note: Program Review is NOT in itself a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your Dean or supervisor.

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect on program status during the 2022-23 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2023-24.

Sections: There are two sections to this document. Sections and questions identify the name of the committee or office that will use the information and where you can get additional help.

- The first section focuses on general program reflection and planning.
- The second section focuses on data analysis, including SLOs/SAOs/PSLOs
- The final section is a review of your pathway maps and curriculum, to be filled out only by programs with curriculum offerings.

Topics: The Program Review Glossary defines key terms. Writers should review this glossary before writing: <https://bit.ly/2LqPxOW>

For Help: Contact Nadiyah Taylor: ntaylor@laspositascollege.edu.

A list of contacts for help with specific sections is provided on the Program Review website under the “tools for writers” tab. [<https://bit.ly/3fY7Ead>]

Instructions:

- 1) Please respond to each question with enough detail to present your information, but it doesn't have to be very long.
- 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
- 3) Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.
- 4) Send an electronic copy of this form to Nadiyah Taylor and your dean **by November 1, 2022**

Helpful Links:

[Program Review Home Page](#)

[Fall 2021 Program Reviews](#)

[Frequently Asked Questions](#)

Throughout this document you'll see that equity is a guiding principle.

Here is the LPC definition:

Las Positas College will achieve equity by changing the impacts of structural racism, ableism, homophobia, and systematic poverty on student success and access to higher education, achieved through continuous evaluation and improvement of all services. We believe in a high-quality education focused on learning and an inclusive, culturally-relevant environment that meets the diverse needs of all our students.

LPC Equity Definition: Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus.

Section One: Your Program In 21-22 – Please check N/A where relevant

A. Accomplishments: Identify accomplishments from the 21-22 AY.

Some areas you may want to note in your explanation are:

- Did your accomplishments support your program's plans identified in 21-22 PR
- Did they relate to guided pathways, and/or
- Did they support areas in the equity definition above

_____ N/A

Accomplishments
1. Last year in our program review we noted a desire to update our ethics content to reflect more diverse traditions and well as traditions offering challenges to the main Western ethical theories. These elements were de-emphasized when C-ID required that Aristotle, Kant and Utilitarianism make up the bulk of any C-ID conforming ethics course. While keeping a strong emphasis on these 3 thinkers, the course outline was expanded to reflect a need for broader cultural literacy and the importance of minority and intercultural traditions.
2. Representation of African American students had increased in the year of our 2020-2021 program review. In that program review we indicated that we would monitor our numbers this year to see if that trend remained stable. Representation of African American students remained at that sustained level for the 2021-2022 evaluation cycle.
3. Overall the representation of minority students in Philosophy courses increased over the 202-2022 academic year, with an increase of 6% in the overall minority population representation seen in Spring 2022.
4
5
6

Tab to add more lines as needed

B. Challenges, Pain Points, and Needs:

What significant challenges or obstacles did your Program face during AY 21-22 especially related to accomplishing program goals/plans? You may want to consider areas in the equity definition on page 2.

_____ N/A

Challenges/Pain Points/Needs
1. As indicated in our 2020-2021 program review, we had planned to evaluate the Philosophy 2 course for inclusivity of comparative traditions and representation of ethical theories relating to race and gender. Several years ago this content was deemphasized in the course outline in response to CSU CID requirements that the course focus primarily on Kant, Aristotle and the Utilitarians. Our newly revised course keeps this important set of core ideas, but also brings to the forefront the expectation for representation of other theories that are more diverse culturally and geographically.
2. In our last program review (2020-2021) we noted an increase in students over 50, a population that has suffered in general over the last 20 years. We were happy to see a marked increase in this population during that period. That increase held for Fall 2021, but had evaporated by Spring 2022. Similar results were noted in the Humanities discipline as well. It is speculated that this transient increase in the relevant population was the result of a preponderance of online courses, as well as the free time generated by broad stay-at-home orders for the older working population.
3. In this evaluation cycle our program missed our program set standard by 4%. This decrease seems to be driven primarily by Philosophy 1, and to a lesser extent by Philosophy 6. Remediation plans are discussed below.
4. This year we plan to update Philosophy 1 and Philosophy 4, consistent with 5 year planning cycle expectations. We also plan to review the outlines to reflect concerns of equity and including during this revision cycle.
5.
6.

Tab to add more lines as needed

C. Reflecting on your program's experiences from 2020 - to 2022, what innovations or new processes did you integrate that you would like to continue?

_____N/A

--

D. Explain one way that your program is connected to the College Mission and/or Educational Master Plan. Identify the specific elements.

- [College Mission](#)
- [Educational Master Plan](#) (see pages 72-76)

_____ N/A

The college Mission Statement includes language on the importance of inclusion and equity. The ethics curriculum was recently updated to reflect an emphasis on equity through discussion of post-colonialist philosophy and intercultural comparative ethical theories. Similar content-specific curriculum can be found in Philosophy 1, 3, and 5.

E. Planning: What are the most important plans, either new or continuing, for your Program?

_____ N/A

Plan	New	Continuing	Short term	Long term
We are in year 2 of evaluating the logic element of our PSLO for the Philosophy program. In the past 2 years there has been a wide variation in the instructors teaching the course and the outcomes. The outcomes were significantly better for 2020-2021 than for 2021-2022, but many potentially confounding variables make the results difficult to interpret. These include the effects of Covid, and the fact that the course was taught by a different instructor almost every term, some of whom had less experience teaching the course, and different instructors will use different assignments to evaluate the related SLO's. For next year we plan to complete the 3 year evaluation cycle and look at the 3 years of trends as a whole to see if broader actions are necessary. This year we plan to take a closer look at our textbooks and evaluate them for diverse representation. This is in response to the lower success rates in the SLO for minority students for the PSLO. This PSLO is fed mainly from SLO's in Phil 6.		x	x	

In this evaluation cycle our program missed our program set standard by 4%. This decrease seems to be driven primarily by Philosophy 1, and to a lesser extent by Philosophy 6. Because the most dramatic effect was in Philosophy 1, the instructors teaching this course met to discuss specific strategies that could be used to encourage student success and retention. Methods discussed included additional supports, tutorials, outreach, guidance, helpful announcements, instructions, introductory videos, and grading feedback. Our main teacher for Philosophy 1 plans to 1.) Create a new page in my Course Information module that emphasizes the significance of doing well on quizzes to the course grade and explains some tips and strategies for doing well on quizzes. 2.) Message students who fail to submit (required) assignments in the first month of the term. 3.) Message students who are falling behind (>75% course grade) near the midpoint of the semester. 4.) Message students who fail to submit a final essay assignment. We hope to see some progress with our numbers here and look forward to evaluating next year.				
Feedback from a departmental survey, as well as enrollment trends over the past year, indicate that philosophy students disproportionately prefer taking their courses online and asynchronously. In response to this expectation, we plan to shift a higher proportion of our courses to the online, asynchronous format. We will monitor trends next year to see if this helps stem the decrease in student enrollments seen in the discipline.				

Tab to add more lines as needed

F. If you have outreached to students in your department, program, or classes, please share information about what you discovered and how you have used the feedback.

_____ N/A

Describe student outreach used to gather feedback. For example, through surveys, conversations, etc.	During the time of covered by this program review I ran surveys in my courses requesting information on the preferences of my students for the online, hybrid, on-campus, synchronous and asynchronous modalities.
What did you learn?	It was found that most students preferred their philosophy courses in an online, asynchronous format.
How will you use the feedback?	The feedback was used to advocate for a higher proportion of online courses in our discipline. Continuing trends show we should continue this for the rest of 2022-23.

G. Are there institutional barriers to the equity work that your program would like to engage in, and what suggestions do you have for minimizing or eliminating these barriers? (See page 2, for the equity definition)

___x___ N/A

Barrier	Suggestions

Section Two: Data Analysis – Quantitative and Qualitative

A. IR Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

(Note: Not all Programs have IR data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box.)

- IR Data packets are available here (posted Fall 22): <https://bit.ly/2lYaFu7>
- Course Set Standard Overview & Success Rates Dashboard can be found in the middle of this page: <https://bit.ly/2Y9vGpl>

--

Overall program success rates their lowest numbers in the last several years during the 2021-2022 school year. The most dramatic of these drops was Philosophy 1, which saw success rates drop to 54% success for 2021-22, but Philosophy 6: Logic also saw a drop to 60% for 2021-22, both of which are the lowest success rates for those courses in the last 5-year cycle.

		Las Positas College						Total	
		Success		Non-success		Withdrawal			
		Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct
PHIL 1	2016-17	282	75%	38	10%	54	14%	374	100%
	2017-18	307	80%	39	10%	36	9%	382	100%
	2018-19	241	77%	36	11%	38	12%	315	100%
	2019-20	180	65%	39	14%	56	20%	275	100%
	2020-21	158	64%	20	8%	69	28%	247	100%
	2021-22	87	54%	45	28%	28	18%	160	100%
PHIL 6	2016-17	30	71%	2	5%	10	24%	42	100%
	2017-18	31	67%	5	11%	10	22%	46	100%
	2018-19	27	61%	5	11%	12	27%	44	100%
	2020-21	75	77%	8	8%	14	14%	97	100%
	2021-22	84	60%	30	21%	27	19%	141	100%

B. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only):

The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly. There are valid reasons a program does not meet the Program Set Standard; when a program does not meet this standard, they are simply asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate.

[Program-set standard data can be found on this page](#)

- Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion?
____ Yes __X__ No
- If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

[illegible]

PHIL	66%	70%	✗		78%	831	76%	798	74%	742	66%	618	72%	733	66%	555
------	-----	-----	---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

As discussed above we had disappointing success rates in our Philosophy 6 and Philosophy 1 courses, with the most dramatic effects in Philosophy 1, showing the only success rate in the 50's or below for the recorded 5 year cycle. We plan to have a discussion and brain storming session with all the faculty teaching Philosophy 1 this year to discuss possible strategies to generate student persistence and success, including ways in which the course could be better adjusted to support student needs and facilitate success.

C. SLOs/SAOs: Assessment of Student Learning and Support

Program Review is our major source of data on student learning for the college and is therefore regularly reviewed. *Each year programs must discuss how their PSLOs, CSLOs, or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) support the College Mission. This helps us to see how our students are progressing in their learning.*

For assistance with these questions and instructions on how to run the necessary reports in eLumen, [click here](#).

You should complete at least one of the following three sections. Please choose the option(s) below that are appropriate for your program - Go directly to the section(s) you chose.

- [C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs \(disaggregated PSLOs\)](#)
- [C2: Instructional Programs with CSLOs \(Departments without degrees, non-major courses, and/or other courses up for assessment\)](#)
- [C3: Non-Instructional Programs \(SAOs\)](#)

C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs (disaggregated PSLOs)

- 1) To assess PSLOs, CSLOs must be correctly mapped to only one PSLO within eLumen and every mapped CSLO must have assessment data. Please insert a checkmark in one of the following options that correctly describes your data and move on accordingly.
 - a. If the CSLOs are mapped correctly and there is data for each CSLO, then continue to question 2.
 - b. If the CSLOs have assessment data and the mapping needs to be completed, then complete the mapping within eLumen ([See SLO Handbook, p. 7](#)) and continue to question 2.

- c. If not all of the mapped CSLOs have assessment data, then you cannot assess the PSLO. In this case, continue to question C2.

2. Based on your current [3-year plan](#), list the PSLO(s) for the academic year 2021-2022 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.

For this 3-year cycle we chose to focus on our PSLO dealing with the learning of formal logical technique. We chose this PSLO because it is the skill in the philosophy degree that students seem to struggle with the most.

2) What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments for the selected PSLO? ([run Faculty Participation report](#) from last year). ____100____%

3) Non-disaggregated Analysis of PSLO(s): In general, what conclusions can be drawn about student learning in your program?

PSLO Data for formal logical technique shows that most students are gaining proficiency in formal logical technique. Data also showed that during the 2021-2022 school year the level of proficiency in this PSLO dropped meaningfully.

PSLO: Upon completion of the AA-T in Philosophy, students are able to develop and present formal philosophical arguments using effective logical argumentative technique and avoiding logical error and fallacies.

	Mastery		Above Average		Average		Below Average		No Demonstrated Achievement	
Fall 2020	61	44.85%	29	21.32%	17	12.50%	15	11.03%	14	10.29%
Spring 2021	66	48.18%	36	26.28%	18	13.14%	7	5.11%	10	7.30%
Summer 2021	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Fall 2021	56	50.45%	17	15.32%	10	9.01%	10	9.01%	18	16.22%
Spring 2022	26	19.70%	26	19.70%	27	20.45%	19	14.39%	34	25.76%
Overall	209	40.50%	108	20.93%	72	13.95%	51	9.88%	76	14.73%

Interestingly, the most obvious correlation in this data is that students seemed to be doing better with this PSLO when all courses were online, suggesting that the large amount of online resources may have been helpful for this group, or that the end of stay-at-home orders were associated with significant life stressors that resulted in incomplete or poorly completed work. Another observation is that these courses (Philosophy 6 and 8) were expanded to include much larger numbers of students than in previous years. Past data shows that expanding the accessibility of a course to meet student demand often results in lower success rates because students with lower priority numbers (and hence less preparation) and students who delay (and might be thought less proactive in their education) will be able to add their desired course in higher numbers, but with a plausibly lower likelihood of success.

As discussed in the Data Packet evaluation section, these trends also correlate with overall

program success rates which saw their lowest numbers in the last several years during the 2021-2022 school year. The most dramatic of these drops was Philosophy 1, which saw success rates drop to 54% success for 2021-22, but Philosophy 6: Logic also saw a drop to 60% for 2021-22, both of which are the lowest success rates for those courses in the last 5 year cycle.

- 4) Disaggregated Analysis of PSLO(s) to identify potential inequity: Disaggregation allows you to examine inequities in student learning outcomes within sub-populations in your program. [See the Guide](#) for instructions on how to disaggregate PSLO data.

Which variables did you use to disaggregate the data? Mark all the apply.

- Gender
- Age
- Ethnicity
- EOPS
- Veteran
- BOG Recipient
- First Generation
- DE
- Online
- Hybrid
- Fact-to-Face

- 5) Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns.

Data show that the outcomes vary quite a bit from semester to semester based in demographic correlations. For race/ethnicity African American students had the highest incidence of non-success over the relevant time period with a success rate in the relevant PSLO of under 50%. The overall numbers of African American students are low, but the data does call for reflection. It is possible that well documented external factors such as economic conditions, work situations and other pressures are the major factors here, but we do plan to monitor these trends over time and consider aspects of the relevant courses themselves may help contribute. Data for African American Students is below.

PSLO: Upon completion of the AA-T in Philosophy, students are able to develop and present formal philosophical arguments using effective logical argumentative technique and avoiding logical error and fallacies.

	Mastery		Above Average		Average		Below Average		No Demonstrated Achievement	
Fall 2020	3	75.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Spring 2021	4	36.36%	2	18.18%	4	36.36%	1	9.09%	0	0.00%
Summer 2021	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Fall 2021	5	23.81%	3	14.29%	0	0.00%	5	23.81%	8	38.10%
Spring 2022	6	33.33%	1	5.56%	3	16.67%	4	22.22%	4	22.22%
Overall	18	33.33%	7	12.96%	7	12.96%	10	18.52%	12	22.22%

This can be compared with the non-disaggregated data set below

PSLO: Upon completion of the AA-T in Philosophy, students are able to develop and present formal philosophical arguments using effective logical argumentative technique and avoiding logical error and fallacies.

	Mastery		Above Average		Average		Below Average		No Demonstrated Achievement	
Fall 2020	61	44.85%	29	21.32%	17	12.50%	15	11.03%	14	10.29%
Spring 2021	66	48.18%	36	26.28%	18	13.14%	7	5.11%	10	7.30%
Summer 2021	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Fall 2021	56	50.45%	17	15.32%	10	9.01%	10	9.01%	18	16.22%
Spring 2022	26	19.70%	26	19.70%	27	20.45%	19	14.39%	34	25.76%
Overall	209	40.50%	108	20.93%	72	13.95%	51	9.88%	76	14.73%

- 6) Identify any challenges facing your department that may contribute to inequitable outcomes as revealed by your disaggregated PSLO data. (Refer to section 1B if needed)

Philosophy 6 and 8, the relevant course for this PSLO are the courses that are least directly amenable to revisions of inclusion and diversity in content since they are the only courses that focus on formal manipulation of language and symbols rather than cultural, philosophical, or literary content. At least some of the course textbooks used by instructors have been examined for inclusive language, and it is clear that efforts are being made by the textbook companies to include inclusive language on some culturally diverse example cases with the problem sets and instruction.

- 7) Based on discussion with others in your program, explain potential changes that will improve student learning and address inequities identified through analysis of disaggregated PSLO data.

Examination of the inclusive language of the course textbooks used by a broader range of instructors could confirm inclusivity for the relevant courses on a broader scale.

- 8) The 2022-2023 Academic year is the last year in our 3-year assessment cycle. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all of your courses will be assessed by June 2023.

Will all of your courses be assessed by June 2023?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist, and the SLO Chair](#).

9) Are you planning on updating any CSLOs or PSLOs?

_____ YES _____x_____ NO

(If yes, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this.)

10) If you experienced any challenges in completing your PSLO assessment process please list those in the box below along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

The relevant reports, especially when disaggregated include massive amounts of report elements, but often with small sample sizes and different assignments being used by different instructors (in accordance with academic freedom) to rate the individual student scores on the PSLO's. This is nothing new, but does make the process challenging.

C2: Instructional Programs With CSLOs - Departments without degrees, non-major courses, and/or other courses up for assessment

1. Based on your current [3-year plan](#), list the CSLO(s) for the academic year 2021-2022 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.

2. What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments for the selected CSLO? (run [Faculty Participation](#) report from last year). _____%

3. [Using the CSLO data and reflection questions](#), what are some conclusions?

4. List changes that you plan on making to improve student learning.

5. The 2022-2023 Academic year is the last year in our 3-year assessment cycle. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all of your courses will be assessed by June 2023.

Will all of your courses be assessed by June 2023?

____ Yes ____ No

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist](#), and the [SLO Chair](#).

6. Are you planning on updating any CSLOs?

____ YES ____ NO

(If yes, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this.)

7. If you experienced any challenges in completing your CSLO assessment process please list those in the box below along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

C3: Non-Instructional Programs (SAOs)

1. Based on your current [3-year plan](#), list the SAO(s) for the academic year 2021-2022 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.

2. What percentage of staff completed the planned assessments for the selected SAO(s)? (run [Faculty Participation report](#) from last year). _____%

3. Based on discussion with others in your area: Using the [SAO data and reflection questions](#) or other sources of data, what conclusions can be made?

* If you used other sources of data, briefly explain below.

4. List changes that you plan to improve outcomes in your service area.

5. The 2022-2023 Academic year is the last year in our 3-year assessment cycle. Please review your [3-year plan](#) and verify that all of your courses will be assessed by June 2023.

Will all of your courses be assessed by June 2023?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed, or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the Curriculum and SLO Specialist, and the SLO Chair.

6. Are you planning on updating any SAOs?

☐ YES ☐ NO

(If yes, then you may do this through eLumen, see the SLO Handbook if you need instructions on how to do this.)

7. If you experienced any challenges in completing your SAO assessment process please list those below, along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

Note: There is an opportunity to give feedback on the PR template on the last page if you won't be completing the next sections

Section Three: Guided Pathways & Curriculum Review

(Programs with Courses Only)

For assistance with these questions, contact the [Curriculum Committee Chair](#)

Part One: Guided Pathways: Your program's work with guided pathways

A. Program Maps - [The Program Maps \(degree and certificate course sequences\) are found in Academic & Career Pathways](#)

Up-to-date Program Maps are used by students in your pathway, for data collection to support in-reach to students in your Pathway, predictive scheduling recommendations for Discipline Plans, and may influence the allocation of FTEF.

Please compare each Program Map to your current course offerings and course sequencing. Pay close attention to prerequisite information and to classes that may only be offered particular terms.

1) Are your Program Maps accurate?

- Yes, all of my maps are accurate X
 - No. The Program Map for _____ (degree/certificate name) _____
Requires an update
 - Requires a **non-curricular change** (ie: course sequencing) Please consult your [Pathway counseling faculty liaison](#)
 - **Curricular Change** (Program modifications) - Modifications are initiated through the Curriculum Committee. For mapping support contact the [Curriculum & SLO Specialist](#).
-

Part Two: Curriculum Review

For assistance with this section, contact the [Curriculum Committee Chair](#).

The following questions ask you to review your program's curriculum. To see the last outline revision date and revision due date follow the directions below:

1. Log in to CurricUNET
2. Select "Course Outline Report" under "Reports/Interfaces"
3. Select the report as an Excel file or as HTML

A. Title V Updates [Curriculum Committee]: Do you need to update any courses to stay within the 5-year cycle? List courses requiring updates below.

Reminder: updates to course title or units, and course deactivations, will require updating any program they are associated with. List programs requiring updating in question (C).

☒ YES ☐ No

Course Name & Number
Philosophy 1: God, Nature, Human Nature (4/30/2023)
Philosophy 4: Knowledge (4/30/2023)

B. Degree/Certificate Updates [Curriculum Committee]: Do any programs require modification in this cycle? If yes, list them below.

Reminder: Program modifications sent to the Curriculum Committee for approval require an updated Program Map. For mapping and curriculum support please contact the [Curriculum & SLO Specialist](#).

☐ YES ☒ No

Certificate or Degree

C. Are there any courses or programs for which a non-mandatory update is planned?

Reminder: Program modifications sent to the Curriculum Committee for approval require an updated Program Map. For mapping and curriculum support please contact the [Curriculum & SLO Specialist](#).

☐ YES ☒ Not at this time

If yes, explain details, rationale, or any support that might be helpful to the committee.

--

D. Does your program plan to create any new courses or programs this year?

Reminder:: New program proposals require a Program Map for Senate approval. Please **contact the Curriculum & SLO Specialist** if you are planning a new program.

_____ YES ☒ No

If yes, please provide details and the rationale

--

E. Are there any courses that you plan to deactivate or sunset?

☒ YES _____ No

Course Name & Number
Philosophy 1H: Honors God, Nature, Human Nature
Philosophy 2H: Honors Ethics

Program Review Suggestions (optional): What questions or suggestions do you have regarding this year's Program Review forms or process?

--