

**Program: Philosophy**

**Division: Arts and Humanities**

**Date: November 4, 2024**

**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 inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

**Please note:** Program Review is NOT 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 your program status during the 23-24 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2024-25.

#### **Helpful Links:**

- ★ [Tools for Writers](#) - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ [Program Review Glossary](#) - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ [Fall 2023 Program Reviews](#)
- ★ [Program Review FAQs](#)

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at [kspirn@laspositascollege.edu](mailto:kspirn@laspositascollege.edu)

---

## **Sections**

There are four sections to the document:

1. Review your program, including curriculum updates, accomplishments, challenges, and planning.
2. Data Analysis
3. SLO/SAO Review
4. Feedback on the PR template and process

#### **Instructions**

1. Please answer each question with enough detail to present your information, but it doesn't have to be 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 Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, Nov. 4, 2024

5. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.

***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 1: Your Program In 2024-2025

Please place an X next to N/A where relevant

### A. Accomplishments: Identify your main accomplishments from the 23-24 academic year.

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

- Did your accomplishments support your program's plans identified in recent PRs?
- Did they relate to guided pathways?
- Were they in support of the colleges [equity definition](#)?
- Did they connect to any of the college [planning priorities](#)?
- Did you receive any positive/negative feedback from students?
- Are there any innovations or new processes you'd like to integrate?
- Has your program changed in response to the SCFF model of college funding? (completions, increasing enrollment, offering certificates, degrees, etc.)?

In our last program review, we noted that we planned to review Philosophy 1 and Philosophy 4, and update the curriculum, with a special emphasis on diversity and inclusion of representation in the course content. Both of those courses were updated in this cycle. Philosophy 1 was found to already contain diverse content in virtue of previous revisions, and the course outline for Philosophy 4 was updated to reflect the need for a wider diversity of content, especially in terms of feminist epistemology and epistemic thinkers from minority traditions. We believe this supports the LPC equity mission to provide a "high-quality education focused on learning and an inclusive, culturally relevant environment that meets the diverse needs of all our students." Specifically, this focuses on cultural relevance by ensuring the representation of diverse intellectual histories.

Our program saw the highest productivity and head-count ratings that we have seen over the past several years. The productivity ratings we expect to see continue, but we have some specific reasons why we expect the head-count ratings to decrease due to the CALGETC removal of Introduction to Logic from the breadth curriculum.

We were happy to see our service to older adults has continued to increase because our service to that population had been decreasing for several years prior to the most recent review cycles.

We were able to evaluate a PSLO in our program for the first time based on our 3-year planning cycle. Student performance was roughly equal when disaggregated by gender but showed but reflected national trends in disproportionate performance based on the categories of race-ethnicity.

N/A \_\_\_\_\_

### B. Challenges, Pain Points, and Needs

What significant or ongoing challenges or obstacles did your Program face during the 23-24 academic year, especially related to accomplishing program goals/plans? Consider funding, staffing, materials, facilities, outside requirements such as legislative mandates, working on equity gaps, etc. Highlight/identify any challenges mentioned in previous reviews.

Our program has grown quickly, as have most programs on our campus, in the last few years. Challenges of disproportionate performance based on the categories of race-ethnicity.

N/A\_\_\_\_\_

**C. Planning: What are your program's most important plans, either new or continuing?**

- We will be evaluating our PSLO based on logical analysis for the philosophy program.
- We will participate in our first Arts and Humanities Expo to promote our program for new students.
- We will continue to monitor our outcomes based on age, gender, race-ethnicity and other attributes of relevant sub-populations.
- We will monitor changes student enrollment in our logic course based on the new CALGETC requirements that do not include logic as fulfilling a required criteria for undergraduate breadth.
- If we are able to obtain dis-aggregated data by course, we will see if success rates in our Philosophy 1 courses have increased since our last program review
- We will follow success rates to see if they improve above our program set standard.

N/A\_\_\_\_\_

**D. Identify any college, district, or legislative barriers to your program's equity work. What suggestions do you have for minimizing or eliminating these barriers?**

Barriers: IR data disaggregated by course was not in our IR packet this year

Suggestions: Obtaining that data would be useful for identifying courses with specific struggles.

N/A\_\_\_\_\_

**E. Curriculum Updates**

Reasons for updating include that it is required every two (CTE) or five (non-CTE) years, there is a program or college need, starting a new program, or new legislation.

1. Are you planning to update any curriculum in 24-25?  
Yes\_\_\_ No\_x\_\_
2. Comments (Optional):
3. Please review your program [maps](#). Do you need to make any modifications?  
Yes\_\_\_ No\_x\_\_
4. If yes, compare each [Program Map](#) to your current course offerings and sequencing. Pay close attention to prerequisite information, and classes offered only during certain semesters.
  - a) If your map requires a **non-curricular change** (i.e., course sequencing), consult your [Pathway counseling faculty liaison](#) to initiate changes.

b) **If your map requires a curricular change** (Program modifications) - these are initiated through the Curriculum Committee.

Any questions? Contact the [Curriculum Chair](#) or the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist](#).

---

## Section 2: Data Analysis – Quantitative and Qualitative

**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 and reach out to [the IR team](#).)*

Here are a few samples of data to review and reference if that's helpful.

- IR Data packets [are available here](#) (Posted Fall 24)
- Academic & Career [Pathway Specific data](#) (Posted Fall 24)
- Your program's survey data
- [Transfer data](#)
- Course Set Standard Overview & Success Rates Dashboard are in the middle of [this page](#)

### Student Headcount

Our number of students is at its highest rate in years, and perhaps at its highest rate ever. We expect this number to actually decrease over the next few years, primarily because the rate of students taking logic should fall of dramatically as CALGETC makes its way through the advising and planning cycle of students. Logic has made up an increasing proportion of our courses, and is expected to fall to much lower rates over the next few years, making up 44% (4/9) of our course offerings in Spring of 2023 and 50% (2/4) of our offerings in Summer 2024. If the number of students taking logic falls as expected, it could easily result in a drop of student enrollments of 30% or more over the next few years.

### Student Demographics: Age

In our last program review we noted an increase of student over 30 who were taking our courses. This trend reversed a trend noted over many years of fewer and fewer older students in our courses. At that time, we said we would monitor to see if this was a persistent trend, thinking it might just be the result of Covid or the result of so many of our courses being online, which would be convenient for adults who may be working full-time or have other commitments. Since that time the participation of older adults has continued to increase, so this trend seems to be continuing.

### Student Demographics Race

No consistent trends in Race/Ethnicity data could be detected.

## Course Success Rates

In our last program review we noted some changes that we planned to implement in our Philosophy 1 courses to raise our success rates to our program set standard. We did meet our program set standard last year (2022-2023) during which time we submitted a “now substantial changes” report rather than a complete program review, however, this year we have fallen back below our set standard. We have speculated that the increase in Phil 6 courses is the reason for this change, but we are not able to observe the success rates for our specific courses because that data was not provided in the IR packets like it was for the 2021-2022 program cycle.

## Productivity

Our productivity marks were higher this year, with 598 in the fall, and 592 in the spring. This is expected to be mostly due to increasing students returning post-covid, and this trend is expected to continue in next years program review due to an increasing overall population and limited funds to serve students and offer additional courses in the campus as a whole.

### ***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. 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There are valid reasons a program does not meet the Program Set Standard; when a program does not meet this standard, they are 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.](#)

1. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion?

Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_x\_\_\_\_

2. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

## Program Set Standard Analysis

We have noticed that the last year or so has seen a high level of students expressing exhaustion, conflicting priorities, mental health challenges, and other obstacles to their learning. Many of the students expressing these concerns also end up dropping our courses or staying in the courses but stop attending and learning in the last month or so of the course.

Another trend we have had over the past few years is a large increase in the number of logic courses that we are offering. Logic courses contain a large proportion of mathematics and formal logic content. Because of this, the success rates are always closer to those of mathematics classes than to other courses in the humanities. Interestingly, CALGETC will no longer require logic as a lower division breadth requirement, so the number of students taking logic, and the number of courses we offer, is expected to fall precipitously. This may well have the

inadvertent result of our overall success rates going up as logic will make up a disproportionate percentage of our courses.

---

### Section 3: SLOs/SAOs: Assessment of Student Learning and Support

Program Review is the college's major data source on student learning and support and is, therefore, regularly reviewed. *Each year, programs must discuss their PSLOs, CSLOs, or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs.) This helps us to see how our students are progressing in their learning.* For assistance with these questions and instructions on running reports using eLumen, [click here](#).

Please complete at least one of the following three sections based on what is appropriate for your program.

Check at least one below:

- 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)**

To assess PSLOs within eLumen, CSLOs must be correctly mapped to only one PSLO, and every mapped CSLO must have assessment data. Please review the items below and proceed accordingly.

- If the CSLOs are mapped correctly and there is data for each CSLO, then continue to question 2.
  - 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.
  - If not all mapped CSLOs have assessment data, then you cannot assess the PSLO. In this case, continue to section C2.
1. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)

Will at least one SLO be assessed in each course by June 2026?

Yes  No

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

2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the PSLO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.

We chose our PSLO based on logic because it is the PSLO that is most specific to the philosophy major, and it is the skill that students struggle with the most.

3. What percentage of faculty completed the planned CSLO assessments? (In eLumen, [run a Faculty Participation report](#) for 23-24).
  - 50   %
  
4. Analysis of PSLO(s): What conclusions can be drawn about student learning and equity in your program based on eLumen and/or other data? You may want to consider disaggregated data. When using eLumen [See the Guide](#) for instructions on how to disaggregate PSLO data.

### **Male/Female**

Women and men were found to have very similar outcomes for the relevant PSLO as seen below.

#### Female Self-Identified

Mastery		Above Average		Average		Below Average		No Demonstrated Achievement	
110	60.11%	18	9.84%	13	7.10%	17	9.29%	25	13.66%

#### Male Self-Identified

Mastery		Above Average		Average		Below Average		No Demonstrated Achievement	
105	56.45%	15	8.06%	21	11.29%	11	5.91%	34	18.28%

### **Age**

Those older than 21 and those 21 or younger were found to have very similar outcomes, as shown below.

#### 21 or Younger

Mastery		Above Average		Average		Below Average		No Demonstrated Achievement	
176	59.26%	26	8.75%	30	10.10%	23	7.74%	42	14.14%

#### Over 21

Mastery		Above Average		Average		Below Average		No Demonstrated Achievement	
49	54.44%	7	7.78%	5	5.56%	5	5.56%	24	26.67%

### **Race/Ethnicity**

Race and ethnicity data show trends similar to national trends, with White and Asian students generally performing higher on the PSLO and African American, Hispanic, Filipino, and Pacific Islander students generally



hada lower average achievement level. These trends match trends found in high-school scores. (see, fore example, NAEP – National Assessment of Educational Progress mathematics data for 12<sup>th</sup> grade students, <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/mathematics/nation/groups/?grade=12>).

Because this aspect of philosophy is largely based on mathematics and formal logic, the specific content is largely based on mandated principles that would share a similar curriculum interculturally. Still, efforts are made to choose textbooks with examples that are multicultural to encourage inclusion. Efforts are also made to provide final project analysis data that students can choose based on concerns from diverse student populations, including issues often found in minority communities. For example, example data sets and arguments from the Opposing Viewpoints are often used to allow students to analyze (if they choose) issues relevant to minority communities. (See reports from groups such as the NAACP <https://naacp.org/know-issues> and the Ballard Report <https://ballardbrief.byu.edu/issue-briefs/educational-disparities-among-racial-and-ethnic-minority-youth-in-the-united-states> for information on topic of interest to minority populations and issues faced disproportionately by minority populations.

We have discussed these issues and encouraging continued focus on them throughout the next review period.

5. Based on discussions with others in your program, explain potential changes designed to improve student learning and close any equity gaps identified through the analysis of PSLO data. Please also note if you decide to update any CSLOs or PSLOs based on this analysis (If updating, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this).

We have discussed these issues and are encouraging continued focus on them throughout the next review period. We will continue to monitor these issues for improvements.

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

Running the right reports and finding the information we were looking for within the report was quite a challenge.

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

1. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)

Will all courses be assessed by June 2026?

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](#).*

2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the CSLO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review.
3. What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments for the selected CSLO? (In eLumen, [run a Faculty Participation report](#) for 23-24).
4. What conclusions can you draw from the CSLO data and reflections in eLumen. If you used any additional evidence or methods to answer this question, please explain.
5. Explain potential program changes designed to improve student learning. Please also note if you have decided to update any CSLOs or PSLOs based on analysis (If updating, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this).
6. 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. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)  
Will all courses be assessed by June 2026?  
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](#).*
2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the SAO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review.
3. [Based on discussion with others in your area](#), what conclusions can be drawn from the SAO data and reflection questions from eLumen or other sources of data?
4. Explain any planned changes to improve outcomes in your service area. Please note if you have decided to update any SAOs based on this analysis.
5. 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.

### **Section 4: Suggestions for the Program Review Committee (optional)**

What questions or suggestions about this year's Program Review forms or process do you have?

We know that IR is overburdened with so many responsibilities and requests, but having the course-level data like we had for 2021-2022 would be of great assistance. Without that data, we are left to speculate in an evidentiary vacuum about which courses are the cause of trends found in our program as a whole.