

## PHILOSOPHY

### 1. Executive Summary

#### 0. Executive Summary

This report remains partial and incomplete as there is currently **no full-time faculty** in philosophy at Cañada College. The department is in transition as long time faculty Frank Young has retired. The college is currently in the process of looking for a replacement. The replacement hiring process, however, will not be completed until the end of the spring semester delaying the completion of the program review among other things.

### 2. Program Context

1. Mission: How does your program align with the college's mission? If your program has a mission statement, include it here

The department of philosophy at Cañada College is designed to teach students the broad and wide-ranging discipline of philosophy at a college-level. The program strives to implement the highest level of teaching introducing students to the basic concepts, theories, and epistemological assumptions associated with the field of philosophy. This program is designed to serve students interested in transfer, especially but not exclusively to the CSU and UC systems. It is designed to facilitate the completion of lower division sociology courses so that students will be able to transfer to nearby institutions as juniors.

2. Articulation: Describe how your program's articulation may be impacted by changes in curriculum and degree requirements at high schools and 4-year institutions. Describe your efforts to accommodate these changes.

The philosophy degree is now AA-T ready. The AA-T degree is designed to provide clear pathways from Cañada to the CSU system. In addition, philosophy curriculum has been modified such that so course outline is more than 5 years old.

3. Describe how changes in community needs, employment needs, technology, licensing, or accreditation affect your program. CTE programs: identify the dates of your most recent advisory group meeting and describe your advisory group? recommendations for your program.

N/A

### 3. Looking Back

4. Curricular Changes: List any significant changes that have occurred in your program's curricular offerings, scheduling, or mode of delivery. Explain the rationale for these changes.

For many years most philosophy courses were taught by one full-time faculty and one or two adjuncts. There were previous very few online courses offered. However, over the past few semesters, online courses have significantly expanded. The rationale for the addition was that there were no almost no online courses offered.

5. (A) Progress Report-IPC Feedback: Provide your responses to all recommendations received in your last program review cycle.

Two issues were commented on in the previous program review. One related to not having completed an assessment of PLOs. This past year, this issue was rectified as philosophy course exams and papers were assessed in regards to PLOs along with the other social science disciplines.

The second comment related to not having enough Load to justify a full-time hire in philosophy. It is true that Load was relatively low in 2014. However, the numbers have dramatically increased such that philosophy now has one of the highest Load measures in the college (2016), thus justifying the need for a full-time philosophy position.

(B) Progress Report-Prior Action Plans: Provide a summary of the progress you have made on the strategic action plans identified in your last program review.

N/A

6. (A) Impact of Resources Allocation: Describe the impact to-date that new resources (equipment, facilities, research) requested in prior years' program reviews have had on your program. If measurable impacts on student success have been observed, be sure to describe these and include any documentation/evidence. If no resources have been recently requested, please write not applicable.

N/A

(B) Impact of Staff Changing: Describe the impact on your program of any changes in staffing levels (for example, the addition, loss or reassignment of faculty/staff). If no changes have occurred, please write "not applicable"

This past year, long time faculty Frank Young retired. Currently, there are only two adjunct professors left to teach sociology courses. There is, however, no philosophy faculty to work on curriculum, participate in committee work, or to even complete this program review.

#### 4. Current State of the Program

7. (A) Connection & Entry-Observation: Observation: Describe trends in program and course enrollments, FTES, LOAD and Fill Rates. Cite quantitative data and identify the specific tables from the data packets. If other sources of data are used, please upload these documents or provide URLs.

/

(B) Connection & Entry-Evaluation: Evaluation: What changes could be implemented, including changes to course scheduling (times/days/duration/delivery mode/number of sections), marketing, and articulation that may improve these trends in enrollment? NOTE: If you intend to implement any of these changes, you should create Action Plans in the Planning module of SPOL. Doing so will also allow you to request resources that may be required for successful implementation.

/

8. (A) Progress & Completion-Observation: Observation: Describe trends in student success and retention disaggregated by: ethnicity, gender, age, enrollment status, day/evening. Cite quantitative data and identify specific tables from the data packets. If other sources of data are used, please upload these documents or provide URLs.

/

(B) Progress & Completion Online-Observation: Observation: For online courses describe any significant differences in the success and retention of students who are taking online courses compared to face-to-face courses.

/

(C) Progress & Completion-Evaluation: Evaluation: Based on these trends, what do you feel are significant factors or barriers influencing student success in your courses and program? What changes (e.g. in curriculum, pedagogy, scheduling, modality) could be implemented to improve these trends? NOTE: If you intend to implement any of these changes, you should create Action Plans in the Planning module of SPOL. Doing so will also allow you to request resources that may be required for successful implementation.

/

9. (A) SLO Assessment-Compliance: Are all course SLOs being systematically assessed at least once every 4 years? Describe the coordination of SLO assessment across sections and over time

/

(B) SLO Assessment-Impact: Summarize the dialogue that has resulted from these course SLO assessments. What are some improvements in your courses that have been implemented through SLO assessment? How has student learning been improved by changes in teaching? Cite specific examples

/

10. (A) PLO Assessment-Plan: Describe your program's Program Learning Outcomes assessment plan. Please specify whether you are using direct or indirect measurements of assessment.

The Social Sciences consists of nine departments: anthropology, communication studies, economics, geography, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology, and have three PLOs. Mostly these are one full-time person departments. In order to assess the PLOs efficiently, the Social Science faculty have created a general analytic rubric to be used across the departments to directly measure student writing assignments as a program (note: an analytic rubric is a rubric that provides descriptive feedback along several dimensions or parts, and a general rubric is one that can be used across assignments and/or disciplines). Each department brought 5 ungraded student writing samples selected by lot from one assignment administered during the semester to create a pool of assignments to draw from (the writing prompt was also attached to each of the samples). The rubric was then used to score a random sample of student writing assignments from the program as a whole. All faculty scored student writing assignments outside of their disciplines.

Rubric scoring. The rubric was organized into three rows, one row for each PLO, and into three columns that included descriptive feedback for each level of competency: "Incomplete", "Acceptable", and "Accomplished". When evaluating the student writing assignments, the faculty selected one of the five scoring options (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, or 2) for each row of the rubric to indicate the students' level of competency ("incomplete" was represented by the scores 0 and 0.5, "acceptable" by 1 or 1.5, and accomplished by a 2). An average score of 1.0 ("acceptable") was desired.

(B) PLO Assessment-Impact: Summarize the major findings of your program's PLO assessments. What are some improvements that have been, or can be, implemented as a result of PLO assessment? NOTE: If you intend to implement any of these changes, you should create Action Plans in the Planning module of SPOL. Doing so will also allow you to request resources that may be required for successful implementation.

This past semester, 27 papers and exams were assessed. 85% (23/27) of the papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.44, an increase from the previous assessment. The criterion was met. This was the second year the rubric was used to assess student competency. During the first year, one major area of concern that was discussed during the

scoring of the samples: there was some difficulty identifying the social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting (although faculty attached the writing prompt). During the second year, there was some confusion with sampling methods. A few faculty members did not use random sampling to select their examples. This probably altered the results. It was decided all examples need to be randomly selected next semester. Also, faculty discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program.

## **5. Looking Ahead**

### 11. Program Improvement Initiatives:/