College of San Mateo

Program Review Submission

2014-2015 Instructional Program Review

Program Name: **Philosophy**
Program Contact: **Ball, Jeremy**
Academic Year: **2014-2015**
Status: **Submitted for review**
Updated on: **03/30/2015 08:22 AM**

---

1. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's **College Mission and Diversity Statements**, **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**, **5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** as appropriate.

1. **The department offers four courses which are primarily taken by students who are transferring and /or seeking an AA/AS degree. All four classes count as meeting GE requirements for an Associates' degree and for CSU GE transfer. Three of them count as IGETC transfer courses. There is neither a Philosophy major nor certificate at this time. We will develop an AA-T this next year. There are no sequential course offering. The courses promote student excellence by their rigorous standards and addresses the institutional mission statement by preparing "…students to be informed and engaged citizens in an increasingly global community." We also maintain a themed learning community program with the Psychology department, "Movie Night", as a means to enhance institutional dialog and responds to the '5 in 5 goal' of "Establish "themed" experiences/integrated learning communities." Currently the development of the AA-T for Philosophy is being created at the state level and will eventually be implemented at CSM, streamlining the transfer process for students majoring in Philosophy.**

---

2. Student Learning and Program Data

A. Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for courses offered by the program. Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

We performed a complete assessment of all SLOs for all courses in the Fall of 2011 and determined we were successfully communicating the information. We plan to reassess in the Spring of 2015.

2. Comment on the success rates in the program SLOs that are aligned with specific course SLOs. What do the program SLO and course data reveal about students completing the program? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement. Is the alignment between course and program SLOs appropriate and informative? See **course-to-program SLO alignment mapping**.

Philosophy is not a program in and of itself, so we don't have Program SLOs. Based on the assessment we have done to date, we appear to be achieving our course SLOs adequately and connecting to GE SLOs. Enrollments are high (indeed we typically turn away students who want to enroll particular y in the Online section of phil 100.

3. Evaluate the program SLOs in relation to survey data from the degree and certificate award earners survey. What does the survey data reveal about the effectiveness of the program SLOs? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

> N/A

4. Describe any additional methods used to assess program SLOs and reflect on the results of those assessments.

> N/A

5. For any courses in the program that satisfy a GE requirement, which GE SLOs are supported or reinforced by the course SLOs? What do assessment results for the course SLOs reveal about student attainment of the GE SLOs? See **GE SLO Alignment Summary Report** or **All Courses GE SLO Alignment Data**.

> Our courses appear to map very well with GE SLOs, with the notable exception of Quantitative reasoning skills. As a department we plan to address this by taking our current Phil 103 course and splitting the content covered in it into two courses. One of the courses will aim at fulfilling the 1B requirement. We will remove the symbolic logic sections of the course and focus more on argumentative and expository writing. The other class would be a symbolic logic course and might better address the college GE SLO regarding quantitative analysis and formal reasoning. This class is also a key element in our CID process.

B. Student Success Indicators

1. Review **Student Success and Core Program Indicators** and discuss any differences in student success indicators across demographic variables. Also refer to the **College Index** and other relevant sections of the **Educational Master Plan: Update, 2012**, e.g., Student Outcomes and Student Outcomes: Transfer. Basic Skills programs should also refer to **ARCC** data.

> **There is a 5% difference between male and female regarding success with females more successful. As the students age, they succeed at higher rates and are retained at higher rates. Two ethnic groups, Black and Pacific Islander students stand out as succeeding at lower than average rates 30%, and 26% respectively compared to the average which is 56.2%. Because these groups are also the 1st and 2nd smallest in terms of the number of students, it makes each individual student weigh more as reflected in the percentages. It is hard to draw meaningful conclusions from such a small sample since the numbers are statistically insignificant. This past year's data may also be a bit skewed in that one of our professors participated in the study abroad program. While he typically teaches four sections, a part-time replacement was given two courses. Additionally, one of our long term part time instructors did not communicate well with the dean and unexpectedly retired, leave two sections without an instructor. Only one of those sections was replace with a different instructor. The result was a decrease of three sections for the Fall term. This caused a significant increase in enrollment in the remaining sections affecting the student to teacher interaction.**

2. Discuss any differences in student success indicators across modes of delivery (on-campus versus distance education). Refer to **Delivery Mode Course Comparison**.

> **The success rate for students in the online Phil 100 class seems to jump all over the place year to year. We don't know why--the class has not changed significantly during the three year interval we are considering. The data seems to indicate that the three year average has both the success rate and retention rates of the online class being very close to those in our traditional classes.**

C. Program Efficiency Indicators. Do we deliver programs efficiently given our resources?

Summarize trends in program efficiency as indicated in the **Student Success and Core Program Indicators** (LOAD, Full-time and Part-time FTEF, etc.)

> **The load for the program has dropped from 555 in 12-13 to 528 in 2013-14. This is due to our previous decision to add extra students when there was an overall college need to include as many students as we could take. This decision was seen as part of an overall desire to aid the college in tough economic times, weathering the "academic storm". Now that funding is more secure, we have discontinued the practice of taking "substantial overload" numbers of students to focus more effectively on student retention and success given the amount of rigorous writing that our courses require to meet proper academic standards. By comparison to the overall load numbers for Creative Arts/Social Science which was 500 in 12-13, the department still maintains a higher number. The overall college Load is 532, so we also measure favorably in that regard.**

3. Additional Factors

Discuss additional factors as applicable that impact the program, including changes in student populations, state-wide initiatives, transfer requirements, advisory committee recommendations, legal mandates, workforce development and employment opportunities, community needs. See **Institutional Research** as needed.

> Due to the creation of the AA-T and AS-T programs state wide, we also need to offer such a degree to make the opportunities available to students. We are responding to the needs of the institution demonstrating that we recognize the value of students earning Associates degrees.

4. Planning

A. Results of Program Plans and Actions

Describe results, including measurable outcomes, from plans and actions in recent program reviews.

> We have successfully offered a second section of the Philosophy 300 class. The response from the students has been positive since we are offering sections on both TTH and MWF. In the past, due to faculty availability, a section was only offered on TTH. This limted access for students on a MWF schedule. Since the class strives to educate students for our global environment, this has been a good move.

B. Program Vision

What is the program's *vision* for sustaining and improving student learning and success over the next three years? Make connections to the **College Mission and Diversity Statements**, **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** as appropriate. Address discussion in the Student Learning and Program Data section: SLO assessment results and trends in student success indicators.
[**Note**: Specific plans to be implemented in the next year should be entered in C of the Planning section.
CTE programs must address changes in the context of completion and employment rates, anticipated labor demand, and any overlap with similar programs in the area as noted in D1 and D2 of the Career Technical Education section.]

> **We have increased our use of the learning center   beyond merely having philosophy tutors. We are in the process of piloting the Supplemental Instruction model which connects with the 5 in 5 plan to   "coordinate all learning support services offered in the Learning center."   Our classes offer a level of rigor which challenges students to develop an   intellectual skill which improves students' success as they transfer (as we   have found anecdotally from former students who have matriculated) and which promotes academic excellence. The content of philosophy classes prepares   students to become informed citizens in a world which is becoming more   integrated. We are also working with the learning center to develop   assessment models to determine how learning center services contribute to   student success in our philosophy classes.**

1. To guide future faculty and staff development initiatives, describe the professional activities that would be most effective in carrying out the program's vision to improve student learning and success.

> **At its current size, the set of courses offered by the department are taught by experienced faculty members who have been very active in participating in a host of professional enrichment activities during the past decade. One of the most effective activities has been participation in the college's Study Abroad Program. One full time faculty participated in the semester abroad in Florence and the other participated in Paris in the Fall of 2014. The participation in this program is very beneficial to departmental faculty in helping to reinvigorate our experiences as faculty members and in helping faculty reconnect to the student population they serve here at the college.**

2. To guide future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs, describe the interactions that would help the program to improve student success.

> **We will continue our work with the learning center and the development of multiple philosophy tutors (we would like one for each of the two full time faculty in the department.**

3. To guide the **Institutional Planning Budget Committee** (IPBC) in long-range planning, identify any major changes in resource needs anticipated during the next three years. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation.

See the Resource Requests section below to enter itemized resource requests for next year.
Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated.

Faculty

> **It's highly likely that one of the faculty members, Dave Danielson, will retire sometime in the next 4 years.**

Equipment and Technology

> N/A

Instructional Materials

> N/A

Classified Staff

> N/A

Facilities

> N/A

C. Program Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success

Prioritize the plans to be carried out next year to sustain and improve student success. Briefly describe each plan and how it supports the **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**. For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes. (Plans may extend beyond a single year.)

AA-T

We plan to develop an AA-T for Philosophy. We hope to complete it in the Fall of 2015.

---

5. Resource Requests

Itemized Resource Requests

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation.

Faculty
NOTE: To make a faculty position request, complete **Full-time Faculty Position Request Form** and notify your Dean. This request is separate from the program review.

Full-time faculty requests	Number of positions

Equipment and Technology

Description	Cost

Instructional Material

Description	Cost

Classified Staff

Description	Cost

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a CSM Facility Project Request Form.

Description	Cost

---

6. Program Maintenance

A. Course Outline Updates

Review the **course outline update record**. List the courses that will be updated in the next academic year. For each course that will be updated, provide a faculty contact and the planned submission month. See the **Committee on Instruction website** for **course submission instructions**. Contact your division's **COI representatives** if you have questions about submission deadlines.
Career and Technical Education courses must be updated every two years.

Courses to be updated	Faculty contact	Submission month
Philosophy 103	Jeremy Ball	2/15

B. Website Review

Review the program's website(s) annually and update as needed.

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
David Danielson	4/14

C. SLO Assessment Contacts

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Dave Danielson	Fall 2014
Jeremy Ball	Fall 2014