



2017-2018
Annual Program Review
Philosophy

Table of Contents

Section 1: Program Planning

Section 2: Human Capital Planning

Section 3: Facilities Planning

Section 4: Technology Planning

Section 5: New Initiatives

Section 6: Prioritization

Program Planning: Philosophy

Internal Analysis

ENROLLMENT AND FTES:

The number of enrollments in Philosophy courses in 2015-2016 showed a **slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and a **moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** in comparison with the number of enrollments in 2013-2014.

The FTES in Philosophy credit courses in 2015-2016 showed a **slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and a **moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** in with in comparison with FTES in 2013-2014.

EFFICIENCY (NUMBER OF SECTIONS, FILL RATE, FTEF/30, WSCH/FTEF):

The number of sections in Philosophy courses in 2015-2016 showed **minimal to no difference** from 2014-2015 and a **moderate decrease (-5.0% to -9.9%)** in comparison with the number of sections in 2013-2014.

The fill rate in Philosophy courses in 2015-2016 showed **minimal to no difference** from 2014-2015 and a **slight decrease (-1.0% to -4.9%)** in comparison with the fill rate in 2013-2014.

The FTEF/30 ratio in Philosophy courses in 2015-2016 showed a **slight decrease (-1.0% to -4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and a **slight decrease (-1.0% to -4.9%)** in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2013-2014.

The WSCH/FTEF ratio in Philosophy courses in 2015-2016 showed a **slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and a **moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** in comparison with the WSCH/FTEF ratio in 2013-2014.

COURSE SUCCESS RATE:

The course success rate in Philosophy courses in 2015-2016 showed a **moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **minimal to no difference** in comparison with the course success rate in 2013-2014. The course success rate from 2015-2016 showed **minimal to no rate difference** than the college success average* (**66.6%**) and showed a **substantially higher rate (>= 10.0%)** than the institutional-set standard* (**56.6%**) for credit course success.

TERM RETENTION RATE:

The term retention rate in Philosophy courses in 2015-2016 showed a **moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and a **slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** in comparison with the term retention rate in 2013-2014. The term retention rate from 2015-2016 showed a **slightly higher rate (1.0% to 4.9%)** than the college retention average* (**83.3%**) and showed a **substantially higher rate (>= 10.0%)** than the institutional-set standard* term retention (**70.8%**) for credit courses.

AWARDS (DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES):

The number of degrees in Philosophy in 2015-2016 showed **no previous data** from 2014-2015 and showed **no previous data** in comparison with the number of degrees awarded in 2013-2014.

The number of certificates in Philosophy in 2015-2016 showed **no previous data** from 2014-2015 and showed **no previous data** in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2013-2014.

MODALITY:

In 2015-2016 **less than a quarter (1% to 24%)** of the **Philosophy** courses were offered as **cable** courses, while **none (0%)** of the courses were offered in **correspondence**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **hybrid**, **close to half (25% to 50%)** of the courses offered were **online**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **self-paced**, **close to half (25% to 50%)** of the courses offered were **telecourse**, and **none (0%)** of the courses were offered in **traditional in-person** setting.

GENDER

In 2015-16 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *female students*; and there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *male students*.

AGE GROUPS

In 2015-2016 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students *less than 20 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students *20 to 24 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students *25 to 29 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students *30 to 34 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students *35 to 39 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students *40 to 49 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students *50+ years old*.

RACE/ETHNICITY

In 2015-2016 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *African American* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *American Indian* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *Asian/Pacific Islander* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *Hispanic/Latino* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *White/Non-Hispanic* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for *Multi-race* students; there **was a disproportional impact** in **Philosophy** course success rates for students who have *declined to state their race/ethnic identity*.

Note: Disproportional Impact is calculated via the Proportionality Index Method with an 80% threshold for negative impact. This method is a measure of representational equity of each subgroup to its initial proportionality at the beginning of the term. Proportionality Index Method compares the demographic characteristics of those who successfully completed the course to the demographics characteristics of the same group that enrolled in the course at the beginning of the term. Proportions of less than 80% are flagged as experiencing disproportional impact.

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
CENSUS Enrollment	2,248	2,348	2,375
FTES	206.0	215.0	217.2
FTEF30	3.5	3.4	3.4
WSCH/FTEF	969	1,032	1,060
Sections	29.0	27.0	27.0
Fill Rate	82.1%	78.1%	78.3%
DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES			
Associate Degrees	0	0	0
Certificates	0	0	0
STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS			
GRADED Enrollment*	2,222	2,330	2,380
GENDER			
Female	38.1%	31.1%	25.8%
Male	60.8%	67.9%	73.0%
Unknown	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%
AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	11.3%	7.0%	6.8%
20 to 24	27.0%	22.8%	20.5%
25 to 29	17.2%	17.4%	18.1%
30 to 34	13.0%	16.7%	15.9%
35 to 39	9.7%	11.2%	12.3%
40 to 49	13.1%	16.5%	17.8%
50 and Older	8.7%	8.5%	8.7%
RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	15.2%	18.4%	19.0%
American Indian	0.7%	1.0%	1.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	20.7%	16.4%	14.4%
Hispanic/Latino	25.0%	25.7%	29.9%
2 or More Race	3.9%	4.0%	4.6%
White	31.7%	32.4%	29.2%
Unknown	2.8%	2.1%	1.8%
INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable	11.0%	17.1%	21.2%
Correspondence	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Online	56.3%	44.7%	37.4%
Self-Paced	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Telecourse	30.8%	37.6%	41.1%
Traditional	1.8%	0.6%	0.3%
SUCCESS & RETENTION			
Course Success (A, B, C, P)	67.3%	64.1%	67.5%
Course Retention (A-F, P, NP)	82.9%	78.7%	84.5%

* Note: **GRADED ENROLLMENTS** excludes Zero Unit Lab enrollments since there is only 1 Grade issued across 2 or more CRNs.

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	2,223	2,329	2,375
-Overall Success Rate	67.5%	65.2%	67.5%
-Overall Retention Rate	82.9%	79.0%	84.5%

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS			
GENDER			
Female	846	723	613
Male	1,351	1,581	1,733
Unknown	26	25	29

<u>Success Rate</u>			
- Female	69.6%	63.3%	74.6%
- Male	66.0%	66.2%	65.1%
- Unknown	73.1%	56.0%	62.1%

<u>Retention Rate</u>			
- Female	84.8%	77.2%	87.8%
- Male	81.6%	79.9%	83.4%
- Unknown	88.5%	72.0%	82.8%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	2,223	2,329	2,375
-Overall Success Rate	67.5%	65.2%	67.5%
-Overall Retention Rate	82.9%	79.0%	84.5%

AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	251	161	161
20 to 24	601	531	488
25 to 29	383	406	429
30 to 34	289	389	377
35 to 39	216	260	291
40 to 49	290	384	422
50 and Older	193	198	207

Success Rate

Less than 19	73.3%	65.8%	77.0%
20 to 24	65.6%	64.8%	69.5%
25 to 29	63.7%	60.3%	63.9%
30 to 34	70.2%	67.9%	61.8%
35 to 39	70.8%	68.1%	70.4%
40 to 49	71.0%	68.2%	70.4%
50 and Older	60.1%	61.1%	63.3%

Retention Rate

Less than 19	86.1%	82.0%	91.9%
20 to 24	84.9%	78.5%	86.1%
25 to 29	78.9%	74.6%	81.8%
30 to 34	81.3%	81.0%	81.7%
35 to 39	82.4%	81.5%	85.2%
40 to 49	85.9%	79.2%	86.0%
50 and Older	78.8%	79.3%	82.1%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	2,223	2,329	2,375
-Overall Success Rate	67.5%	65.2%	67.5%
-Overall Retention Rate	82.9%	79.0%	84.5%

RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	555	597	714
American Indian	462	383	341
Asian	337	429	450
Hispanic/Latino	85	92	111
Pacific Islander	60	48	41
White	708	757	694
Unknown	16	23	24

Success Rate			
African American	66.5%	62.6%	64.4%
American Indian	73.8%	74.7%	80.4%
Asian	51.9%	58.0%	55.6%
Hispanic/Latino	69.4%	55.4%	71.2%
Pacific Islander	70.0%	62.5%	51.2%
White	71.3%	68.4%	72.9%
Unknown	56.3%	47.8%	54.2%

Retention Rate			
African American	82.2%	78.2%	82.1%
American Indian	87.9%	82.0%	89.4%
Asian	71.2%	76.9%	83.6%
Hispanic/Latino	77.6%	71.7%	88.3%
Pacific Islander	85.0%	79.2%	63.4%
White	85.9%	80.2%	86.2%
Unknown	93.8%	78.3%	79.2%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	2,223	2,329	2,375
-Overall Success Rate	67.5%	65.2%	67.5%
-Overall Retention Rate	82.9%	79.0%	84.5%

INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable	245	399	502
Correspondence	0	0	0
Hybrid	0	0	0
Online	1,253	1,040	890
Self-Paced	0	0	0
Telecourse	684	875	976
Traditional	41	15	7

Success Rate			
Cable	67.3%	65.7%	62.2%
Correspondence			
Hybrid			
Online	65.9%	60.9%	74.4%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse	69.7%	69.7%	63.8%
Traditional	78.0%	93.3%	85.7%

Retention Rate			
Cable	80.8%	83.7%	84.7%
Correspondence			
Hybrid			
Online	83.6%	74.5%	86.3%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse	81.7%	81.9%	82.8%
Traditional	90.2%	93.3%	100.0%

Implications of Change

The transition to canvas was not without some bumps as it caused us to unexpectedly lose one of our adjuncts. Nevertheless, it has all-in-all been a positive experience. The transition has given us a chance to review and modernize our classes, as well as to improve RSI. Additionally, canvas provides many useful tools for communicating with students and, while the LMS has some quirks, it provides a learning medium that I am very happy with overall.

All of my courses have online versions. My own courses now include Logic, Ethics, and, after this summer, Philosophy 100. The lectures consist of PowerPoints which have narrated audio, are turned to video and uploaded to YouTube with appropriate closed captioning. My live courses do not always cover the exact same material, but I to my online lecture videos in my live course shells as well for students who have missed overlapping material or wish to review.

Student (SLOs) and Program Student Learning Outcome (PSLOs)

Summarize SLOs, PSLO findings, dialog, and Include SLO and PSLO data if available

With the new transition to Canvas SLO collection was thrown into temporary chaos. The plan is to discuss SLO collection with other philosophy instructors and synchronize strategies for evaluating the same learning outcomes between instructors who teach the same class but might cover different material.

At the all-college meeting we developed a schedule for SLO evaluation and re-evaluation, but the department still needs an opportunity to get together and discuss how to approach standardizing SLO evaluation for each class.

We also need to discuss program level SLO's for the ADT.

Curriculum Review

No modifications or updates were made to curriculum in 2016-17

Progress on Initiative(s)

Table Progress on Forward Strategy Initiatives

Initiative(s)	Status	Progress Status Description	Outcome(s)
Offering the PHIL ADT supports the College's Mission, specifically Goal #3: Innovation & Improvement. Coastline will continue to create and nurture innovative programs, services, and technology solutions that respond to the needs and expectations of its learning community.	In-Progress	2015-16 ADT: The course most recently added to the philosophy curriculum, History of Ancient Philosophy (C102), is required for the Phil ADT. This course has been approved and is listed as "active" in CurricUNET; however, the actual course content has not yet been designed.	Given the increased number of telecourse students and the move to Canvas, designing the content for this C102 course was not given priority over improvements in those two areas. However, course content can be designed during an intersession.

		<p>2016-17: The status on the ADT remains this same. This is because it was deemed that my time would be better spent by spending this Summer constructing my own Canvas Philosophy 100 course rather than History of Ancient philosophy which, while required for the ADT, is less apt to fill.</p>	<p>2016-2017: As noted, the course could have been designed during the intersession, but consensus was that producing content for the philosophy 100 course was more pressing.</p> <p>Because I make PPT videos with full narration and closed captioning (a typical course requires me to produce hundreds of pages of my own scripted narration), it usually takes the full summer to construct all lessons for a quality course. Phil 102 could be produced in summer of 2018 unless it is again determined that another major project would better serve the students.</p>
--	--	--	--

Response to Program/Department Committee Recommendation(s)

Table Progress on Recommendations

Recommendation(s)	Status	Response Summary
Build more awareness around the discipline-specific majors.	Addressed	Humanities will build student awareness about majors via internal promotion (instructors communicating future class and major options with their current students) and external marketing.

Program Planning and Communication Strategies

Describe the communication methods and interaction strategies used by your program faculty to discuss programmatic-level planning, SLO/PSLO data, institutional performance data, and curriculum and programmatic development.

The philosophy department meets in person to discuss our discipline two times a year at the all-college meetings. We also communicate as needed through e-mail. Additional coastline events and meetings allow the chance for additional communication as needed.

Having been chosen to fill the newly opened Philosophy Chair position, I would like to ensure regular e-mail communication. My most immediate goal is to synchronize our approach to collecting SLOs.

Section 2: Human Capital Planning

Staffing

Table 2.1 Staffing Plan

Year	Administrator	Management	F/T Faculty	P/T Faculty	Classified	Hourly
Previous year 2016-17	Dean		1 FTE	Position Title (# of positions)		
Current year 2017-18	Dean		1 FTE	Position Title (# of positions)		
1 year 2018-19	Dean		1 FTE	Position Title (# of positions)		
2 years 2019-2020	Dean		1 FTE	Position Title (# of positions)		
3 years 2020-2021	Dean		1 FTE	Position Title (# of positions)		

Provide a description of the staffing for the program. Include a description of the previous, current, and year of staffing estimates. Support the projection with evidence and specify how position growth or reduction relates to College plans. Additionally, for full-time positions, include a Coast District approved job description.

Staffing for the philosophy department is currently adequate. My only concern is whether or not contract education is getting enough attention. My LHE load is usually fairly high and it is difficult to take on too many contract education students. This was my first semester scheduling. I will know more after spring of 18 comes and goes as I will see if classes needed to be canceled for lack of attendance or whether our estimation of the number of courses needed was too conservative.

Professional Development

Provide a description of the program’s staff professional development participation over the past year. Include evidence that supports program constituents participating in new opportunities to meet the professional development needs of the program.

Table 2.2 Professional Development

Name (Title)	Professional Development	Outcome
Philosophy faculty	Canvas training	Coursers are now available in Canvas

Training is up to date. Instructors have been Canvas trained. Various workshops throughout the semester provides adequate opportunity to learn about and add new teaching tools.

Section 3: Facilities Planning

Facility Assessment

Provide a description of the program facilities and specify any changes over the past year as it relates to the comprehensive forward strategy and overall College planning. Provide evidence of emerging needs for modifications or additions to the program facilities.

I am more than happy with the current quality of facilities. We have smart boards in the classrooms, and excellent good audio-visual technology.

The one thing that I might suggest are curtains or blinds for the rooms which do not have them (such as some of the rooms at the Newport Beach Center). Too much light from outside can make it more difficult for students to see PowerPoint slides and video clips.

Section 4: Technology Planning

Technology Assessment

Provide a description of the program's utilization of technology and specify any changes over the past years as it relates to the comprehensive forward strategy and overall College planning. Provide evidence of emerging needs for modifications or additions to the program technology.

In terms of live, real time, courses, philosophy does not tend to have a need for much technology apart from strong audio-visual equipment, which we have. The only technology issue I have in mind there are the blinds/curtains for class rooms which do not currently have, which I already mentioned.

In terms of online courses, Canvas has far more capabilities than Seaport did, and some of these were are just getting used to. It would be nice if Canvas had a few additional features:

- The ability to designate certain questions as extra credit within quizzes and tests.
- The ability to associate particular questions within individuals tests as well as other assignments with individual SLOs along with automatic harvesting of this data.
- The ability to assign a time multiplier to individual students who, because of fair accommodation, have been awarded extra time on tests and quizzes. In other words, the ability to tell Canvas that such-and-such a student will receive 1.5x as long to complete any given assessment without having to modify every individual timed assessment in the course.
- The ability to perform a search of all pages within a classroom for key terms or for links. As it stands it is sometimes easy to change a particular term or reference on one page but miss doing so on another.
- Canvas does not always seem to automatically adjust dates correctly when importing courses. It would be a great improvement if this feature were more dependable.
- It would be nice if Canvas would put a red boarder (or some other indicator) around the tiles of courses that were unpublished on the user dashboard.

Section 5: New Initiatives

No new initiatives were created this year.

Section 6: Prioritization

No new initiatives were prioritized this year.

Data Glossary

Enrolled (Census): The official enrollment count based on attendance at the census point of the course.

FTES: Total full-time equivalent students (FTES) based on enrollment of resident and non-resident students. Calculations based on census enrollment or number of hours attended based on the type of Attendance Accounting Method assigned to a section.

FTEF30: A measure of productivity that measures the number of **full-time faculty** loaded for the entire year at 30 Lecture Hour Equivalents (15 LHEs per fall and spring terms). This measure provides an estimate of full-time positions required to teach the instruction load for the subject for the academic year.

WSCH/FTEF (595): A measure of productivity that measures the weekly student contact hours compared to full-time equivalent faculty. When calculated for a 16 week schedule, the productivity benchmark is 595. When calculated for an 18 week schedule, the benchmark is 525.

Success Rate: The number of passing grades (A, B, C, P) compared to all valid grades awarded.

Retention Rate: The number of retention grades (A, B, C, P, D, F, NP, I*) compared to all valid grades awarded.

Fall-to-Spring Persistence: The number of students who completed the course in the fall term and re-enrolled (persisted) in the same subject the subsequent spring semester.

F2S Percent: The number of students who completed a course in the fall term and re-enrolled in the same subject the subsequent spring semester divided by the total number of students enrolled in the fall in the subject.