

COASTLINE COLLEGE

2018-2019
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

Section 1: Program Planning:

Internal Analysis

Productivity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
College State-Funded Enrollment	61,418	64,029	60,242
Philosophy Enrollment	2,358	2,377	2,101
College Student Resident FTES	6,073.20	6,343.35	5,928.76
Philosophy Resident FTES	211.83	213.66	188.17
Sections	27	27	32
Fill Rate	77.4%	78.1%	69.2%
WSCH/FTEF 595 Efficiency	1,031	1,056	888
FTEF/30	3.4	3.4	3.5
Extended Learning Enrollment	466	500	405

The percentage change in the number of Philosophy **enrollments** in 2016-17 showed a substantial decrease from 2015-16 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15.

The percentage change in 2016-17 **resident FTES** in Philosophy credit courses showed a substantial decrease from 2015-2016 and a substantial decrease in comparison with resident FTES in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the number of **sections** in Philosophy courses in 2016-17 showed a substantial increase from 2015-16 and a substantial increase from the number of sections in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the **fill rate** in 2016-17 for Philosophy courses showed a substantial decrease from 2015-16 and a substantial decrease in comparison with the fill rate in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the **WSCH/FTEF** ratio in Philosophy courses in 2016-17 showed a substantial decrease from 2015-16 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15.

The percentage change in the **FTEF/30** ratio for Philosophy courses in 2016-17 showed a moderate increase from 2015-16 and a slight increase in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2014-15.

There was a substantial decrease in the number of Philosophy **Extended Learning enrollments** in 2016-17 from 2015-16 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15.

Comparison of Enrollment Trends	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
College State-Funded Enrollment	61,418	64,029	60,242
Philosophy Enrollment	2,358	2,377	2,101

Modality	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Traditional	0.6%	0.3%	2.3%
Online	44.5%	37.6%	35.4%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	54.8%	62.1%	62.3%

Gender	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female	31.0%	25.9%	26.9%
Male	67.9%	72.9%	72.0%
Unknown	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%

Ethnicity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
African American	18.5%	18.9%	16.8%
American Indian/AK Native	1.0%	0.9%	1.2%
Asian	16.0%	14.1%	10.5%
Hispanic	18.6%	22.0%	23.1%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%
White	32.7%	29.4%	33.7%
Multi-Ethnicity	10.8%	13.0%	12.5%
Other/Unknown	1.9%	1.5%	2.0%

Age Group	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
19 or Less	7.1%	7.0%	8.6%
20 to 24	22.8%	20.6%	17.4%
25 to 29	17.3%	18.1%	17.5%
30 to 34	16.5%	15.7%	14.9%
35 to 39	11.2%	12.3%	13.6%
40 to 49	16.2%	17.6%	19.0%
50 and Older	8.9%	8.7%	8.9%

Philosophy courses made up 3.5% of all state-funded enrollment for 2016-17. The percentage difference in Philosophy course **enrollment** in 2016-17 showed a slight decrease from 2015-16 and a slight decrease from 2014-15. Enrollment in Philosophy during 2016-17 showed 2.3% of courses were taught **traditional (face-to-face)**, 35.4% were taught **online**, 0.0% were taught in the **hybrid** modality, and 62.3% were taught in the **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** modality.

In 2016-17, Philosophy enrollment consisted of 26.9% **female**, 72.0% **male**, and 1.1% students of **unknown** gender. In 2016-17, Philosophy enrollment consisted of 16.8% **African American** students, 1.2% **American Indian/AK Native** students, 10.5% **Asian** students, 23.1% **Hispanic** students, 0.2% **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, 33.7% **White** students, 12.5% **multi-ethnic** students, and 2.0% students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity. The age breakdown for 2016-17 enrollments in Philosophy revealed 8.6% aged **19 or less**, 17.4% aged **20 to 24**, 17.5% aged **25 to 29**, 14.9% aged **30 to 34**, 13.6% aged **35 to 39**, 19.0% aged **40 to 49**, and 8.9% aged **50 and older**.

Awards	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
College Awarded Degrees	1,882	2,109	2,220
Philosophy Degrees	0	0	0
College Awarded Certificates	748	644	602
Philosophy Certificates	0	0	0

The percentage change in the number of Philosophy **degrees** awarded in 2016-17 showed no comparative data from 2015-16 and no comparative data from the number of degrees awarded in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the number of Philosophy **certificates** awarded in 2016-17 showed no comparative data from 2015-16 and showed no comparative data in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2014-15.

Comparison of Success Rates	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
College State-Funded Success Rate	65.4%	66.7%	68.1%
College Institution Set Standard Success Rate	55.3%	55.4%	56.7%
Philosophy Success Rate	64.4%	67.5%	68.3%

Modality	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Traditional	93.3%	85.7%	95.8%
Online	60.3%	74.3%	73.4%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	67.4%	63.3%	64.4%

Gender	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female	62.7%	74.4%	71.3%
Male	65.4%	65.2%	67.3%
Unknown	53.8%	62.1%	62.5%

Ethnicity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
African American	56.8%	55.6%	57.5%
American Indian/AK Native	43.5%	59.1%	57.7%
Asian	74.5%	80.6%	75.0%
Hispanic	62.1%	65.7%	63.8%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	50.0%	66.7%	50.0%
White	67.7%	72.9%	76.3%
Multi-Ethnicity	59.4%	63.8%	66.5%
Other/Unknown	64.4%	52.8%	58.5%

Age Group	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
19 or Less	64.9%	77.0%	79.0%
20 to 24	64.1%	69.2%	68.8%
25 to 29	59.7%	64.2%	69.8%
30 to 34	67.9%	61.5%	67.0%
35 to 39	67.0%	70.5%	66.3%
40 to 49	68.1%	70.6%	67.4%
50 and Older	57.7%	63.3%	61.0%

The percentage difference in the **course success rate** in Philosophy courses in 2016-17 showed a slight increase from 2015-16 and a moderate increase from 2014-15. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Philosophy 2016-17 course success rate to the College's overall success average* (66.6%) and the institution-set standard* (56.6%) for credit course success, the Philosophy **course success rate** was minimally different than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard*** (56.6%) for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Philosophy success rate for 2016-17, the success rate was substantially higher for **traditional (face-to-face)** Philosophy courses, moderately higher for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and slightly lower for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Philosophy success rate for 2016-17, the success rate was slightly higher for **female** students in Philosophy courses, slightly lower for **male** students, and moderately lower for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Philosophy success rate for 2016-17, the success rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Philosophy courses, substantially lower for **American Indian/AK Native** students, moderately higher for **Asian** students, slightly lower for **Hispanic** students, substantially lower for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, moderately higher for **White** students, slightly lower for **multi-ethnic** students, and moderately lower for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Philosophy success rate for 2016-17, the success rate was substantially higher for students aged **19 or less** in Philosophy courses, minimally different for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly higher for students aged **25 to 29**, slightly lower for students aged **30 to 34**, slightly lower for students aged **35 to 39**, minimally different for students aged **40 to 49**, and moderately lower for students aged **50 and older**.

Comparison of Retention Rates	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
College State-Funded Retention Rate	85.7%	86.1%	85.8%
College Institution Set Standard Retention Rate	70.1%	69.9%	73.2%
Philosophy Retention Rate	78.8%	84.5%	85.1%

Modality	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Traditional	93.3%	100.0%	100.0%
Online	74.5%	86.3%	86.8%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	82.1%	83.3%	83.6%

Gender	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female	77.2%	87.6%	86.6%
Male	79.6%	83.4%	84.5%
Unknown	73.1%	82.8%	87.5%

Ethnicity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
African American	76.8%	83.3%	84.1%
American Indian/AK Native	78.3%	86.4%	80.8%
Asian	81.4%	89.9%	86.8%
Hispanic	78.1%	83.1%	84.3%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	85.7%	66.7%	100.0%
White	79.5%	86.1%	86.7%
Multi-Ethnicity	76.4%	81.1%	82.1%
Other/Unknown	82.2%	66.7%	87.8%

Age Group	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
19 or Less	80.4%	92.1%	92.3%
20 to 24	78.2%	86.0%	84.4%
25 to 29	74.7%	81.6%	85.9%
30 to 34	81.2%	81.6%	85.3%
35 to 39	81.1%	84.9%	83.5%
40 to 49	79.4%	85.9%	84.7%
50 and Older	78.4%	82.1%	81.3%

The percentage difference in the **retention rate** in Philosophy courses in 2016-17 showed minimal difference from 2015-16 and a moderate increase from 2014-15. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Philosophy 2016-17 retention rate to the College's overall retention average* (85.8%) and the institution-set standard* (73.2%) for credit course success, the Philosophy **retention rate** was minimally different than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard*** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Philosophy retention rate for 2016-17, the retention rate was substantially higher for **traditional (face-to-face)** Philosophy courses, slightly higher for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and slightly lower for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Philosophy retention rate for 2016-17, the retention rate was slightly higher for **female** students in Philosophy courses, minimally different for **male** students, and slightly higher for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Philosophy retention rate for 2016-17, the retention rate was minimally different for **African American** students in Philosophy courses, slightly lower for **American Indian/AK Native** students, slightly higher for **Asian** students, minimally different for **Hispanic** students, substantially higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, slightly higher for **White** students, slightly lower for **multi-ethnic** students, and slightly higher for students of **other or unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Philosophy retention rate for 2016-17, the retention rate was moderately higher for students aged **19 or less** in Philosophy courses, minimally different for students aged **20 to 24**, minimally different for students aged **25 to 29**, minimally different for students aged **30 to 34**, slightly lower for students aged **35 to 39**, minimally different for students aged **40 to 49**, and slightly lower for students aged **50 and older**.

*Note: College term success and retention averages and institution-set standards are computed annually and recorded in the college Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Scorecard.

Data Source: Banner Student Information System

Calculation Categories

Language	Range
Minimal to No Difference	< 1.0%
Slight Increase/Decrease	Between 1.0% and 5.0%
Moderate Increase/Decrease	Between 5.1% and 10.0%
Substantial Increase/Decrease	> 10.0%

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

I have changed the wording and number of SLOs for a number of our philosophy courses and put these changes through the Curriculum Committee. Some of the SLOs previously seemed to be tailored to very specific instructors and textbooks.

We have started standardizing our SLO quizzes so that each instructor uses the same or similar quiz for each course. This fall I will be constructing a SLO quiz for Intro to Philosophy. There are some problems with trying to standardize SLO quizzes for philosophy courses because the very same course, taught by two different instructors, might quite legitimately cover different philosophers and different philosophical topics (much like two contemporary literature courses might cover entirely different works of fiction). Because I wish to construct the SLO quiz so as to leave instructors as much academic freedom as possible, creating one for Intro might be challenging.

Evaluations:

For fall 2017 Phil 120: 100% met mastery for SLO 1 and 87.5 for SLO 2.

For spring 2018 Phil 115: 45 43.5% mastered SLO1 and 86.9% mastered SLO 2.

Flex Day this semester did not seem to include a time for a department meeting which is the time when philosophy faculty generally talks about SLOs.

Curriculum Review

Summarize curriculum activities in the past year, providing dates of revisions, new course adoptions, and/or course deletions. Present a list of current degree(s)/certificate(s) and write a summary on new any degree or certificate discontinued over the past year.

Table Curriculum Review

Course	Date Reviewed	Status
PHIL 115	Spring 2018	Updated SLOs
PHIL 120	Fall 2017	Updated SLOs
Phil 100	Fall 2018	Updating SLOs (forthcoming)

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	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	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>expectations of its learning community.</p>		<p>content has not yet been designed.</p> <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>2018: The History of Ancient course, required for the ADT, has not yet been created. At the moment it is unclear that such a course would receive enough enrollment to prioritize its construction.</p> <p>Instead, this summer I taught two courses and also reworked a portion of the quiz and test material for Phil 120 (I write all of my own questions).</p> <p>In Summer 2019 I will have a choice between teaching a number of classes, creating History of Ancient, or modifying an existing course to use OER material.</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)

Progress on Recommendations

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

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.

Because I am the only full time philosophy instructor, the most effective way to meet with other faculty members has been at the All-college meetings held twice a year. The past couple meetings, however, have not provided us with an opportunity to meet.

Apart from those meetings, my primary communication with other faculty in the philosophy department is through e-mail. Sometimes I arrange to meet individual faculty members to discuss SLO evaluations, but it is difficult to get all the adjunct faculty together at the same time.

Implications of Change

Provide a summation of perspective around the implications associated with shift in the program performance trends

The philosophy program has not changed a great deal. Plans to complete a History of Ancient Philosophy course in order to offer the ADT have not been abandoned, but it is currently unclear that this should currently be the priority. Summer is the best time to create new material or make major modifications to an existing course. Because I am the only full time philosophy instructor, I am practically limited to one such change/addition a year.

Since we have been revising the way that SLOs are evaluated, and since it is now the case that only one course is evaluated per semester, it will be difficult to gauge performance trends in terms of SLOs until after fall of 2019. At this point, our new SLO quizzes will begin repeating, which will give us comparative data.

Section 2: Human Capital Planning

Staffing

Table 2.1 Staffing Plan

Year	Administrator	Management	F/T Faculty	P/T Faculty	Classified	Hourly
Previous year 2017-18	Dean		1	4		
Current year 2018-19	Dean		1	4		
1 year 2019-20	Dean		1	5		
2 years 2020-21	Dean		1	5		
3 years 2021-22	Dean		1	5		

Based on the data trends and the expected implementation of the College Enrollment Management Plan, the program is expected to grow proportionately with the institution.

Professional Development

Table 2.2 Professional Development

Name (Title)	Professional Development	Outcome
Fred Curry	APA Conference	Learned of new research and online teaching strategies that may be implemented in the future.

In the future, the department chair is interested in attending the APA conference in Seattle.

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

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. It would be nice if the college would push to have these features added:

- The ability to designate certain questions as extra credit within quizzes and tests.
- 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 border (or some other indicator) around the tiles of courses that were unpublished on the user dashboard.
- It would be nice if Canvas quizzes would allow us to set a word *maximum* for essay questions. This will force students to word their answers carefully and prevent them from going off on tangents. It will also likely reduce cheating.
- It would be nice if Canvas could store all written answers, both in quizzes and forums, in order to make plagiarism checks. We are able to use Turn-It-In for essays, but it would be nice if similar originality reports could be generated for the material local to canvas.

- It would be nice if we could have master-pages that are shared by multiple courses. That way we can make changes to multiple courses by changing a single page. **For example:** Many instructors have the same participation policies for multiple courses. They might also have the same point structure and other policies. If such policies are shared by 5 different courses then changing policies means changing at least 5 different pages. Multiple changes takes more time and also increases the possibility of error or inconsistency between courses. If, however, a master page could be tokenized among different courses, the course could be updated by editing a single page, and all courses that use that page would have consistent content.

Section 5: New Initiatives

No new initiatives

Section 6: Prioritization

List and prioritize resource requests that emerge from the initiatives. For full-time positions, include a Coast District approved job description

Initiative	Resource(s)	Est. Cost	Funding Type	Health, Safety Compliance	Evidence	College Goal	To be Completed by	Priority

Prioritization Glossary

Initiative:	Provide a short description of the plan
Resource(s):	Describe the resource(s) needed to support the completion of the initiative
Est. Cost:	Estimated financial cost of the resource(s)
Funding Type:	Specify if the resource request is one-time or ongoing
Health, Safety Compliance:	Specify if the request relates to health or safety compliance issue(s)
Evidence:	Specify what data type(s) supported the initiative (Internal research, external research, or learning outcomes)
College Goal:	Specify what College goal the initiative aligns with
To be completed by:	Specify year of anticipated completion
Priority:	Specify a numerical rank to the initiative

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.