

## PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2016-2017

---

**Program: Humanities Cluster: Humanities, Philosophy, and Religion**

**Division: Arts and Humanities**

**Date: 9/27/16**

**Writer(s): Jeremiah Bodnar and Elizabeth Wing Brooks**

**SLO/SAO Point-Person: Angelo Bummer**

---

**Audience:** Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

**Purpose:** To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

**Uses:** This update will be used to inform the campus and community about your program. It will also be used in the processes of creating Dean's Summaries, determining College Planning Priorities and allocating resources.

**Time Frame:** This update should reflect on program status during the 2015-16 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2017-18.

**Topics:** The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second, third and fourth sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes. Only instructional programs need to complete Sections 2, 3, and 4.

**Scope:** While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

**Instructions:**

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
  - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "Not Applicable."
  - 3) Optional: Meet with your dean to review this document before October 10, 2016.
  - 4) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by October 10, 2016.
- 

### Part One: Program Snapshot

**A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?**

**If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.**

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research (<http://goo.gl/Ssfik2>)
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data
- SLO/SAO Data (<http://goo.gl/iU2yIZ>)

The most significant change in the Humanities cluster since the time of our last program planning update has been the retirement of our previous full-time humanities instructor and Humanities cluster coordinator Candy Klaschus. Elizabeth Wing Brooks has been hired into her position.

**B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2015 Program Review Update have been achieved and how? PRUs from 2015 are available here: <http://goo.gl/9iF3m9>**

The most immediate need at the time of our last program planning update was to make provisions for the retirement of our full-time humanities instructor. The hiring of this position was approved, and a replacement was hired in the spring of last year. This puts us in a good position to be able to review our overall humanities offerings and begin planning for the needs of the humanities cluster going forward.

**C. Discuss at least one example of how students have been impacted by the work of your program since the last program review update (if you did not already answer this in Question B).**

In our program planning update for AY 2015-2016 we noted a decline in the average age of our philosophy students. We hypothesized that this may be due to a cutback in the evening offers for our courses. Since that time, we have attempted to increase our evening offerings at the colleges and at local satellite campuses. We are now able to offer additional night classes at additional locations and we look forward to seeing the hard data on the results in order to evaluate the effectiveness of these changes in serving students who are "non-traditional" in this way.

**D. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?**

The main challenge we are facing at this time is an influx of new faculty. While undoubtedly a blessing for the college, the influx of new faculty (both full-time and adjunct) creates a need for increased training, cooperation, and strategies for program improvement.

**E. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?**

Relative to the challenges mentioned above, we plan to increase the organization and planning apparatus among our cluster faculty, and to begin an organized plan to review all courses, update those courses and degrees which may have become outdated, and generate a strategy for ensuring that all programs, SLO's and courses remain up-to-date in our new environment. Specifically, we would like to see all courses brought up-to-date in all three of the disciplines in our cluster. This revision is also a central component of completing the needed update of the Philosophy AA-T degree, which cannot be updated if any of the courses are out of compliance. We also plan to look at the Humanities program to determine future goals, and ask if any revisions or additional courses are needed to meet students' needs. Specifically, the Humanities 44 course looks to be in need of revision to fit better with the overall goals of the program.

**F. Instructional Programs: Detail your department's plans, if any, for adding DE courses, degrees, and/or certificates. For new DE degrees and/or certificates (those offered completely online), please include a brief rationale as to why the degree/certificate will be offered online.**

At this time the courses in our cluster offered online include Humanities 10 & 28, Philosophy 1 & 2, and Religious Studies 1 & 2. During the regular school year our Humanities department offers the fewest number of DE courses among the disciplines in our cluster. Our new humanities instructor has a good deal of online teaching experience and we will be evaluating and needs to offer additional humanities courses fully online or as hybrid courses, as well as planning for the submission of additional courses to the Curriculum Committee for DE approval, and the creation of new DE content if we find there is a need in this area.

**G. Do plans listed under Question E or Question F connect to this year’s planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.**

***Planning Priorities for 2016-17***

- ***Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards***
- ***Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance***
- ***Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes***
- ***Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.***

The second and third priorities listed here are related directly to our plans. Part of our need for further organization among both adjunct and full-time faculty as discussed in section E is to work toward an integrated approach to SLO creation, planning, and evaluation. Our curricular goals mentioned in section F do not (of themselves) provide additional institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance, but it does show us actively working to fulfill these curricular commitments. The new curriculum support person has already helped us as we gather the information to begin this planning process and will continue to help us as we develop our further goals.

**H. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no**

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/Ssfik2>)

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

Not applicable.

**I. Units with SAOs: Using SAO data from last year, describe the impacts of SAO practices on student learning, achievement, or institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples). SAO data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/iU2yIZ>**

|   |
|---|
| SAO: Not applicable                                       |
| Describe the quantitative or qualitative results:         |
| Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known): |
| Discuss your action plan for the future:                  |

**Part Two: Course-Level SLO Assessment Schedule**

**THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REMOVED. PLEASE SKIP TO PART THREE.**

**Part Three: Assessment Results  
(Instructional Programs Only)**

1. Describe an example of how your program used **course SLO data (SLOs)** from last year (2015-16) to impact student learning or achievement. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples).

|  |
|--|
| Course: Philosophy 3   |
| Course SLO: student is able to apply philosophical methods of artistic analysis learned in class to specific works of art while evaluating those philosophical methods as well.  |
| Describe the quantitative or qualitative results: 67% of students were evaluated at full proficiency in 2015, as opposed to 39% in 2014.   |
| Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known): In past years the Aesthetics course SLO has frequently shown lower numbers than courses with similarly targeted SLO's in other philosophy courses. An additional day of rough-draft workshop was added to the Aesthetics course syllabus, and additional evaluative instructions were added to the course. In the 2016 course the level of proficiency shows dramatic improvement. |
| Discuss your action plan for the future: Such improvement has not been statistically tested for formal significance, and causal conclusions should be cautious. Still, in light of the positive data the extra day of rough draft workshop has been added to the class as a permanent fixture. The results of the SLO for Aesthetics will continue to be evaluated with this change in mind.   |

2. Degree/Certificate granting programs only: Describe an example of how your program used **program-level SLO data (PSLOs)** from last year (2015-16) to impact student learning or achievement. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples).

|   |
|---|
| Degree/Certificate: Philosophy AA-T   |
| Program SLO: Upon successful completion of this program, students will be able to respond to philosophical writing and ideas of historical and contemporary philosophers by describing philosophical arguments, evaluating those arguments, and applying them with accuracy and creativity to contemporary conditions.  |
| Describe the quantitative or qualitative results: High levels of mastery (46%) and just below mastery (39%) were shown for this program level SLO for the most recent term (Spring 2016), giving good evidence that the courses are indeed successful in teaching the desired skills. Most notable in the program level SLO data was the restricted data set achieved with the single program level SLO now active in Elumen.   |
| Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known): We have begun the creation of a second program level SLO that will be mapped to another central element of the philosophy program. This PSLO will be there to ensure that students gaining the philosophy AA-T are learning how to dialogue in a way that is not just informed and effectively argued, but also in a way that shows they have learned effective and respectful communication of those ideas, especially in oral format. |

Discuss your action plan for the future: We plan to complete this PSLO, map it to course level SLO's, and evaluate this PSLO it alongside the current PSLO to ensure students in the program are evaluated according to a more well-rounded evaluation of the general skills of philosophical communication.

## Part Four: Program Curriculum Map (Instructional Programs with Degrees/Certificates Only)

### Background: Program-level Student Learning Outcomes

Program-level Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) are defined as the knowledge, skills, abilities, or attitudes that students have at the completion of a degree or certificate. Faculty within a discipline should meet to discuss the expected learning outcomes for students who complete a particular series of courses, such as those required for a certificate or a degree. PSLOs should be the big things you want students to get out of a degree or certificate. PSLOs should be developed throughout the program and in multiple courses. Discussions might also involve colleagues in other programs regarding prerequisites and transfer courses or community stakeholders regarding job expectations.

It is recommended that each program have 3-6 PSLOs. Discipline faculty members might need to have a more comprehensive list based on the requirements of external stakeholders (employers, state requirements, etc.). For most programs, PSLOs are only assessed through linked course-level SLOs. You might assess PSLOs in a capstone project or capstone course that many students complete when earning a certificate or degree. Alternatively, you could assess development of a set of skills as students advance through different courses in your program (ENG 1A -> ENG 4 or 7).

Program-level outcomes should

1. **describe** what students are able to do after completing a degree or certificate;
2. be **limited** in number (3-6 outcomes);
3. be **clear** so that students and colleagues can understand them;
4. be **observable** skills (career-specific or transferable), knowledge, attitudes, and/or values;
5. be **relevant** to meet the needs of students, employers, and transfer institutions;
6. be **rigorous** yet realistic outcomes achievable by students

## Curriculum Map Directions

**Note: If you have multiple degrees/certificates, choose one to map. If you have already submitted mapping to the SLO committee and do not wish to make changes, you may copy that mapping into this chart or attach the map you already created.**

1. In the boxes across the top row, review all the non-GE courses required for your degree/certificate. (including those that aren't in your discipline). Make any desired changes to those courses. (Electives do not need to be included, though they may).
2. In the left column, write the program learning outcomes you have drafted for your program.
3. In the boxes in the center of the page, mark the course SLO that maps to the program SLO you have identified. Each program SLO should map to multiple courses in your program.

| <b>Example: English Associate's Degree for Transfer</b>                                     |   |       |        |        |                                       |         |
|---|---|-------|--------|--------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Program Learning Outcomes</b>  | <b>Required Courses in Degree/Certificate</b> |       |        |        |                                       |         |
|   | Eng 4   | Eng 7 | Eng 35 | Eng 41 | Electives*<br>(Eng 20, 32,<br>45, 44) | MSCM 1* |
| 1. Identify and evaluate implied arguments in college-level literary texts.                 | X   |       |        |        |                                       |         |
| 2. Write an academic essay synthesizing multiple texts and using logic to support a thesis. | X   | x     |        |        |                                       |         |
| 3. Write a research paper using credible sources and correct documentation.                 | X   | x     |        |        |                                       | x       |
| 4. Analyze an author's use of literary techniques to develop a theme.                       |   |       | x      | x      | x                                     |         |

\*Including electives is optional.

Your Program's Map

Degree or Certificate: Philosophy AA-T - \* Please note that Phil 6 is the only absolutely required course for the Philosophy AA-T degree. All other courses belong to hierarchical lists of restricted electives. Currently Phil 3 and 5 are the lowest ranking on this set of hierarchical lists. Phil 1 and 2 belong to the highest ranking of these lists.

| Program Learning Outcomes (3-6 recommended)   | Required Courses in Degree/Certificate |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |  |
|---|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--|--|
|   | Phil 1                                 | Phil 2 | Phil 3 | Phil 4 | Phil 5 | Phil 6 | Hist 1 | Hist 2 |  |  |
| 1. Program SLO: Upon successful completion of this program, students will be able to respond to philosophical writing and ideas of historical and contemporary philosophers by describing philosophical arguments, evaluating those arguments, and applying them with accuracy and creativity to contemporary conditions. | X                                      | x      | X      | x      | x      |        |        |        |  |  |
| 2.  |  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |  |
| 3.  |  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |  |
| 4.  |  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |  |
| 5.  |  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |  |
| 6.  |  |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |  |

1. Did you make any changes to your existing mapping? (circle one)

Yes

No

This degree/certificate did not have previous mapping

2. If you answered "yes" to Question 1, explain what changes you made.

The mapping would have existed before this program update, though I'm not sure if any formal report of this mapping was completed in the past. Additional PSLO and CSLO changes are in the works, but not have been fully completed and approved as of the writing of this report.

3. Reflection Questions: The following questions are for the consideration of your program as you look at your completed chart. You do not need to record your responses here. If you discuss these questions with others (for example, at a department meeting), you may want to take minutes documenting your discussion.

- a. How many courses help students achieve each program outcome? Do students have enough opportunities to achieve the outcome?
- b. In which course(s) are students likely to demonstrate satisfactory achievement of each program outcome? In other words, which courses(s) might be an official or unofficial capstone requirement?

**This issue was discussed in our Humanities cluster meeting on 9/27/16. Elizabeth and Jeremiah both noted that there was good coverage for our current PSLO in the underlying courses, though no single course jumped out as the obvious capstone. Because logic is the one course required of every philosophy major, and is usually taken later in the degree, it would make sense to add an argumentation and rationality SLO which maps to Phil 6 and shows it special place in the Philosophy AA-T curriculum.**