2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: Philosophy

Division: Arts and Humanities

Writers: Jeremiah Bodnar

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Jeremiah Bodnar

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 2, 2026.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Discipline Data Packets – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ Course Success Rates Dashboard – allows you to research your program's success rates

Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

Section 1: Program Reflection and Planning

These questions appear on all Program Reviews including comprehensive and updates.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 25-26.

- *In our last program review, we discussed some worries about Philosophy 6 and Philosophy 8. We had decided that we would probably need to deactivate Philosophy 8, in part because the class was simply not manageable within the confines of the faculty contract at that time. Philosophy 8 contained a complete logic class and a complete composition class, and we worried that it simply could not be managed with a student cap of 44 and a regular lecture load factor. With the help of Craig Kutil and the FA, we were able to negotiate a cap and load factor on par with English 6, the most comparable composition course in the English department. We hope that this will make the course manageable, though we do worry that the 4 units for the course may make it somewhat less desirable than competing courses, and the increased load creates difficulties for the course in terms of enrollment management.*
- *We had extremely high productivity last year with a WISH/FTEF of 600 in Fall 2025 and 575 in Spring 2026. I believe this is a result of strong teaching, but also of increased focus on admitting students after add numbers are released consistent with drop projections for students in the first few weeks of classes.*
- *We are happy to report that our course success rate has been above the program set standard for the second year in a row. Our program-set standard is 65%. Last cycle (2024-2025) we achieved 69% and this cycle (2025-2026) we achieved 70%*

- *We continue to update our curriculum to ensure it has culturally diverse content. The Philosophy 1 course outline was recently revised with an emphasis on globally diverse cultural representation throughout the content sections.*
- *Our courses have filled very robustly during this past evaluation period, with some of our highest fill rates in years, even for online courses.*

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 25-26

- Artificial intelligence continues to offer challenges to the traditional teaching models in philosophy. Especially for online courses. Written assignments are the most common way to create assessments in philosophy courses, and are even mandated as a primary evaluation and teaching model in, for example, the course descriptors for of our courses that are CID articulated. We are doing what we can to try to ensure authentic learning. One of our instructors, for example, has started scheduling one-on-one meetings to ensure that students understand and can communicate the ideas in their written work. On the whole, however, we believe that the challenges of AI require a system-wide response to create policy and tools to address teaching in this new era, as these problems cannot truly be solved by each teacher individually trying to keep pace and constantly update their protocols in response to AI.

3. What are your upcoming **plans**? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- Philosophy 8 is a Logic and Argumentation course that was created some years back. It is designed as a course that meets both the expectations of a transfer-level logic course and a transfer-level composition course. In the most recent faculty contract, this course was given the same FTEF load and enrollment cap as comparable English composition courses. This course is a useful addition to our suite of second year composition courses because it includes a discission of logic, statistics, scientific reasoning, and other elements that will be especially useful to those studying the sciences or social sciences. The increased unit load does create challenges for enrollment management. Over the coming year, we plan to strategize ways of addressing these challenges and figure out how this course fits into our overall plan, and the plans for the suite of second year composition courses.

Section 2: SLOs/SAOs

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review, with brief annual check-ins on the Program Review Updates. The following resources will be useful when completing this section:

- Three-Year Assessment Template
- Aggregated and Disaggregated Data from the following sources:

- ELumen (if saved--no longer available online)
- CurrIQunet
- Student Success Dashboard

1. During the 2023-2026 three-year assessment cycle that just concluded, what did your program set out to learn through your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessments?

- We evaluated our Phil 6: Logic course the years 2023-2024, and 2024-2025. Unfortunately, our data for 2024-2025 was lost with the Elumen transfer. Analysis of our logic course from the 2023-2024 cycle showed similar outcomes across age and gender categories, with some disparity based on race. We will be looking at these issues again in our future assessments of Phil 6: Logic.
- For the 2025-2026 assessment cycle, we evaluated a set of similar SLO's that were all designed to capture the ability to evaluate complex theories and apply those theories to complex cases. Our data so far show very high trends success rates for this set of SLO's, indicating that our students who remain in the course and complete assessments are learning complex theoretical analysis at a very high rate.
-

2. Based on your analysis of your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessment data, what conclusions did you draw about student outcomes and equity in your program?

- *Outcomes from course and program level data show trends similar to nationwide trends, with Asian students typically having high success rates, and at-risk minorities often having success rates below average.*

3. Explain potential plans to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps.

- *Our instructors have taken a deliberate approach to increase the representation of diverse communities in our course content. One of our ethics teachers, for example, recently introduced a set of course material with an impressively high representation of ethical philosophy from throughout the world. This is one of the most diverse sets of material we have seen in ethics, and we look forward to seeing how these specific changes might result in higher outcomes for frequently underrepresented groups.*

4. Describe any obstacles that you encountered in your assessment process and any supports that would be helpful.

- *We did encounter some glitches when working with Curricunet Meta to complete our SLO's. Assessments simply did not generate for some of our instructors who had taught the courses for which we created the aggregate assessments. In another glitch, some of our course assessments generated incorrectly, importing students from two courses into a single assessment, making it impossible to assess those courses. For this reason, the SLO data from 2025-2026 should be acknowledged for its limited scope and generalizability.*

Section 3: Data Discussion

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review. Workshops and office hours will be offered in Fall 2026 to support Program Review writers.

1. RPIE Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

*(**Note**: Not all Programs have RPIE data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to the RPIE team.)*

Data may come from:

- RPIE Data Packets
- Transfer data
- Succes Rates Dashboard (scroll down on page)
- Requested data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE)
- SLO/SAO data
- Data from program-created surveys or investigations
- Any other relevant source of quantitative or qualitative data

- *Data from our packets and data from our SLO's show very comparable results. Generally, students are having a high level of succes. We are serving a diverse community of students, and students from all groups are mostly successful.*

2. Equity: Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns and any actions that should be taken at the program or college level.

- *Our instructors have taken a deliberate approach to increase the representation of diverse communities in our course content. One of our ethics teachers, for example, recently introduced a set of course material with an impressively high representation of ethical philosophy from throughout the world. This is one of the most diverse sets of material we have seen in ethics, and we look forward to seeing how these specific changes might result in higher outcomes for frequently underrepresented groups.*
- *We continue to work to diversify out content, and we will be monitoring for the effect of the changes that we have recently implemented over the next few years to see if diversifying our curriculum has the effect of increased interest and success for minority students, bringing down those discrepancies shown in the data.*

3. Course Modality (Instructional Programs Only): In reviewing your program's data packet and Succes Rates Dashboard, are there differences in success rates by modality (i.e. face-to-face, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid, or hyflex)? If so, reflect on what might account for differences and any actions that should be taken. (Non-instructional programs may also choose to reflect on online vs. in-person services if applicable).

- *Rates of success for our in-person courses are higher than our rates of success for our online courses. We experience this at a time when rates of success for online courses are generally improving. We suspect that one reason for this is the rigorous standards of our online courses and the investment we have made in trying to make sure that students truly understand the work and are not using AI as a substitute for their learning. One of our online instructors, for instance, arranges meetings with each student at the end of the year to discuss their final essays and ensure that the student has an understanding of the work they have completed. This is somewhat speculative, but we believe that one reason our success rates have not improved in the same way that other programs have is because our faculty use measures designed to deter students substituting the use of AI for their own thoughts and understanding. At the same time, we have also had discussions about things we can do to make our courses more enjoyable, understandable, and increasing student-facutly interaction by making sure that students get a personalized classroom experience even in online courses. We hope to continue this trend and look forward to seeing how these changes might provide genuine improvements in our success metrics.*

4. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only): The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly below 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There is no punishment for not meeting the standard, and many valid reasons this may occur. When a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | Program-set standard data can be found on this page

5a. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion in AY25-26?

Yes__xd__ No____

5b. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests. Success rates for individual courses can be found on the Success Rates Dashboard.

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

Section 4: Special Topics

These questions have been chosen for this year's Comprehensive Program Review to meet reporting mandates (for accreditation, Ed. Code, or other sources).

1. Mission: Describe 1-3 examples of how your program's work has aligned with the college's mission, vision, values, and/or educational master plan over the past three years. (Possibilities might include new initiatives, resource allocation/use, program improvements, or other activities).

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Educational Master Plan

- *Our mission statement and values statement both discuss the importance of fostering equity and supporting our diverse communities on campus. Our recent work to diversify our philosophy curriculum fits this goal, both as an attempt to create an equitable learning environment where all students can learn, and in the teaching of diverse subject matter.*

2. Regular Substantive Interaction (Instructional Programs Only)

To meet our college, ACCJC, state, and federal standards, **all online instructors** must demonstrate "**regular and substantive interaction**" (RSI) with students. That is, we must be clearly providing instruction and interacting with our online students, just like we would in an on-campus class. The following reflection questions allow us to capture how RSI is occurring in our classes.

The following documents explain requirements and best practices for RSI:

- ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education
- Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements

2a. If your program offers DE courses, how are Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements met in your area? Examples appear on the DE addendums of your Course Outlines of Record. Place an X next to each method used in your courses.	
x	Course materials make clear to students how often and when the instructor will interact with students (e.g. syllabus/home page lists email/office hours/other ways to communicate and typical response times)
x	Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses)
x	Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses)
x	Provides additional information from various sources/mediums to engage students with course content (e.g. instructor-curated content in Canvas pages that help deepen students understanding of course content)
x	Facilitates discussions (e.g. through Canvas discussion boards, Pronto, Studio, or Hypothesis)
x	Provides feedback on students' coursework (e.g. through detailed rubrics and/or assignment comments in Speedgrader; note: a grade alone does not quality as RSI, nor does auto-graded feedback students may get through completing publisher content)

x	Responds to students' questions (e.g. through timely responses to student messages in Canvas Inbox, discussion boards, social annotation assignments)
x	Facilitates student success through ongoing outreach (e.g. posts announcements; uses "Message Students Who" to encourage struggling students to attend office hours or access free tutoring)
	Other [explain]:

2b. What challenges if any have you faced in implementing RSI? What additional training or resources might instructors in your program need to increase the quality of RSI in online courses?

- *Time management is always a difficult challenge because individualized feedback can take so much time. Strategies for working with AI would be helpful. AI can in theory help, but also much of our time can end up being used to outsmart AI and interaction time can be wasted trying to police AI. We could use training in alternate strategies to integrate AI in meaningful ways, or how to design course material in meaningful ways so that AI use is irrelevant.*

Section 5: Program Review Feedback

What questions or suggestions do you have about this year's Program Review forms or process?

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

Detailed Instructions

Instructions

1. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, November 2.
2. Please respond to questions with enough detail to present your information; it doesn't have to be long.
3. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
4. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.
5. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.

Sections: There are five sections to the document:

1. Program Reflection and Planning
2. SLO/SAO Review
3. Data analysis
4. Special topics
5. Feedback on the PR template and process

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 25-26 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2026-27. It is fine to discuss topics beyond these time frames, but please specify the time frame in your responses.

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

Uses: This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Equity: Here is the LPC definition of equity, which is a guiding principle in reviewing programs: "Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus."

Please note: Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu