

Program: Philosophy

Division: Arts and Humanities

Writer(s): Jeremiah Bodnar

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Jeremiah Bodnar

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 3.

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.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 24-25.

- *Our IR data shows that last semester we had our highest percentage of African American, Asian American, and Filipino American student population was at its highest rate in 5 years. We hope that this effect is, at least in part, due to emphasis within our program at diversifying the content of our courses, both through curriculum updates, and through individual efforts within our courses to increase representation from diverse sources. These efforts have been described in past program review documents and may be one reason for the increased numbers in our most recent term.*
- *Success rates increased as a whole between 23-24 and 24-25. We hope that this is a by-product of the emphasis on good teaching.*
- *In last year’s program review we indicated our intention to participate in the Arts and Humanities Fair. The fair was quite successful, with several students showing interest in the program. We also created a philosophy club on campus as a result of the interactions on that day.*
- *In last year’s program review, we indicated that we would be monitoring our logic course for a possible rapid decrease in enrollments due to the changes in CalGetc for GE status of logic courses. We are happy to report that enrollment in logic has remained robust over the past year.*
- *In last year’s program review, we indicated that our course success rate was 63%, which was below our “set standard” of 64%. We are happy to report that our success rate has risen to 69%. We worry that pervasive use of AI may be creating a false sense of learning achievements, especially in our online courses. We are doing our best to monitor and address*

this issue when possible, but there are limits to what can be done at the level of the individual professor to address this issue.

- *In last year's program review we noted the low success rate for our philosophy 1 program for that 23-24 school year. We are happy to say that this rate has increased for 24-25 and is now well above the program set standard. The aberration noted in 23-24 does not appear to be a trend.*

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 24-25.

- AI has created new challenges for all programs. Most significantly, it has become increasingly difficult to ensure that work is done by the students themselves, especially in online courses. All instructors are monitoring for work that seems to indicate AI and working with students individually, but a broader approach lead by academic senates, administration, and the CCCCO need to be put in place for strategies for dealing with this new challenge.

3. What SLO(s) or SAO(s) if any did your program assess or discuss since your last program review? Please describe any findings and planned actions.

- Unfortunately, our data from 2024-2025 was lost with the end of our Elumen contract. Luckily, with our existing SLO 3-year plan, we are still on pace to evaluate all our courses by the end of next year. Last year's analysis of our logic course showed similar outcomes across age and gender categories, with some disparity based on race. We look forward to evaluating our other courses at this level of detail next year if the detailed and disaggregated data is provided.
-

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

- As noted above, we will be evaluating some targeted SLOs in our programs beyond logic next semester. If possible, we will be looking at disaggregated data to evaluate effects on all populations through an equity lens. If disaggregated SLO data is not available, we will use disaggregated course success data instead.
- We will most likely be disactivating Phil 8 and Phil 5. Phil 5 will likely be deactivated because of low enrollments. Phil 8 will most likely be deactivated for low enrollments, because it cannot be offered at fewer than 4 units, and because the workload of the composition elements would put an unfair burden on instructors. For example, the comparable English courses are capped at 28 and have additional load provided, while our course is capped at 44 with no additional load, despite similar demands on teaching and grading.
-

CTE REPORT (CTE DISCIPLINES ONLY)

1. Does this program continue to meet a labor market demand?

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

2. Are there similar programs in the area? If yes, list the programs and their institutions.

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

3. Has the program demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students? Provide employment and completion success based on Perkins Core Indicator Report.

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

4. Does the program provide opportunities for review and comments by local private industries? Attach most recent Advisory Committee meeting minutes.

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

Detailed Instructions and Information

Instructions:

1. Please answer each question with enough detail to present your information, but it doesn't have to be long.
2. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
3. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.
4. Send an electronic copy of this completed form to Program Review chair Karin Spirn and your Dean by November 3.
5. 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.

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.

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.

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 24-25 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2025-26. It is okay to include information outside of these time windows as needed.

Program Review Process: Comprehensive Program Reviews will be completed every three years, in alignment with the SLO/SAO cycle. On the other years, programs will complete an update.

SLO/SAO Process: SLOs and SAOs should be assessed according to a three-year plan, with comprehensive reporting on the third year. For more information, contact SLO chair John Rosen: jrosen@laspositascollege.edu

Equity is a guiding principle. Here is the LPC definition:

Las Positas College will achieve equity by changing the impacts of structural racism, ableism, homophobia, and systematic poverty on student success and access to higher education, achieved through continuous evaluation and improvement of all services. We believe in a high-quality education focused on learning and an inclusive, culturally relevant environment that meets the diverse needs of all our students.

LPC Equity Definition: 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.