

**Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2016**

Name of Department: Philosophy/Religious Studies

Efficacy Team: Maria Del Carmen Rodriguez, Marc Donnhauser, Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Continuation

The Philosophy/Religious Studies department provides acceptable data, explanations and analysis to show their program is effective and meeting the needs of its students while aligning with the college's strategic initiatives. They have a commendable record with online courses and a laudable focus on increasing retention and success, though the committee encourages the program to look toward opportunities for growth, given the college's growth plans, as well as understanding the opportunities their new AA-T in Philosophy will bring, as the department moves from one that primarily served general GE and transfer requirements, to one that also is responsible for training those who will major in philosophy.

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	Meets
Part I: Access		
Demographics	<i>The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population</i>	<i>The program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance. If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.</i>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
<p>The department explains and analyzes its demographic data. The department's demographics are close to campus-wide numbers in most respects. The department is commended for bringing the number of African-American students being served in the program closer to the campus-wide (and is fact now 2% above), when this was not the case in the past. The program is studying the small discrepancy with Hispanics served.</p>		
Pattern of Service	<i>The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.</i>	<i>The program provides <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs. If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.</i>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
<p>The department does a good job explaining its pattern of service, including having an online option for all courses. The program also shows that the current pattern of service meets demands by including fill rates and noting that online courses are very flexible for students who have challenging schedules. However, the department only runs one evening course and no weekend courses. While it is perhaps true that their commendably broad online offerings satisfy demand during those times, it would have been stronger had the department been able to show that there was no actual demand for on-campus courses during those times.</p>		
Part II: Student Success		
Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success	<i>Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.</i>	<i>Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals. If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.</i>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
<p>The major goals of the department are to increase the success and retention of their students, though in general their numbers are only slightly lower than the college averages. But the department was acutely aware that online courses tend to have lower numbers in these areas. The department shows they are active in improving their online delivery. The department, though, does not address their goal of promoting their new AA-T degree.</p>		
Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes	<i>Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.</i>	<i>Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.</i>

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
The department regularly assesses SLOs, has completed 3-year reviews, and robustly demonstrates that SLOs are actively used by the department faculty to assess courses, make curricular changes, adjust assessment methods. The department has PLOs for its philosophy degree, including mapping. But the degree is too new to have any reviews.		
Part III: Institutional Effectiveness		
Mission and Purpose	<i>The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.</i>	<i>The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.</i>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
The program has a mission, which aligns with both the college's older and newer mission statements. In addition, the program is cognizant of its need to include its degree into a revised mission statement in the near future.		
Productivity	<i>The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.</i>	<i>The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.</i>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
The program demonstrates it is productive at an acceptable level, including discussing FTES and WSCH numbers. The WSCH numbers align with the college's average, and a bit short of the 525 goal. The program also points out the ways in which its two full-time instructors contribute to the college as club advisor, on academic senate and with distance education.		
Relevance, Currency, Articulation	<i>The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.</i> <i>Out of date course(s) that are not launched into Curricunet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.</i>	<i>The program provides evidence that the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program. Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU, or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.</i>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
The program's courses are relevant, current and all transfer to both UC and CSU.		
Part IV: Planning		
Trends	<i>The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.</i>	<i>The program identifies and describes major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.</i>

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The department cites a couple of important societal trends – an anti-intellectual streak that devalues philosophy and the humanities even while surveys show both a diversity of religious affiliation and large numbers of Americans changing religious affiliations. The department hopes their courses can both defend the importance of philosophy while giving students tools to navigate the religious and philosophical diversity of the present time. The department notes the use of high-interest texts that connect philosophy with both real-world issues as well as popular culture.

The department also discusses the imminent retirement of one of its two full-time faculty, the one with the FSA in Religious Studies. The department is planning well for this eventuality, pursuing overlapping avenues to insure that students taking courses in religious studies will have appropriate faculty as well as a full-time champion for that facet of the department.

Since the college is currently in a growth mode, it would have been useful for the department to address this issue.

Accomplishments

The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.

The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The department is proud of its successful delivery of many of its courses in online formats. In addition, the wide variety of philosophy and religious studies courses is touted, though the comparison to other local and state colleges on this measure would have benefitted with specific examples. Finally, the 98% fill rate is noted, with the department acknowledging the need for planning to increase retention and success to make the most of this accomplishment.

Weaknesses/challenges

The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.

The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Once again, the department notes their goal of raising retention and success, and though the planning discussion here is simple, given that this issue has been discussed (including planning) at other places in the document, the planning requirement has been satisfied.

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate

Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.

Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.

Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.

Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The document effectively discusses the department’s technological connections and use, and its contribution to campus climate. In terms of partnerships, the department ensures that its courses transfer to 4-year institutions, though its AA-T degree will require a bit closer relationship with those institutions.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories

Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.

Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no “Does not Meets” in the previous efficacy review): MEETS

There were no deficiencies in last program efficacy document.