Name of the Program  Philosophy for Children  __________________________________________________________

Program as used in this prioritization process can be a specialization, section, division, field of study, center, degree program, etc. The unit head, in collaboration with others as appropriate, must determine the level of analysis required.

How long has the program existed:  For 22 years __________________________________________________________

Department/School/College:  Philosophy/ Arts & Humanities ______________________________________________________

The department would fall under which of the following Vice Chancellor’s offices?

___ x  Academic Affairs
_____   Research and Graduate Education
_____   Student Services
_____   Administration, Finance, and Operations

How does the program fit into the larger administrative unit? (Describe in two or three sentences.)

This is a program within the Philosophy Department, which is in the College of Arts and Humanities. Both undergraduate and graduate students participate in the program.

Briefly describe the program (no more than half a page):

P4C began around 1969 when Matthew Lipman, then a Colombia University philosophy professor, became disenchanted with the educational system. He observed that children did not think as well as they could or should in a democratic society. He was also concerned that schools actually encouraged children to have a negative view of their own intellectual abilities. Lipman went on to create a curriculum that incorporated the skills of logic and reasoning found in philosophy to improve thinking. For 22 years, Dr. Thomas Jackson, University of Hawaii at Mānoa, has elaborated upon Lipman's curriculum, creating additional strategies that complement Lipman's vision. Dr. Jackson's work has led to the P4C Hawaii movement where The Philosophy in the School's Project is ongoing. Since 1995, the P4C program at the University of Hawaii, with the support of the Soong Ching Ling Foundation and the Uehiro Foundation, has been conducting workshops and exchanges with elementary schools in China and in Japan. He runs a class PHIL 492 Introducing students to the pedagogical methods, runs a practicum PHIL 493 for undergraduates wishing to go into DOE schools to teach philosophy, and works with two model schools (Waikiki Elementary and Kailua High).
P4C Hawaii

Vision
Education for the purpose of creating intellectually responsible communities.

Mission
P4C Hawaii is dedicated to preparing, supporting and sustaining educators, researchers and students who engage or are interested in engaging in the P4C Hawaii approach to education.

History
With roots reaching deeply into American Pragmatism and the thought of such philosophers as John Dewey and William James, P4C is a direct response to the international crisis in education. P4C converts traditional classrooms into reflective communities of inquiry where students and teachers continue to develop their ability to think for themselves in responsible ways. P4C began around 1969 when Matthew Lipman, then a Colombia University philosophy professor, became disenchanted with the educational system. He observed that children did not think as well as they could or should in a democratic society. He was also concerned that schools actually encouraged children to have a negative view of their own intellectual abilities. Lipman went on to create a curriculum that incorporated the skills of logic and reasoning found in philosophy to improve thinking. For 22 years, Dr. Thomas Jackson, University of Hawaii at Mānoa, has elaborated upon Lipman’s curriculum, creating additional strategies that complement Lipman’s vision. Dr. Jackson’s work has led to the P4C Hawaii movement where The Philosophy in the School’s Project is ongoing. Since 1995, the P4C program at the University of Hawaii, with the support of the Soong Ching Ling Foundation and the Uehiro Foundation, has been conducting workshops and exchanges with elementary schools in China and in Japan.

Present
Today P4C is an international movement with programs in place all over the US mainland and throughout the world in 40 countries from Argentina to Zimbabwe. P4C in Hawaii is a growing phenomenon that continues to create educational experiences, for both teachers and students, guided by these four principles:

- Creating community is essential to all aspects of learning
- A learner-centered approach to education fosters active and meaningful engagement
- Thinking can be developed through the practice of reflective inquiry
- Philosophy, embedded within a community of inquiry, is an important tool for learning how to become a responsible thinker

Future
The University of Hawaii is strategically positioned to serve as a crossroads for the demonstration and practice of P4C Hawaii throughout the Pacific Rim. We are being propelled onto a larger stage as P4C Hawaii draws positive recognition around the world. With support, it is expected that the P4C Hawaii movement will continue to grow: 1) its program of education at the University of Hawaii; 2) its support of students and teachers in Hawaii’s schools; 3) its capabilities for researching and evaluating the P4C Hawaii approach; 4) international exchange programs and activities; 5) community outreach; and 6) its capabilities for hosting local, national and international conferences.

• What are the services it provides, and to whom (students, faculty staff, donors, other)?

We provide:
- Pedagogical, philosophical, emotional and moral support to DOE teachers. Currently there are 12 at Kailua High School, (9 in the English Department, 3 in Ethnic Studies), 12 teachers at Waikiki School and 1 teacher at James E. Campbell High School;
- Introductory classes (PHIL 492) and workshops in p4c facilitation, collaboration and philosophical reflection to pre-service teachers, students, and faculty;
- Follow up practicum experience through PHIL 493
- Philosophical and organizational support for the many graduate students who conduct research in p4c;
- Resources (i.e., articles, studies, visitation opportunities, practical experience, lectures etc.) for the national and international p4c community. We host students and teachers from across the US and from around the world

• What services does it receive from others?
We receive organizational support from the Philosophy Department and the UH Foundation.

• On what tasks/services does this program collaborate with others?
We collaborate with individuals, departments, and institutions on research, training, workshops, conferences, teacher exchange programs, and program development here in Hawaii and in other countries.

• Are these services elsewhere available at the University? In the surrounding community?
No, no.

• What is the funding source(s) (state, self-sustaining, grants, etc)? At what level?
Uehiro Foundation, Japan (currently $30,000/year); private donor (currently $10,000/year)

• Are there needs and demands for services that the program cannot meet? What are they, and how do they relate to the University’s mission?
Yes. There are more teachers and schools engaged with P4C than the present program can fully support. Furthermore, there are additional schools that would be part of the program if they could be properly supported with adequate staffing. Ongoing research as well as publications on p4c Hawaii would greatly benefit from a "research coordinator" and an "archivist", roles that are not currently supported. The university’s mission includes research and community outreach. This project responds to both of these missions in important ways. With more support it could more properly respond to these aspects of the mission of the University.

• How many, and what type of staff are employed?
One director who is a full time Specialist with the Department, one half-time graduate assistant, and casual hires who provide in-class support to teachers, web-design expertise, and film documentation services. The minimum requirements for the casual hires are graduate student standing in philosophy and successful completion of Phil. 492 and 493.

• What are the basic responsibilities of each position? Which individuals are cross-trained and in what areas?
The director is responsible for the overall direction and growth of the project and is able to work in all areas of the project. The graduate assistant serves as philosopher in residence at designated p4c model schools, thereby extending the reach of p4c programs and carrying out the mission and strategic plan outlined in the prospectus. The graduate assistant also assists the director as needed. The Graduate assistant is cross-trained to work with
active teachers, teach university classes, mentor university undergraduates and graduate students in p4c, and work in almost all facets of p4c Hawaii. Current casual hires are not cross-trained and provide services in their areas of expertise. In-class support means weekly visits to classrooms to assist teachers and their students in developing philosophically safe inquiry communities. This position also entails data gathering on individual classroom communities which is part of the project’s ongoing research initiative.

**What technologies are available? Are there technological improvements that could be made to save on labor, or to improve the product/service offered? How does the program get technological support?**

We receive some technological support from the Philosophy Dept.

Video documentation of classroom sessions is a key component of our research data base. For this we currently rely on the skills and professional equipment of one of the Philosophy Department’s graduate students. The purchase of an external hard drive to store the data, editing equipment and some funding to support his work, currently voluntary, would greatly help this aspect of the research into the effectiveness of the project.

**How is the program’s success reviewed? By whom? How often?**

The project is supported by a Council that includes members of the Philosophy Dept. faculty as well as participating high school and elementary school faculty. This Council meets on a monthly basis to coordinate and assess current project initiatives and to plan future activities. Two years ago the Council developed a Prospectus that serves as the foundation for program evaluation.

**What data or evidence does the program have that reflects on its performance?**

The following is a list of some of the research (MA theses, doctoral dissertations) that both theoretically and empirically address the impact of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING AND LI: THE CONFUCIAN PROCESS OF HUMANIZATION THROUGH RITUAL PROPRIETY</td>
<td>Geir Sigurdsson</td>
<td>December 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT SCHOOLS ARE FOR; PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PLACE IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>Chad Edward Miller</td>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE IMPACT OF PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN ON SELF-CONFIDENCE AND SELF-CONCEPT. A META-NARRATIVE REFLECTION OF A TRANSFORMATION.</td>
<td>Tammy Jones</td>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN HAWAI'I AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS’ REFLECTIVE THINKING IN CLASSROOM DISCUSSIONS</td>
<td>Natalia Lavrenthiva-Grass Lukey</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATING FOR GOOD JUDGMENT</td>
<td>Thomas B. Yos</td>
<td>December 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATING VISUAL PERCEPTION TOWARDS AESTHETIC ENJOYMENT: AN EXPLORATIVE ART UNIT WITH FIFTH GRADERS</td>
<td>Lisa Marie Laws</td>
<td>May 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPING COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY USING PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN AND THE MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES</td>
<td>Luz Garcia Villalba</td>
<td>December 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN ARISTOTELIAN LOGIC BE TRANSLATED INTO CHINESE: COULD THERE BE A CHINESE</td>
<td>Jinmei Yuan</td>
<td>May 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition following two MA theses have recently been published in German by scholars who did their research on schools in Hawaii:

PHILOSOPHEREN MIT JUGENDLICHEN NACH THOMAS JACKSON (HAWAII): GRUNDHALTUNG UND ZWISCHENMENSCHLICHE KOMMUNIKATION ZWISCHEN SCHULERINNEN UND FACILITATOR, Kornelia Moderle, 2008

IST PHILOSOPHEREN MIT KINDERN PHILOSOPHIE? Maria Eitzinger, 2008

Recent test data indicates significant student improvement in test scores on the DOE standardized high school English Proficiency Exam at Kailua and James E. Campbell High Schools. At KHS, during the 2006-2007 year, only one sophomore teacher -- the grade that is tested -- was utilizing p4c; more than 80% of his students met or exceeded the standard, as compared to 40% of the students who were not in his classes. As more 10th-grade teachers have implemented p4c and test scores in English have been consistently increasing.

There are currently three doctoral dissertations in process in the College of Education that deal directly with the impact of the program at the high school level. A previous graduate student in our program is completing her doctoral dissertation at the Tokyo Institute of Technology. Her dissertation is researching the impact of p4c on an ecological restoration project on Sado Island in Japan.

- Do our peers have a similar program? How do they differ?

“Philosophy for Children” is an international initiative in education that began in the early 1970’s. Those participating in this initiative share a belief that philosophy as a discipline has a key role to play in schooling. At present this role is still largely absent. The participants in this initiative differ, however, in what they see as the proper response to this absence. While most of the programs were initially inspired by the work of its
founder, Matthew Lipman, the approaches have diverged. Some, such as Montclair State University and the University of Alberta, Edmonton, use the philosophy curriculum developed by Lipman as the heart of their program. P4c Hawaii is unique in its mission, its key components (the Good Thinker’s Toolkit, intellectual safety, Plain Vanilla, etc), its involvement with local schools, (especially the use of philosophy graduate students to provide sustained in-class support to teachers) and in its function as an active bridge between the University Philosophy Department, the College of Education, and DOE schools.

• **What opportunities exist for greater collaboration and team approaches in the delivery of services?**

Both Waikiki Elementary School and Kailua High School are model schools for the Project. They serve as training sites for newcomers to the project, as resources for ongoing research, and as visit/training sites for local and foreign visitors (collaboration is already in place in China, Japan, Austria, and Switzerland.) In addition, the College of Education regularly recommends the core beginning course for the project, PHIL 492, to its undergraduates. The availability of additional sections of this course would immediately expand the potential for delivery of services.

In addition, a robust, generously funded and growing initiative in p4c exists at Creighton University. Philosophy students involved the program there have already been sent to Hawaii for training and more such exchanges will develop with proper support.

Internationally, the Program has a long-standing relationship (since 1996) with the Soong Ching Ling Foundation in China which continues to support p4c in Jiao Zuo City, Henan Province, and for the past three years, supported by the Uehiro Foundation, strong ties have been developed with Kokoro No Kyoiku Ken Kyu Kai, a major teacher organization in Japan that is dedicated to reforming approaches to teaching in Japan. Teachers and researchers have spent time in Hawaii, field testing lessons with students in schools here, and a Hawaii teacher and principal were hosted in Japan last summer where they conducted demonstration classes and presented at a major education conference.

The Hawaii project, having been in continuous existence since 1984, has significant ties with teachers, faculty and administrators in the DOE who are willing to engage in other valuable collaborative initiatives including in the area of sustainability.

Close ties have been developed with the College of Education as increasing numbers of their students, both undergraduate and graduate, have taken PHIL 492. There is strong interest in a certificate program in p4c, as well as an MA and ultimately PhD that focuses specifically on p4c.

• **Are there efficiencies that could be gained by consolidating with a similar entity? Have such opportunities been explored before? If so, what was the outcome?**

No

• **What strategies could result in better efficiencies in the program?**

The challenges to the program are not a matter of “better efficiencies” but more dependable, sustained, adequate support.
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At present, given the demands of supporting the model schools, providing guidance for MA and PhD work in p4c (in both the Philosophy Department and the College of Education), maintaining a p4c “library”, teaching the core course, PHIL 492 and its partner, PHIL 493, conducting his own research and writing in p4c, and teaching introductory courses in the Philosophy department, the director is spread very thin. The ability to
restrict the immediate duties of the director to those tasks he is uniquely qualified to carry out -- such as building a collaborative degree program in p4c with the Philosophy Department and the College of Education, using existing relationships to actively seek funding from additional sources, supervising doctoral research in p4c, and research and publication -- and delegate other duties to other faculty, staff or graduate students would result in better efficiency for the Program. However, such delegation requires a uniquely trained staff and graduate students, which in turn requires more dependable, sustained and adequate financial support.

**Program Definition**

For purposes of this review, a program is defined as an activity, or collection of activities, that consume resources (dollars, people, space, equipment, time). All administrative operations should be reviewed using this guide.

Departments and programs are not necessarily synonymous -- a department is not necessarily a single unit, but sometimes comprised of multiple programs. For instance, Facilities and Grounds is a department, but within the department, there are several programs: project management, architectural design, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, etc.

**Categorizing Programs**

As a starting point for the review process, programs will be categorized into one of three areas:

1. Program is **essential** to the operations of any university;
2. Program is **less essential**, but generally included at major research universities;
3. Program is **non-essential** to the operation of a university.

**For Programs in Category 1**, the focus of the review will be on efficiency and effectiveness, quality, and cost;

**For Programs in Categories 2 and 3**, the focus will be on **centrality** (how it meets the central mission of the University), **program quality**, **program needs** (both why the University needs the program and what the program needs from the University), other factors such as **uniqueness** and **program cost**, relative to benefits provided.

**Review and Analysis of Programs**

After developing an inventory and categorization of all programs as outlined above, administrators of these programs will be asked to provide information to assist in the review and analysis process.

**Outcome of Program Review**

After review and analysis, programs will be identified for one of the following actions:

1. New/In transition
2. Target for growth or investment
3. Maintenance at stable resource levels
4. Reorganize, restructure, merge or consolidate
5. Reduce in size or scope
6. Phase out, close or eliminate

**Guiding Questions for the Review Process:**

- What are the main goals and objectives of the program?
- What are the services it provides, and to whom (students, faculty staff, donors, other)?
- What services does it receive from others?
- On what tasks/services does this program collaborate with others?
- Are these services elsewhere available at the University? In the surrounding community?
- What is the funding source(s) (state, self-sustaining, grants, etc)? At what level?
- Are there needs and demands for services that the program cannot meet? What are they, and how do they relate to the University’s mission?
- How many, and what type of staff are employed?
- What are the basic responsibilities of each position? Which individuals are cross-trained and in what areas?
• What technologies are available? Are there technological improvements that could be made to save on labor, or to improve the product/service offered? How does the program get technological support?
• How is the program’s success reviewed? By whom? How often?
• What data or evidence does the program have that reflects on its performance?
• Do our peers have a similar program? How do they differ?
• What opportunities exist for greater collaboration and team approaches in the delivery of services?
• Are there efficiencies that could be gained by consolidating with a similar entity? Have such opportunities been explored before? If so, what was the outcome?
• What strategies could result in better efficiencies in the program?

Guide for Prioritization (examples)

Criteria for New or In Transition
• The program was established within the past three years and is seen to be needed
• Establishment of the program was based on demonstrated need and it appears to be meeting the need

Criteria for Growth and Investment in Program
• Need for the program is increasing due to regulatory issues, growth of unit(s) being supported, or for other articulated reasons.
• The program has received state/regional/national recognition for services.
• The program is an integral part of the university mission.

Criteria for Maintenance of Program at Stable Resource Levels
• Demand for the program has been relatively constant; program able to meet objectives.
• The program is an integral part of the university mission.
• Similar services are otherwise unavailable, or inferior.

Criteria for Reorganization, Restructuring, or Merger
• The program offers services that are not necessary to the university, or that duplicate those of one or more other units.
• Program could be more efficiently delivered in concert with other programs or by reorganizing delivery in new ways

Criteria for Reduce in Size or Scope
• Program could meet most needs even if reduced in size or scope
• Program is not fully subscribed

Criteria for Elimination
• Demand for program is low, or declining at a rapid pace.
• Services are not essential to the central mission of the university.
• Activity or services provided by the unit are inconsistent with the future direction of the University.