De Anza College

Program Review – Annual Update Form

1. Briefly describe how your area has used the feedback from the Comprehensive Program Review provided by RAPP members (if unsure, request the feedback form from your dean/manager).

One of the main feedback items from the Comprehensive Program Review had to do with a collaborative style of exams, which are used by one of the Department's two instructors in their on-campus classes. RAPP suggested piloting this project in the Department's online classes. That may have been done by the instructor who teaches online, but the main program-related work during the past year has been on developing an AS-T degree (see items 2 and 3, below). The Department is also doing the 5-year Curriculum Updates for both of its currently-existing courses this year.

- 2. Describe any changes or updates that have occurred since you last submitted program review (comprehensive program review <u>submissions</u>)
 - The Geology Department and the Division Dean have explored options for bringing more class sections back to campus during the 2024-25 school year. Following the Dean's recommendations, during Fall 2024 and Winter 2025 two sections of Geology 10 were converted from online to on-campus (compared to the previous year), and one section of Geology 20 was converted from online to on-campus.
 - The Geology Department is developing new courses for an AS-T Degree (see item 3, below).
- 3. Provide a summary of the progress you have made on the goals identified in your last program review (as included in the comprehensive program review).

The Geology Department has taken steps to create an AS-T degree in Geology, and to create the two courses necessary to offer it. Specific steps taken to date include:

- The initiating instructor has submitted the De Anza Curriculum New Program Form for the AS-T degree and it has been signed by the Department Coordinator.
- The initiating instructor has submitted the De Anza Curriculum New Course Form for Evolution of the Earth, and it has been signed by the Department Coordinator.
- The initiating instructor has submitted the De Anza Curriculum New Course Form for Geology In The Outdoors, and it has been signed by the Department Coordinator.
- The initiating instructor has written curriculum, shared it with the Department Coordinator, and the Department is in agreement about moving forward with putting curriculum into eLumen.

- Course outlines are being entered into eLumen in order to be able to submit them to the Curriculum Committee.
- 4. If your goals are changing, use this space to provide rationale, or background information, for any new goals and resource requests that you'll be submitting that were not included in your last program review.

The Department's goal remains the same as in the last Comprehensive Program Review: Create the courses for an AS-T degree.

5. Describe the impact to date of previously requested resources (personnel and instructional equipment) including both requests that were approved and were not approved. What impact have these resources had on your program/department/office and measures of student success or client satisfaction? What have you been able to and unable to accomplish due to resource requests that were approved or not approved?

Because the curriculum process will necessitate a year or two before new AS-T-specific courses can be taught, new resources have not been requested yet. However, when the time for deploying those courses draws closer, the Department may need to request new materials and/or equipment, such as fossil samples for the Evolution of the Earth course, or field equipment for the Evolution of the Earth course. There could even be a dialogue about the possibility of the College helping provide transportation to field sites for the Geology In The Outdoors course.

- 6. How have these resources (or lack of resources) specifically affected disproportionately impacted students/clients?
- 7. Refer back to your Comprehensive Program Review under the section titled Assessment Cycle as well as the SLO website (https://www.deanza.edu/slo/) for instructional programs. In the table below provide a brief summary of one learning outcome, the method of assessment used to assess the outcome, a summary of the assessment results, a reflection on the assessment results, and strategies your area has or plans to implement to improve student success and equity. If your area has not undergone an assessment cycle, please do so before completing the table below.

Table 1. Reflection on Learning Outcomes (SLO, AUO, SSLO)

Learning
Outcome (SLO,
AUO, SSLO)

SLO from Geology 10: Use observations from the crust and lithosphere of the Earth to determine geologic history at hand-sample, outcrop, local, and regional scales.

Method of Assessment of Learning Outcome (please elaborate)	The Department Coordinator always uses a type of question on their Test 2 (of 3) which was originally created many years ago by Sandy Hay, who was the founding Geology instructor at both Foothill and De Anza Colleges, and the founding PSME Division Dean at De Anza. In this question, students are given cross-sections of an idealized set of tilted sedimentary strata, and asked to determine which cross-section shows a transition from marine to non-marine conditions (or vice-versa). To assess this SLO for the current APRU, the Dept. Coordinator calculated the percentage of students answering this question correctly on their Test 2, as well as on an anonymous in-class "voting" version of the question designed as practice for Test 2. This was done for the Coordinator's
	classes in F22, Sp23, F23, Sp24, and F24.
Summary of Assessment Results	Results from the in-class practice version of the question are consistently higher than for the version of the question on Test 2. The in-class version had percent-correct values ranging from 50% to 82%. The on-test version had percent-correct values ranging from 54% to 59%.
	(Note: These percentages do not reflect the grades given for the on-test version of this question, because the instructor uses a partial-credit system on their multiple-choice tests. This system results in overall test scores that usually average around 80-85%, similar to the results which "curving" would yield, but without putting students in competition against each other the way "curving" does.)
Reflection on Results	A simple interpretation of the higher scores from the in-class version of the question is this: Students can discuss the question prior to casting their individual anonymous votes, and thus they can help each other figure it out.
Strategies Implemented or Plan to be Implemented (aka: enhancements)	This could potentially be an area where some sort of collaborative exams might be tried, as described in the Comprehensive Program Review. However, it is important to point out that the collaborative exams are only used by one of the two Geology instructors, and NOT by the instructor whose question results are described and discussed above. Switching to an entirely new exam format, based on a completely different testing philosophy, would be a major change, and must be explored and considered carefully before being tried. Significant numbers of currently-unanticipated negative consequences could result from such a major change. Thus, any such experiment would probably happen some time in the future, especially with the Department's AS-T development and 5-year revisions being in-work at the present time.

8. Dean Manager Comments:

Our Geology program has been going strong both online and on campus. Students speak highly of the information they learned in their classes. These classes also provide students with General Education and Lab Science option. The department has great growth ideas and is developing both a new course and a certificate which will sever our students very well. There is no immediate need that can be thought of for the department at this point.