

Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2012-13

	<p>Subject Area Committee Name: Foods and Nutrition Contact person: Tess Weir For LDC/DE: Core outcome(s) assessed: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving and Self Reflection *please attach a table showing the alignment of the degree or certificate outcomes with the College Core Outcomes</p>

Course Number	Course Title	CO 3	CO 6
FN 225	Intro to Nutrition	3	2

1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from recent outcome assessments. These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc. Please be sure to **describe the connection** between the assessment results and the changes made.

Results of Assessment

In Fall 2011, faculty utilized two questions to assess critical thinking and problem-solving and found that the level of critical thinking and problem solving was below an optimal level. However, the assessment as a whole was very informative.

Assessment Driven Changes

Due to the results of the assessment of the critical thinking and problems solving college core outcome, most instructors made specific changes to the question component of the Diet Analysis. For example, instead of asking, "How did your eating behavior change during the study?", the question was changed to: "How did your eating habits change from your normal intake during the three days that you recorded your food intake? For example, people tend to eat healthier as a result of recording their intake. Please be specific; do not just say "I ate healthier these three days."

Regarding the second question "Do you feel that the three days are typical of how you tend to eat most of the time? If not, why? (were you sick, stressed, short on time, etc.?) Explain how your situation affected your food choices.", instructors added more open ended components as well

as directing statements that can lead to critical thinking such as: “Do you feel that the three days are typical of how you tend to eat most of the time? If not, why (were you sick, stressed, short on time, etc.)? Either way, explain how your culture, living situation, habits, etc. affected the way you ate during those three days.”

Other questions were also reworded and improved by adding comments such as “For example..”, “please give details..”, and “compare and discuss..”. Most instructors also request a “summary” for the final question on the assignment. Some instructors worded the question open-endedly: “What do you think you will do with the information from this assignment? And “What did you learn?” Other instructors asked for more in-depth and detailed answers with such questions as, “Will you start working towards making these changes now? If yes, what is your plan? If no, what barriers do you have in achieving this positive dietary or behavior change?” It is important to note that per the assessment peer review report, all faculty must adopt the same changes and use the same questions for more accurate assessment results and outcomes.

For each outcome assessed this year:

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used. Include relevant information about:

The design tool was a direct assessment in question format. However, the delivery method was different for all three instructors whose classes were assessed. Instructor 1 provided the rubric and questions as part of an assignment; Instructor 2 did not use a rubric and the questions were not part of a graded assignment; and Instructor 2 Combined the two questions as one section of a graded assignment.

FN 225 Nutrition was used to assess both outcomes using online and face-to-face modalities. The course was chosen because it is one of two FN courses and has the larger enrollment size. Responses to the two questions were collected from Winter term 2013. Total number gathered equals 127. A total of 79 (62%) were used for assessment. Unfortunately, how the 79 were selected was not completely random. Since Instructor 3 combined the two questions it was difficult to assess the core outcomes when they are put together. Therefore, the SAC decided to throw out those responses and randomly choose from the remainder (87). The data analyzed was 90% of the responses from 3 of 5 FN sections.

Assessment was done using a rubric (Appendix 1). The results were analyzed by dividing out responses between 4 instructors. In an attempt to norm, the assessors scored 5 responses as a group. This was a lengthy process that brought up many concerns, ideas and thoughts that will be mentioned in section 5 of this report.

3. Provide information about the results_(i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?

The results were divided into two groups for each outcome assessed: rubric and non rubric.

	Critical Thinking			Self Reflection		
	Rubric	No Rubric	Total (%)	Rubric	No Rubric	Total (%)
Level 1	4	5	9 (11)	8	4	12 (15)
Level 2	18	6	24 (30)	11	11	22 (27)
Level 3	7	7	14 (17)	11	1	12 (15)
Level 4	25	7	32 (40)	27	6	33 (42)

According to the mapping matrix for core outcome 3.)Critical thinking and Problem Solving and the above data only 46% of the students are meeting level 3 or above. For core outcome 6.) Self-Reflection 67% of the students are meeting at level 2 or above.

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes. (These may include, but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc).

At this time there have been no defined decisions about what should change other than it should change. Each FN 225 instructor does the diet analysis assignment and as the norming process went on we shared many of the same issues. That is, how do we better guide students to give clear and concise answers. We began to feel the rubric was inappropriate and also that many times the students answered the questions in a manner that showed that combining the question allows to students to expand. As it appeared when given separately many responses would begin to answer the other question in such a way that the two questions relate too closely.

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future? If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

The SAC is in agreement that future rubrics or tools of assessment should be explored. The actual process was useful for instructors and brought up observations such as the amount of space that is provided for a response can affect the responses. It seems that the D2L unlimited writing (with rubric) produced answers that might have been lengthy but not

necessarily good quality. Likely this is not an issue that is unique to the FN SAC - clear and concise writing without useless detail can be rare. This then led to the discussion that a fill in the blank type of response might help students focus their thoughts and prioritize what needs to be discussed. This summer a semester long diet analysis will be piloted. Students at the beginning of the term will do the computer analysis but the data will be analyzed during more specific lecture topics. For instance, dietary carbohydrate intake analysis will be done during concurrent lecture.

In closing, what the SAC gained from the process is how to better assess and what we need to do to change our assessment tool and implementation of the tool in order that it is carried out in a manner that provides more useful data. We have not considered this year's assessment of core outcomes as a failure.

Appendix A

Questions to include in all FN 225 Diet Analysis:

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Rubric

Question #1

Discuss areas of diet related health concerns (if any) and food groups you can incorporate or eat less frequently to address these concerns.

<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Identifies at least one food group of concern but no rationale</u>
<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Identifies a couple food groups of concern and relates to a preference or dislike</u>
<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Thoroughly identifies all food groups of concern and makes a connection between those foods and nutrients lacking in the analysis</u>
<u>Level 4</u>	<u>All areas identified in level 3 and also discussed alternative food sources to increase nutrient intake</u>

Self-Reflection Rubric

Question #2

If your diet were to remain the same what might be current and future health concerns?

<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Lists just a current or future health concern without rationale</u>
<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Lists just current or future with rationale or Both future and current without rationale</u>
<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Lists both with rationale</u>
<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Both with rationale and adds a connection between current and future health concerns</u>