

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2015-2016

Program: Nutrition and Health

Division: BSBA

Date: October 2nd, 2015

Writer(s): Marsha Vernoga

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Marsha Vernoga

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2014-15 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2016-17.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second and third sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
 - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "No Changes Since the Program Planning Update."
 - 3) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by _____.
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data

A recent, major loss for the department was the resignation of our full time faculty member, Elizabeth Hopkins- Kurz. She routinely taught Health 1 and Health 3 for the past several years (usually five sections per semester). As in previous years, Kinesiology faculty continue to teach Health classes. Since 2011-2012, the program has a range of one to three part-time faculty teaching one or two sections each. This past year, Paul Sapsford was hired as the Women's Soccer Coach starting in Fall 2014 and has been teaching Health 1 and Kinesiology courses full time (2 Health courses and 3 Kinesiology courses per semester). The program hired a new nutrition faculty member, Marsha Vernoga, who started teaching at LPC in Fall 2014. With this hire and the number of sections for her full-time load, the number of nutrition sections taught by part-time faculty has drastically decreased.

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2014 Program Planning Update (PPU) have been achieved and how?

During Spring 2015, NUTR 3 Nutrition for Health/Wellness was updated to provide an additional Nutrition course option for students who do not have the higher-level math and science skills recommended for NUTR 1. The intent was for this to be a Wellness GE option for students in non-science or health related majors. However, after careful consideration, the update is on hold for now. After reviewing the C-ID website, and talking with several deans in various departments (Dyan Miller and Lisa Everett), the consensus is to try to increase Nutrition courses that would meet a TMC degree for nutrition in the future. There are two TMC degrees coming available that the department could possibly develop in the future. While the Office of Institutional Research does not have data on students intending to enter the field of Nutrition or Dietetics, there are several students who take NUTR 1 that ask faculty about entering this field each semester. Also students participating in the high school senior/parent community outreach event have inquired about nutrition as a major in previous years. In data from the Office of Institutional Research from Fall 2014, 22 students indicated Health Education as their intended major and 10 students indicated Behavioral Science in Public Health/Community Health Science as their intended major. Throughout the years, a few students attending the high school senior/parent community outreach event have inquired about public health as a major. The number of both UCs and CSUs adding or expanding degree options within Schools of Public Health has increased in recent years. The Nutrition 1 degree template as per the C-ID website includes a food science course with a lab. This year the department will investigate and research the possibility of implementing these kind of courses at Las Positas and continue to seek new information on the Nutrition and Health TMC degree as it becomes available and assess the feasibility of adding these degree options.

In addition, since hiring a full time faculty member to teach Nutrition 1, the number of sections have increased and there has been progress in consistently assessing SLO's for that course. The expectation is that student learning and assessment will continue to experience improvement with the hire of our full-time nutrition instructor and with collaboration from adjunct faculty to participate in the SLO process.

We also added nutrition FTEF will allow us to offer more nutrition courses in the future. In addition, more FTEF than we currently have will be necessary to add new courses to offer required courses for the Nutrition and Dietetics transfer degree without compromising access for students who are required to take NUTR 1 for major or program requirements, such as for Nursing.

C. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

The number one obstacle our program faced last academic year and presently is the loss of our full time Health instructor. Last year, the full time instructor had limited time on campus, but helped with the administrative roles as pertained to the department. At this time, the Kinesiology department has a heavy load of curriculum and other administrative tasks for few numbers of faculty. The need for a full time health instructor is dire to the program to move forward in developing new curriculum, applying for a transfer degree, and maintaining continuous quality improvement for student learning in the coming years. We continue to explore the possibility of adding TMC degrees to our department offerings. We will continue to pursue this objective if our department has the resources to offer the coursework necessary. Our prospects for the Public Health Science transfer degree are greatly increased with the hiring of a full-time health faculty. In addition, the department is in need of a full-time health faculty to revise and create curriculum, update discipline plans and SLO's specific to health science, and participate in annual program reviews and updates. Since the department lacks a full-time health faculty, the attention needed in these areas will likely be sub-optimal.

D. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

Our program plans to continue to use assessment results to improve pedagogy and assignments in our Health and Nutrition course offerings both in face to face and online courses. Currently, there is only one Student Learning Outcome written for Nutrition. The department is working closely with the adjunct Nutrition 1 instructor to increase the number of SLO's for this course to gain a more of a robust assessment pool for learning outcome results. Again, another plan includes writing curriculum to increase Nutrition courses that would possibly support a future TMC degree.

E. Do plans listed under question (D) connect to this year's planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2015-16

- ***Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards***
- ***Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance***
- ***Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes***
- ***Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.***

The above plans intertwine with creating the regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards. For example, the ACCJC Standard II requires that faculty ensures "that content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations" while improving courses, teaching and learning strategies to promote student success. We plan to use our assessment results to reflect on our class assignments and lecture formats, while promoting an environment for accepting diversity and different learning styles. Regular meetings within the discipline will help communicate these results and help us to work together to revise and assess current SLO's. We are also hoping to increase our SLO assessment participation rates with part time staff, particularly for adjuncts teaching Nutrition 1 and also for all instructors teaching Health 1.

F. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion?

For Nutrition: X yes ___no
For Health: ___yes Xno

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/y9ZBmt>)

If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

Nutrition met the program-set standard for successful course completion rates in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. Health met the program-set standard for successful completion rates in 2013-2014, however, for 2014-2015, the program set standard was not met (at 65% which is below the 69% goal). After conferring with the Office of Institutional Research regarding this issue, along with the Dean of BSBA, several conclusions surfaced to explain the possible reduction in successful course completion rates. First off, there was an administrative decision to increase distance education classes in Health 1 offerings. The full time health faculty took over all distance education classes for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. This increased the enrollment of online students from 24% to 35% of total enrollments. Distance education classes tend to have a lower success rate in comparison to face to face classes, hence the addition to more students into online classes could have possibly driven down the completion rates. As a consequence, Health 1 and Health 3 face-to-face courses

were covered by other instructors, some who were new to teaching Health 3, and also by instructors who were assigned to take over Health 1 mid-semester when this transition occurred. It is surmised that the decrease in successful course completion rates was circumstantial to the shifts happening in the department last year. The program will continue to monitor the completion rates closely for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 and make adjustments accordingly until a new full-time Health faculty is hired.

G. How have students been impacted by the work of your program since the last Program Planning Update (PPU)?

Hiring a full time nutrition faculty staff has been beneficial to the program. More nutrition classes can be offered and SLO's for Nutrition 1 can be consistently assessed. In addition, updates to nutrition curriculum and the goal to add more nutrition classes will impact the students positively by having more classes, and a wider variety as well, offered in this discipline to meet other program specific requirements (nursing) and also improve the likelihood of offering a Nutrition TMC degree in the future.

Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review

Review your program's SLO assessment results for AY 2014-2015 and respond to the following questions.

- A. Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning (OR) discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in service to students.**

In Health 1, SLO assessment continues to demonstrate student success. While percentages of success vary per semester, the majority of students assessed in Health 1 achieved proficiency at demonstrating a positive increase in attitude towards personal health self-responsibility:

Term	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Spring 2015	77%
Fall 2014	80%

- B. Discuss assessment results that indicate a need for improvement.**

In Nutrition 1, SLO assessments and rubrics are being revised and finalized for the course. There was a decrease in student proficiency between Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 in students analyzing assigned nutrient intake compared to standard recommendations and make suggestions for improvement/maintenance of intake:

Term	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Spring 2015	48%
Fall 2014	70%

- C. Instructional Programs: For the course(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program, or someone in your program, made changes or plans to make changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.**

Non-Instructional Programs: For the areas(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program made changes or plans to make changes as a result of SAO assessment results.

During Fall 2014, the semester long project associated with this particular SLO was revised to be more objective, concise and succinct then implemented in Spring 2015. With that, the instructions changed as well. During the course of spring semester, the instructions were updated when students had clarifying questions. Due to the amount of students that did not meet the objective, it is a possibility that the instructions were not clear enough, or perhaps not read thoroughly by the students. Next semester, a practice activity will be included with more time allotted for face to face

instructions to increase student learning and understanding of how to successfully analyze nutrient intakes based on recommendations and guidelines.

D. Instructional Programs Only: Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.

N/A

E. Instructional Programs: Discuss how distance education course assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.)

Non-Instructional Programs: Discuss how SAO assessment results for online services compare to face-to-face services, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program provides services online.)

The following data is from face-to-face and distance education Health 1 sections taught by one faculty member. Only one of the SLO's was assessed both in DE and Face to Face classes for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015.

For the SLO assessing students' increase in attitude towards personal health self-responsibility, the table below compares the percentage of students scoring proficient or higher for face to face and distance education sections:

Term	Face to Face	Distance Ed
Spring 2015	58%	89%
Fall 2014	71%	97%

The general trend usually seen is that students in face-to-face sections have higher percentages of SLO proficiency than students in distance education sections. However, last year, we see that the distance education classes were more proficient in meeting the SLO which assessed personal health self-responsibility. The Health full-time faculty taught an increased load of distance education classes last year.

- ✓ **Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 15-16 or 2016-17) based on the assessment results?** YES NO

If yes, please explain.



Part Three: SLO/SAO Continuous Improvement Process

A. SLO Planning through AY 2016-17

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how the program's SLO process will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO/SAO assessments: How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning or services? (*NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester. Programs with SAOs should assess at least 50% of their SAOs every year.*)

Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):

- changing number of units/lab hours
- changing pedagogy/curriculum
- changing assessments
- changing service hours
- changing modes of service delivery

--

2. Have your assessment results shown a need for new/revised SLO/SAOs? YES NO

If yes, complete the table below:

Estimated number of courses for which SLOs will be written or revised:	
Estimated number of SAOs that will be written or revised:	

- a. What courses or SAOs will your program assess during this academic year (2015-16)?

--

- b. Instructional programs only: In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Number of Part-Time faculty who will participate in the SLO process (creating, assessing or discussing SLOs)

Fall 2015	
Spring 2016	