Course Assessment– Part B: Your Results & Analysis #156

Your Email *

Please select your course and name from the list. If your course or name are incorrect or missing, please contact Instructional Services.

FN 225 – Nutrition – Jack Brook – Fall – 2016

Part B: Your Results
Directions
1. Report the outcome achievement data gathered via the assignments, tests, etc. you identified for each outcome (question 3) of your Part A. *

Outcome 1: Exam: On Exam 1, 10 out of 14 students earned 8 out of 10 points in calculating Energy Density given Nutrition Facts panel from two separate food labels in order to discuss which food product would be the best choice for a Nutrient Dense Diet. However, only 5 out of 12 were successful on the Final Exam

Outcome 2: Assignment: 12 out of 12 students earned 16 out of 20 points in using their 3–Day food intake data to determine Protein intake related to Animal vs Plant foods to determine if their goal ratio of 60% plant to 40% animal was met.

Outcome 3: Exam: 7 out of 12 students earned 9 out of 12 points in listing three antipromoter and three promoter nutrients or non–nutrients then explain why they are listed in that category in relationship to Cancer.

Outcome #1 *	Analyze the "Nutrition Facts" panel of a food label and calculate Energy Density: Exam: 10 out of 14 earned 8 out of 10 points or higher in calculating Energy Density from the Nutrition Facts panel or two different food labels on Exam 1, however, only 5 out of 12 were successful on the Final Exam.
% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) *	71% for Exam 1. 42% for Final Exam.
Outcome #2 *	Analyze and critique a personal 3–Day diet survey and determine nutrient content: Assignment: 12 out of 12 earned 16 out of 20 points or higher in determining animal vs. plant protein intake.
% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) *	100%
Outcome #3 *	Describe the nutritient and non–nutrient recommendations for reducing the risk of major diseases where diet is a significant risk factor: Exam: 7 out of 12 earned 9 out of 12 points or higher when listing three antipromoters and promoters for determining risk of cancer. Osteoporosis.
% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) *	58%

ANALYSIS

3. What contributed to student success and/or lack of success? *

Outcome 1: 71% of the students achieved 100% the points for the exam question on Exam 1. 50% of the other students who did not get the question correct interpreted Energy Density as Total Calories not Total Calories per weight of product. Unfortunately, only 42% of students were able to calculate Energy Density on the Final Exam. This shows that retention of the material over an 8 week period was low. Based on student evaluations, understanding of the food label improved from a weighted average of 1.6 to 3.50.

Outcome 2: Student outcomes were 100% which indicates that students did understand how to calculate animal vs. plant protein levels in their diet. Based on student evaluations, understanding of the ability to analyze and critique a personal 3-Day diet survey and modify food intake to meet recommended guidelines improved from 1.5 to 3.83.

Outcome 3: Only 58% of students were able to list and explain 3 nutritional antipromoters or promoters for determining nutritional risk of cancer. 83% were able to list 3 antipromoters or promoters, but were not able to explain why. Two other students listed smoking or exercise as either an antipromoter or a promoter. These recommendations, although good, are not based on nutrition so could not be counted as being correct. Overall, students ability to understand the improved from 1.83-3.83.
recommendations for reducing risk of nutrition related diseases improved based on student evaluations which showed improved understanding from 2.33 to 3.80.

---

4. Helping students to realistically self-assess and reflect on their understanding and progress encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning. Consider comparing your students' perception of their end-of-term understanding/mastery of the three outcomes (found in student evaluations) to your assessment (above) of student achievement of the three outcomes. *

Outcome 1: As per a previous evaluation done in the Fall of 2015, there does not seem to be an issue with understanding what Nutrient Density is, but with some of the basic formula set up. Plus retention of the information was less than 50% over an 8 week period. So even though initially the % success improved from 61% for Fall, 2015 to 71%, students did not learn, but more than likely memorized. Emphasis should be continued to help students retain information by having additional homework problems dealing with food label calculations.

Outcome 2: There does not seem to be an issue with understanding how to determine animal vs plant % in foods even though surprisingly more than one student could not determine if eggs would be considered animal or plant. So the use of PowerPoints and example analysis seems to be working. No additional input is needed.

Outcome 3: Making sure that the term Nutritional is understood still seems to be an issue with risk factor questions as it was with the assessment from Fall, 2015. New audios that were implemented did emphasize not using alcohol, smoking and exercise as nutritional recommendations. I plan to add that emphasis to the study guide this next Spring. Students were able to list three recommendations that would antipromote (cancer reducing) or promote (cancer enhancing) cancer risk, but the three non-nutritional recommendations are very common connections to cancer so may be the first ones that come to students minds. Possibly students are not reading the question carefully and focus on cancer reduction or enhancement, but miss the nutritional component. Clarifying the term "Nutritional" by rewording the question would help students to answer correctly.

---

5. Did student achievement of outcomes meet your expectations for successfully teaching to each outcome (question 4 from Part A) *

Outcome 1: No - Only 71% of an expectation of 80% successfully achieved the outcome.

---

6. Based on your analysis in the questions above, what course adjustments are warranted (curricular, pedagogical, student instruction, etc.)? *

Outcome 1: There does not seem to be an issue with understanding what Nutrient Density is as 12 out of 14 students were able to define Nutrient Density , but with some of the basic formula set-up. However, retention of that information was not retained as only 42% successfully calculated Energy Density on the Final. Food label review seems necessary since retention was not retained after 8 weeks.

Outcome 2: There does not seem to be an issue with understanding how to determine animal vs. plant protein in foods

or determining. No changes are needed for this outcome.

Outcome 3: Making sure that the term Nutritional is understood still seems to be an issue with risk factor questions as it was with the assessment from Fall, 2015. Most students understood that antipromoters decrease cancer risk and promoters increase cancer risk, but 3 out of 5 were either not able to explain why or listed smoking or exercise as nutritional. I truly believe that the students could list three nutritional recommendations, but the three non-nutritional recommendations are very common connections to disease so may be the first ones that come to students minds. I will somehow try to reword the question to emphasize "Nutritional"

7. What resources would be required to implement your recommended course adjustments (materials, training, equipment, etc.)? What Budget implications result? *	No additional resources would be required make the improvements. Just adding emphasis and clarity should suffice.
8. Were your assessment methods accurate indicators of student learning? Why or why not? Any additional comments? *	Yes. 1) As a consumer, reading food labels and interpreting them for health reasons is important. Overall students improved from Fall,2015 and evaluations showed a better understanding. 2) Students were able to analyze their food intake and assess their food intake levels and see what changes could be made to improve nutrient intakes. 3) I don't think this assessment showed what students really knew. Emphasizing "Nutritional" would have shown a different outcome.
(OPTIONAL) Reflect on any adjustments you made from the last assessment of this course and their effectiveness in student achievement of outcomes?	Even though emphasis was made on determining Energy Density, it was not successful in meeting the outcome goals. Reading food labels has improved since last Fall which is an indication that the more emphasis on calculations has improved outcomes. Wording and math issues still seem to be areas where emphasis needs to be improved.

Created
21 Dec 2016
9:23:34 AM
PUBLIC

Course Assessment– Part B: Your Results & Analysis　　　#247

Your Email *

Please select your course and name from the drop-down menu. If your course or name are incorrect or missing, please contact Instructional Services.

FN 225 – Nutrition – 1091694 – Jack Brook – Fall 2017

Part B: Your Results
Directions
1. Report the outcome achievement data gathered via the assignments, tests, etc. you identified for each outcome (question 3) of your Part A. *

Outcome 1: Exam: On Exam 1, 21 out of 24 students earned 3 out of 4 points in calculating the % DV of Cholesterol of the Nutrition Facts panel from two separate food labels in order to discuss which food product would be the best choice for a low cholesterol diet based on the quick guidelines goal of 5%.

Outcome 2: Assignment: 20 out of 24 students earned 16 out of 20 points in using their 3-Day food intake data to determine Refined Sugar vs Complex Carbohydrates/Natural Sugarintake related to the standard goals of 10% RS and 48% CC/NS.
met.

Outcome 3: Exam: 17 out of 24 students earned 5 out of 6 points in listing three antipromoter
nutrients or non-nutrients then explain why they are listed in that category in relationship to Cancer.

Outcome #1 *	Analyze the "Nutrition Facts" panel of a food label and calculate % DV of Cholesterol Exam: On the final exam 21 out of 24 earned 3 out of 4 points or higher in calculating the %DV from the Nutrition Facts panel of two different food labels. For Exam 1, 18 out of 27 earned 3 out of 4 points.
% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) *	Final Exam: 87.5% Exam 1: 66.6%
Outcome #2 *	Analyze and critique a personal 3-Day diet survey and determine nutrient content: Assignment: 2 out of 24 students earned 16 out of 20 points in using their 3-Day food intake data to determine Refined Sugar vs Complex Carbohydrates/Natural Sugar intake related to the standard goals of 10% RS and 48% CC/NS.
% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) *	83.3%
Outcome #3 *	Describe the nutrient and non-nutrient recommendations for reducing the risk of major diseases where diet is a significant risk factor: Exam: 17 out of 24 students earned 5 out of 6 points in listing three antipromoter nutrients or non-nutrients then explain why they are listed in that category in relationship to Cancer.
% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) *	70.8%

ANALYSIS

---

3. What contributed to student success and/or lack of success? *

Outcome 1: 87.5% of the students achieved 100% the points for the exam question on the Final which was an improvement over the first exam at 66.6%. However, 3 students who missed the question on the first exam dropped the class so the improvement is a little skewed. If those students were dropped, then the first exam results would be around 78%. Therefore, 3 students were able to improve their outcome from the first exam. Students were able to review the exam 1 question for preparation for the Final Exam.

Outcome 2: Student outcomes were 83.3% which indicates that students did understand how to calculate Refined Sugars vs. Complex Carbohydrates/Natural Sugar levels in their diet. The ones who did not earn full points for the exam had problems mainly with the calculations or did not complete the calculations. I do not believe it was a matter of understanding what was expected.
5

Outcome 3: Only 70.8% of students were able to list and explain 3 nutritional antipromoters for determining nutritional risk of cancer. 91.6% were able to list 3 antipromoters, but 29% were not able to explain why they were listed as such. More emphasis needs to be placed on making sure students understand why and will be expected to remember that information.

4. Helping students to realistically self-assess and reflect on their understanding and progress encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning. Consider comparing your students' perception of their end-of-term understanding/mastery of the three outcomes (found in student evaluations) to your assessment (above) of student achievement of the three outcomes. *

Outcome 1: There does not seem to be an issue with understanding how to calculate %DV for Cholesterol as the improvement of presenting the material has been updated due to past assessment outcomes for other food label calculations. Retention of the information was
maintained from the first exam to the final exam with some improvement from those who were not successful. Emphasis will continue to help students retain information.

Outcome 2: There does not seem to be an issue with understanding how to determine Refined Sugars vs. Complex Carbohydrates/Natural Sugars although there were several questions about what was meant by Refined Sugars. So the use of PowerPoints and example analysis seems to be working, but additional information about what is considered Refined for this assignment may be warranted.

Outcome 3: Making sure that the term Nutritional is understood still seems to be an issue with risk factor questions as it was with the assessment from Fall, 2016. New audios that were implemented did emphasize not utsing alcohol, smoking and exercise as nutritional recommendations. Students were able to list three recommendations that would antipromote (cancer reducing) risk, but had difficulty giving a reason why. Emphasis on the "why" part of the question needs to be addressed.

5. Did student achievement of outcomes meet your expectations for successfully teaching to each outcome (question 4 from Part A) *	Outcome 3: No as the outcome did not meet the 80% goal.

6. Based on your analysis in the questions above, what course adjustments are warranted (curricular, pedagogical, student instruction, etc.)? *

Outcome 1: There does not seem to be an issue with calculating the % DV of Cholesterol for the majority of the students. No adjustments warranted.

Outcome 2: There does not seem to be an issue with understanding how to determine Refined Sugars vs. Complex Carbohydrates/Natural Sugars in foods. No changes are needed for this outcome.

Outcome 3: Making sure that the term Nutritional is understood still seems to be an issue with risk factor questions as it was with the assessment from Fall, 2016. Most students understood that antipromoters decrease cancer risk, but 29%

were either not able to explain why or listed smoking or exercise as nutritional. I will somehow try to improve the emphasis on why.

7. What resources would be required to implement your recommended course adjustments (materials, training, equipment, etc.)? What Budget implications result?	No additional resources would be required make the improvements. Just adding emphasis and clarity should suffice.
8. Reflect on any adjustments you made from the last assessment of this course (if applicable) and their effectiveness in student achievement of outcomes. *	Yes. 1) As a consumer, reading food labels and interpreting them for health reasons is important. Overall students improved from Fall,2016 and evaluations showed a better understanding. 2) Students were able to analyze their food intake and assess their food intake levels and see what changes could be made to improve nutrient intakes. 3) I think this assessment showed that I did not emphasize the "why" enough for students or the understanding of "Nutritional" .
9. Describe how you have shared information about course outcomes with your students.	Outcome 1:After Exam 1, I did send a message about questions missed and did emphasize the need to understand the Food Label calculations for the final. Outcome 2: As part of the grading criteria, I gave a detailed explanation of how the question was assessed. Since the question about Antipromoters was on the final exam, I did not share this information with students.
10. Please describe any changes/additions to instruction, curriculum or assessment that you made to support students in better achieving the CGCC Core Learning Outcomes: **CLO #1: Communication. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Source and Evidence" and "Organization and Presentation"** **and** **CLO #2: Critical Thinking/Problem Solving. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Student's Position" (Critical Thinking) and "Evaluate Potential Solutions" (Problem Solving).**	I made no changes to instruction to meet these outcomes this term.

Created **17 Dec 2017** 3:55:52 PM	
PUBLIC	