Subject Area Committee Name: Foods & Nutrition

Outcome Being Assessed: Cultural Awareness (NOTE- this is a change from Fall 2016 submission)

Contact Person

Name	e-mail
Debra Lippoldt	debra.lippoldt@pcc.edu

This form is for the initial assessment of a core outcome.

- Refer to the help document for guidance in filling-out this report. If this document does not address your question/concern, contact Wayne Hooke to arrange for coaching assistance.
- Please attach all rubrics/assignments/etc. to your report submissions.
- **Subject Line of Email:** Assessment Report Form (or ARF) for <your SAC name> (Example: ARF for MTH)
- **File name:** SACInitials_ARF_2016 (Example: MTH_ARF_2016)
- SACs are encouraged to share this report with their LAC coach for feedback before submitting.
- Make all submissions to **learningassessment@pcc.edu.**

Due Dates:
- **Planning Sections of LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: November 28th, 2016**
- **Completed LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: June 16th, 2017**

Please Verify This Before Beginning this Report:

☐   *This project is not the second stage of the assess/reassess process (if this is a follow-up, re-assessment project, use the LAC Re-assessment Report Form LDC. Available here.)*

1. Outcome

1A. PCC Core Outcome: Cultural Awareness   *Basic application of knowledge and*   *skills*
1B. How does your discipline interpret the outcome you are assessing?   Students apply knowledge of cultural diversity to create appropriate assessments and responses to individual practices/behaviors.
1C. Briefly describe how this outcome is/might be important/useful to your students.   Students completing FN 225 generally head into health-related professions, especiallly nursing, dental hygiene or medical imaging. Cultural awareness is essential to effective health care practice at all levels of professional training in order to create and communicate appropriate, realistic care plans and support clients in making successful change.

2. Project Description

2A. Assessment Context

Check and complete all the applicable items:

☒ **Course-based assessment.**
　　Course names and number(s): FN 225 Nutrition CRNS: (deleted) Type of assessment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): exam questions

　　Are there course outcomes that align with this aspect of the core outcome being investigated? ☒ Yes ☐ No
　　　　If yes, include the course outcome(s) from the relevant CCOG(s): connect pertinent factors between an individual▼←s lifestyle and diet in order to choose foods that will provide a varied, adequate diet.

☒ **Common/embedded assignment in all relevant course sections.** An embedded assignment is one that is already included as an element in the course as usually taught. Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): **exam questions.**

☐ **Common – but not embedded - assignment used in all relevant course sections.** Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

☐ **Practicum/Clinical work.** Please attach the activity/checklist/etc. in an appendix. If this cannot be shared, indicate the type of assessment (e.g., supervisor checklist, interview, essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

☐ **External certification exam.** Please attach sample questions for the relevant portions of the exam in an appendix (provided that publically revealing this information will not compromise test security). Also, briefly describe how the results of this exam are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated.

☐ **SAC-created, non-course assessment.** Please attach the assessment in an appendix. If the assessment cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

☐ **Portfolio.** Please attach sample instructions/activities/etc. for the relevant portions of the portfolio submission in an appendix. Briefly describe how the results of this assessment are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated:

☐ **Survey**

☐ **Interview**

☐ **Other.** Please attach the activity/assessment in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, please briefly describe:

In the event publicly sharing your assessment documents will compromise future assessments or uses of the assignment, do not attach the actual assignment/document. Instead, please give as much detail about the activity as possible in an appendix.

2B. How will you score/measure/quantify student performance?

☐ **Rubric** (used when student performance is on a continuum - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development, attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)

☐ **Checklist** (used when presence/absence rather than quality is being evaluated - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development, attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)

☐ **Trend Analysis** (often used to understand the ways in which students are, and are not, meeting expectations; trend analysis can complement rubrics and checklist)

☒ **Objective Scoring** (e.g., Scantron-scored examinations)

☐ **Other** – briefly describe:

2C. Type of assessment (select one per column)

☒ **Quantitative** ☐ **Direct Assessment**
☐ **Qualitative**   ☐ **Indirect Assessment**

If you selected 'Indirect Assessment', please share your rationale:

Qualitative Measures: projects that analyze in-depth, non-numerical data via observer impression rather than via quantitative analysis. Generally, qualitative measures are used in exploratory, pilot projects rather than in true assessments of student attainment. Note that the **use of a numerical rubric is considered quantitative analysis**, even if the artifacts under consideration are not based on quantitative calculations (e.g. an essay scored by a rubric counts as quantitative in the context of assessment).

Indirect assessments (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.) do not use measures of direct student work output. These types of assessments are also not able to truly document student attainment.

2D. Check any of the following that were used by your SAC to create or select the assessment/scoring criteria/instruments used in this project:

☒ Committee or subcommittee of the SAC collaborated in its creation
☒ Standardized assessment
☐ Collaboration with external stakeholders (e.g., advisory board, transfer institution/program)
☐ Theoretical model (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy)
☐ Aligned the assessment with standards from a professional body (for example, The American Psychological Association Undergraduate Guidelines, etc.)
☐ Aligned the benchmark with the Associate's Degree-level expectations of the Degree Qualifications Profile
☐ Aligned the benchmark to within-discipline post-requisite course(s)
☐ Aligned the benchmark to out-of-discipline post-requisite course(s)
☐ Other (briefly explain:)

2E. In which quarter will student artifacts (samples of student work) be collected? If student artifacts will be collected in more than one term, check all that apply.

| ☐ **Fall** | ☐ **Winter** | ☒ **Spring** | ☐ **Other** (e.g., if work is collected between terms) |

2F. What student group do you want to generalize the results of your assessment to? For example, if you are assessing performance in a course, the student group you want to generalize to is 'all students taking this course.'

all students taking FN 225

2G. There is no single, recommended assessment strategy. Each SAC is tasked with choosing appropriate methods for their purposes. Which best describes the purpose of this project?

☒ **To measure established outcomes and/or drive programmatic change**
☐ **To participate in the Multi-State Collaborative for Learning Outcomes Assessment**
☐ **Preliminary/Exploratory investigation**

If you selected 'Preliminary/Exploratory' (most often a 'pilot study'), briefly describe why you opted to do a pilot study, along with your rationale for selecting your sampling method:

2H. Which will you measure?

☒ **the population** (all relevant students – e.g., all students enrolled in all currently-offered sections of the course)
☐ **a sample** (a subset of students)

If you are using a sample, select all of the following that describe your sample/sampling strategy (refer to the Help Guide for assistance):

☐ **Random Sample** (student work selected completely randomly from all relevant students)
☐ **Systematic Sample** (student work selected through an arbitrary pattern, e.g., 'start at student 7 on the roster and then select every 5th student following'; repeating this in all relevant course sections)
☐ **Stratified Sample** (more complex, consult with an LAC coach if you need assistance)
☐ **Cluster Sample** (students are selected randomly from meaningful, naturally-occurring groupings (e.g., SES, placement exam scores, etc.)
☐ **Voluntary Response Sample** (students submit their work/responses through voluntary submission – e.g., via a survey)
☐ **Opportunity/Convenience Sample** (only a few instructors are participating in a project taught via multiple sections, so, only those instructors' students are included)

5

The last three options in bolded red have a high risk of introducing bias. If your SAC is using one or more of these sample/sampling strategies, please share your rationale:

*2I. Briefly describe the procedure you will use to select your sample **(including a description of the procedures used to ensure student and instructor anonymity)**.*

2J. Follow this link to determine how many artifacts (samples of student work) you should include in your assessment: http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html (see screen shot below).

Start with the number of students you estimate will be enrolled in the course(s) from which you will draw the sample – that is your "population." Enter the other numbers as indicated in the screenshot. The sample size calculator will tell you how many artifacts you need to collect. Enter that number below:

Raosoft

Sample size calculator

| What margin of error can you accept? | 10 % | The margin of error is the amount of error that you can tolerate. If 90% of respondents answer *yes*, while 10% answer *no*, you may be able to tolerate a larger amount of error than if the respondents are split 50-50 or 45-55. |
| 5% is a common choice | | Lower margin of error requires a larger sample size. |

Use 10% and 90% in these boxes.

| What confidence level do you need? | 90 % | The confidence level is the amount of uncertainty you can tolerate. Suppose that you have 20 yes-no questions in your survey. With a confidence level of 95%, you would expect that for one of the questions (1 in 20), the percentage of people who answer *yes* would be more than the margin of error away from the true answer. The true answer is the percentage you would get if you exhaustively interviewed everyone. |
| Typical choices are 90%, 95%, or 99% | | Higher confidence level requires a larger sample size. |

Enter the total number of students currently enrolled in all sections of the courses you are assessing here.

| What is the population size? | 105 | How many people are there to choose your random sample from? The sample size doesn't change much for populations larger than 20,000. |
| If you don't know, use 20000 | | |

| What is the response distribution? | 50 % | For each question, what do you expect the results will be? If the sample is skewed highly one way or the other, the population probably is, too. If you don't know, use 50%, which gives the largest sample size. See below under **More information** if this is confusing. |
| Leave this as 50% | | |

Measure this many students.

| Your recommended sample size is | 42 | This is the minimum recommended size of your survey. If you create a sample of this many people and get responses from everyone, you're more likely to get a correct answer than you would from a large sample where only a small percentage of the sample responds to your survey. |

3. Project Mechanics

3A. Does your project utilize a rubric for scoring? ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**

If 'No', proceed to section B. If 'Yes', complete the following:

Which method of ensuring consistent scoring (inter-rater reliability) will your SAC use for this project?

☐ **Agreement** – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session; ideally, that will be 75% agreement or greater.

If you are using agreement, describe your plan for plan for conducting the "norming" or "calibrating" session:

☐ **Consensus** - all raters score **all** artifacts and reach agreement on each score

☐ **Consistency** – raters' scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise

agreement. Briefly describe your plan:

Notes: the agreement method is the most frequently used for assessment, but the **calculation of inter-rater reliability is also among the more challenging issues** within assessment as a whole. If your SAC is unfamiliar with norming procedures, contact your assessment coach, or if you don't know who your coach is, contact LAC Vice Chair Chris Brooks to arrange for coaching help for your SAC's norming session.

The consistency method is not generally recommended; see the help guide for details.

3B. Have performance benchmarks been specified?

The fundamental measure in educational assessment is the number of students who complete the work at the expected/required level. We are calling this SAC-determined performance expectation the 'benchmark.'

☒ **Yes**
☐ **No**

If yes, briefly describe your performance benchmarks, being as specific as possible (if needed, attach as an appendix):

At least 80% of FN 225 students tested will correctly answer the two cultural awareness questions. See appendix for actual questions.

If no, what is the purpose of this assessment? (For example, this assessment will provide information that will lead to developing benchmarks in the future; or, this assessment will lead to areas for more detailed study; etc.)

3C. The purpose of this assessment is to have SAC-wide evaluation of student work, not to evaluate a particular instructor or student. Before evaluation, remove student-identifying information (and, when possible remove instructor-identifying information). **Please share your process for ensuring that all identifying information has been removed.**

All FN 225 instructors will include the same two indicator questions on exams during the spring term. They will send an excel file of their student responses (no student identifying factors are included) to Emilie Young, Executive Administrative Assistant, who will compile the data without identifying instructors or students into one aggregated report. SAC Chair Debra Lippoldt will complete the LAC assessment report based on these data.

3D. *Will you be coding your data/artifacts in order to compare student sub-groups?* ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**

If yes, select one of the boxes below:

☐ **student's total earned hours** ☐ **previous coursework completed** ☐ **ethnicity** ☐ **other**

Briefly describe your coding plan and rationale (and if you selected 'other', identify the sub-groups you will be coding for):

3E. *Ideally, student work is* **evaluated** *by both full-time and adjunct faculty, even if students being assessed are taught by only full-time and/or adjunct faculty. Further, more than one rater is needed to ensure inter-rater reliability. If you feel only one rater is feasible for your SAC, please consult with an LAC coach prior to submitting your plan/conducting your assessment.*

Who will be assessing student work for this project? Check all that apply.

☒ PCC Adjunct Faculty within the program/discipline
☒ PCC FT Faculty within the program/discipline
☐ PCC Faculty outside the program/discipline
☐ Program Advisory Board Members
☐ Non-PCC Faculty
☐ External Supervisors
☐ Other:

End of Planning Section – Complete the remainder of this report after your assessment project is complete.

Beginning of End-of-Year Reporting Section – complete the following sections after your assessment project is complete.

4. Changes to the Assessment Plan

Were there changes to your project since you submitted the planning section of this report? ☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If so, note the changes below:
Originally, our SAC proposed to re-assess Self-Reflection. However, due to a range of changes, including new PT staffing and upcoming Program Review, it was determined that Cultural Awareness was a priority and could be most efficiently assessed in the time available.

5. Narrative

Broadly, what did your SAC learn from the assessment of the core outcome under consideration this year?

F&N SAC is interested in several aspects of cultural awareness and equity. First, we want to ensure that our FN 225 students (for most of whom this is a required pre-requisite course for future health-related study) are able to identify, appreciate and apply basic principles of cultural awareness. We chose to assess these basic principles by administering two questions as outlined in the Appendix document. All but one section of FN 225 ended up reporting data and both indicator questions were successfully answered with benchmark of at least 80% of students correctly responding. RESULTS 96% on question one and 86% on question two. We are satisfied that our students have an appreciation for the role of cultural influences and are able to identify the best practice approach to demonstration of behavior in a case study type question.

Secondly, (not part of this assessment but FYI) our SAC is interested in exploring possible bias in course outcomes related to ethnicity of students We are assessing this as part of our Program Review. We want to look at our course grading by ethnicity for the past five years to see if there are any trends to consider.)

6. Results of the Analysis of Assessment Project Data

6A. Quantitative Summary of Sample/Population
How many students were enrolled in all sections of the course(s) you assessed this year? 209
(If you did not assess in a course, report the number of students that are in the group you intend to generalize your results to.)

How many students did you actually assess in this project? 184
Did you use a recommended sample size (see the Sample Size Calculator linked to in section 2J)? ☐ **Yes**   ☒ **No**

If you did not use a recommended sample size in your assessment, briefly explain why:

We examined all students enrolled in all sections of FN 225 Spring 2017, with the exception of one section whose instructor was unable to report data by due date for this report.

6B. Did your project utilize a rubric for scoring? ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**
If 'No', proceed to section C. If 'Yes', complete the following:

How was inter-rater reliability assured? (If help is needed calculating inter-rater reliability, please contact your SAC's LAC coach.)

☐ **Agreement** – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session
☐ **Consensus** - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score
☐ **Consistency** – raters' scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement
☐ **Inter-rater reliability was not assured.**

If you utilized agreement or consistency measures of inter-rater reliability, report the level here:

6C. Brief Summary of Benchmark Achievement (frequencies and/or averages)

1. *If you used frequencies of benchmark achievement, report those here. For example, "46 students attained or exceeded the benchmark level in written communication and 15 did not." If necessary, provide detailed results in an appendix.*

2. *If you used percentages of the total to identify the degree of benchmark attainment in this project, report those here. For example, "75% of 61 students attained or exceeded the benchmark level over-all in written communication."*

96% of 184 students attained or exceeded the benchmark that correctly identifies ethnicity as an influencer on health status of different populations in the USA. 86% of 184 students successfully attained or exceeded the benchmark that identifies practitioner demonstration of appropriate cultural awareness in a case study.

6D. If possible, attach a more detailed description or analysis of your results (e.g., rubric scores, trend analyses, etc.) as an appendix to this document. Appendix attached? ☒ *Yes* ☐ *No*

6E. Do the results of this project suggest that academic changes might be beneficial to your students (changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.)? ☐ *Yes* ☒ *No*

If you answered 'Yes,' briefly describe the changes to improve student learning below. If you answered 'No', detail why no changes are called for.

If you are planning changes, when will these changes be fully implemented?

6F. Has all identifying information been removed from your documents? (Information includes student/instructor/supervisor names/identification numbers, names of external placement sites, etc.) ☒ *Yes* ☐ *No*

7. SAC Response to the Assessment Project Results

7A. Assessment Tools & Processes: Indicate how well each of the following worked for your assessment:

Tools (rubrics, test items, questionnaires, etc.):

☒ *very well* ☐ *some small problems/limitations to fix* ☐ *notable problems/limitations to fix* ☐ *completely inadequate/failure*

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment tools that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome).

Processes (faculty involvement, sampling, norming, inter-rater reliability, etc.):

☐ *very well*   ☒ *some small problems/limitations to fix*   ☐ *notable problems/limitations to fix*   ☐ *tools completely inadequate/failure*

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment process that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome).

It is problematic to conduct assessments during spring quarter. In future, we think we will have better results and a more complete faculty disscussion of outcomes to gather data in fall or spring. In addition, it could be instructive to compare results applied to the introductory, non-science based FN 110 Personal Nutrition.

8. Follow-Up Plan

8A. How will the changes detailed in this report be shared with all FT/PT faculty in your SAC? (select all that apply)

☒ *email*   ☐ *phone call*   ☐ *workshop*
☐ *campus mail*   ☒ *face-to-face meeting*   ☒ *other*
☐ *no changes to share*

If 'other,' please describe briefly below.

F&N Spaces pages

8B. Is further collaboration/training required to properly implement the identified changes?   ☐ *Yes*   ☒ *No*

If 'Yes,' briefly detail your plan/schedule below.

8C. Re-assessment is a critical part of the overall assessment process. This is especially important if academic changes have been implemented. How will you assess the effectiveness of the changes you plan to make?

☐ *follow-up project in next year's annual report*   ☐ *on-going informal assessment*

☐ *in a future assessment project*   ☒ *other*

If 'other,' please describe briefly below.

At this time, there are no plans to re-assess. It is likely that faculty will continue to utilize similar exam questions to confirm student mastery of cultural awareness.

8D. SACs are learning how to create and manage meaningful assessments in their courses. This development may require SAC discussion to support the assessment process (e.g., awareness, buy-in, communication, etc.). Please briefly describe any successful developments within your SAC that support the quality assessment of student learning. If challenges remain, these can also be shared.

Since our assessment was completed at the end of Spring term, 2017, we have not had an opportunity to fully examine results . Based on our discussion of the project at the Spring SAC meeting, we do not anticipate major changes at this time. As mentioned earlier, we plan to assess, as part of Program Review, grade distribution patterns across demographics as available, including age, ethnicity and gender to determine if there are areas that warrant deeper inspection.