

Name of Program	Division	Author(s)
Health and Nutrition	BSBA	Elizabeth Hopkins-Kurz & Marsha Vernoga

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. This Program Planning Update covers the academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.
2. The planning should be for the academic year 2015-2016.
3. Use the Save As feature in Word to save this template with your program name, so that you do not overwrite the original template. Please use your program’s catalog rubric and this format when naming your document:

Rubric INS PPU 15_16
 e.g., ESL INS PPU 15_16
4. If the document displays in large type with only File, Tools, and View tabs at the top of the page, select **View, Edit Document**. You will then be able to type where it says “Click here to enter text” and you will be able to click on the check boxes to select them.
5. In each section, click in the box under the instructions and fill in your information. The box will expand as you type. If a section is not pertinent to your program enter N/A in the box; do not leave it blank.
6. When you have completed the form, run the spell-checker (**click inside the text in the first box**, then click on the Review tab and find Spell-Check in the far left corner of the ribbon).
7. Please address your questions to your Program Review Committee representatives or the PR Chair Karin Spirn. Concerns, feedback and suggestions are welcome at any time to PRC representatives or co-chairs.
8. Instructions for submitting your Program Planning Update will be available at the start of the fall semester.

I. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Review of academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14

A. SLO Assessment Review

Review your program’s SLO assessment results through spring 2014 and respond to the following questions.

1. Discuss how assessment results indicate success in student learning. Identify results that indicate a need for improvement.

In Health 1, SLO assessment continues to demonstrate student success. For the SLO assessing students’ increase in attitude towards personal health self-responsibility, below are recent outcomes:

	Percentage of students proficient or
--	--------------------------------------

	higher
Spring 2014	82%
Fall 2013	84%
Spring 2013	60%
Fall 2012	90%

While percentages of proficiency are lower for the SLO generating APA references, a majority of students assessed are successful with this skill:

	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Spring 2014	55%
Fall 2013	61%
Spring 2013	58%

While percentages of success vary per semester, the majority of students assessed in Health 1 achieved proficiency at evaluating the credibility of health information:

	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Spring 2014	81%
Fall 2013	61%
Spring 2013	58%
Fall 2012	90%

The majority of students assessed in Health 1 also demonstrate proficiency in locating and evaluating sources from the appropriate periodical database for their behavior change project:

	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Spring 2014	72%

Fall 2013	68%
Spring 2013	68%

For the SLO integrating scientific research into an individualized behavior change process, results are inconsistent for the two semesters this SLO has been assessed in recent years:

	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Fall 2013	89%
Spring 2013	44%

This is an SLO to assess again in the future to evaluate if results remain at or near the Fall 2013 percentage.

In Health 3, the instructor has continued to focus on students' skills of evaluating health information in popular media sources. Below are the recent outcomes:

	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Spring 2014	62%
Fall 2013	86%
Spring 2013	60%

While the majority of students assessed have been proficient, the percentages range widely in recent semesters.

Another SLO for this course relates to credibility of sources. This SLO needs to be revised to better represent skills the instructor wants to evaluate. Below is recent data:

	Percentage of students proficient or higher
Fall 2013	68%
Spring 2013	45%

After revision to the SLO and rubric, future assessment needs to be completed.

*Note: these percentages are different than percentages generated in eLumen’s percentage report. The software does not include “Not Scored” (NS) students in the denominator when calculating the percentages. The tables above include the NS data in calculations of the percentages. While this lowers success percentages, our program thinks this is a more accurate and useful presentation of the data. We also combined data from two SLOs in eLumen for two of the tables. Data was inadvertently entered under older versions of the SLOs that were revised in 2011.

2. Discuss how distance education courses assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable? (*Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.*)

The following data is from face-to-face and distance education Health 1 sections taught by one faculty member.

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:

	Face-to-Face	Distance Ed
Spring 2014	85%	77%
Fall 2013	95%	75%
Spring 2013	78%	N/A
Fall 2012	80%	N/A

The table below compares proficiency or higher results for students’ success in evaluating credibility of health information:

	Face-to-Face	Distance Ed
Spring 2014	83%	67%
Fall 2013	84%	52%
Spring 2013	88%	N/A
Fall 2012	66%	N/A

The table below compares proficiency results (Proficient/score of 2 is the highest score on this rubric) for the SLO locating and evaluating sources from the appropriate periodical database for students' behavior change project:

	Face-to-Face	Distance Ed
Spring 2014	71%	N/A
Fall 2013	64%	N/A
Spring 2013	55%	74%
Fall 2012	N/A	N/A

The table below compares proficiency or higher results for the SLO on generating accurate APA references:

	Face-to-Face	Distance Ed
Spring 2014	55%	N/A
Fall 2013	61%	N/A
Spring 2013	55%	60%
Fall 2012	N/A	N/A

The general trend is students in face-to-face sections have higher percentages of SLO proficiency than students in distance education sections. However in Spring 2013, there were exceptions for the SLOs locating and evaluating sources from appropriate databases and generating APA references.

3. Discuss how your discipline, or someone in your discipline, made changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.

Health 1

One of our DE instructors made changes in the timing of assignments in an effort to improve distance education students' proficiency rates in evaluating the credibility of health information. She moved the assignment used to assess this SLO from the third module to the introductory module of the course. She also separated the research summaries assignment into the third module by changing its due date to be with the rest of the assignments in this module. In the past, this assignment was introduced in the third module and students were instructed to begin working on it, but it was due with the fourth module. By changing this due date, students now work on their research summaries and behavior change plan in two different modules. Also they are completing the introductory evaluating credibility assignment during the first week of the semester when student participation rates for a relatively low point value assignment seems to be the highest. While this assignment is low in points due to its simplicity and length, it is developing necessary skills for students to complete the later research summaries assignment.

Another change this faculty member has made to her distance education sections is adding an introductory power point presentation with recorded audio on basics of behavior change. She uses a similar power point and brainstorming strategy in the face-to-face sections. In the past, she has in a written format asked distance education students to complete the same exercise, but thought the power point could encourage students to spend more time and effort thinking about this material. This power point presentation is being used for the first time in Fall 2014.

Health 3

In Spring of 2013, the instructor made a major change to assignments in this course. By eliminating a series of journal assignments, the instructor placed more emphasis on the homework assignments, including the assignment used to assess both SLOs for this course. This allowed more time in class to go over the directions in detail and discuss more examples relating previous class discussion to the assignment questions.

4. Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.

N/A

5. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 2015-16) based on the assessment results? YES NO

If yes, please explain.

Our program does not anticipate the need for additional resources based on the assessment results.

B. SLO Process

1. Describe how your program reaches consensus when writing student learning outcomes that are used in multiple sections.

My program offers only one section of each course.

We continue to utilize department meetings to make decisions about student learning outcomes for Health 1. Through discussion, our program has been successful at reaching consensus for consistent components of the behavior change project and corresponding SLOs we have focused on assessing as a department. However, not all faculty have attended these meetings and, therefore, some faculty have not participated in this process.

Our new nutrition faculty will revise the rubric for the Nutrition 1 SLO to better match her Dietary Analysis Project during Fall 2014. She plans to confer with colleagues such as the Health full-time faculty, the chair of the SLO committee, and staff in the Teaching and Learning Center to successfully complete this revision process and data entry into eLumen.

2. Describe how your program reaches consensus when developing and evaluating assessment results for student learning outcomes that are used in multiple sections.

My program offers only one section of each course.

Response is same for the previous question section B question 1 on the development of SLOs for Health 1. Current practice for our department is for faculty to assess outcomes and enter data into eLumen individually.

3. What methods does your program use for documenting SLO related discussions? Check all that apply.

Program emails

Program meeting minutes/agendas

Blackboard/other website

Other (please describe):

For Health 1 meetings in past years, the full-time faculty member has documented meeting minutes and sent these to department faculty by email. However, formal minutes have not been recorded when meetings turned into informal discussion between two faculty members due to lack of attendance.

II. PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Review of academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14

Review the student data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and any additional data your program has collected. Then respond to the sections below.

A. Data Review

If applicable, summarize any **changes** in your program’s data since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12 or observed significant trends that will affect program planning or resource requests.

NOTE: Only include changes that affect student learning, program planning or resource requests.

There are no notable changes or observed significant trends in our program’s data.

B. Program-Set Standard for Successful Course Completion Rates

Your program-set standard for successful course completion rates (i.e., number of grades of ‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’, ‘CR’, and ‘P’ divided by total grades) is calculated by averaging successful course completion rates for your program over a five-year period and then multiplying that result by 95%.

In order to determine if you have achieved your program-set standard for successful course completion rates for a given year (e.g., 2012-13), you will need to assess if your program met or exceeded 95% of the previous 5-year average (i.e., 2007-08 through 2011-12) for your program; these calculations are done for you (*see links below*).

1. What was your program-set standard for successful course completion rates in 2012-13 and 2013-14?

	Program-Set Standard for successful course completion	Did you meet your program-set standard? (Yes or No)
2012-13	http://tinyurl.com/mmfwgfe	
2013-14	http://tinyurl.com/q6dah55	

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

Both Health and Nutrition met the program-set standard for successful course completion rates in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

C. Curriculum Review

1. Review your program’s current curriculum. If applicable, describe any internal or external impacts which will affect your curriculum plans for 2015-16.

During Spring 2014, we successfully updated HLTH 1 curriculum. HLTH 3 is due to be updated and our department plans to work on this during the current academic year (2014-2015). Our department also plans to update NUTR 3 Nutrition for Health/Wellness (in either Spring 2015 or during the 2015-2016 year) so we can offer this course again in the future. This will provide a nutrition course option for students who do not have the higher-level math and science skills recommended for NUTR 1. Our intent is for this to be a Wellness GE option for students in non-science or health related majors.

There are two TMC degrees coming available that our department could develop in the future. They are Nutrition and Dietetics and Public Health Science. 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.

According to the C-ID website, the template for the Nutrition and Dietetics transfer degree is expected to be available April 1, 2015. The vetting period for the Public Health Science transfer degree closed September 5, 2014. The anticipated date for this degree template to be available is not yet published on the C-ID website as of early October 2014. Our department will continue to seek new information on these degrees as it becomes available and assess the feasibility of adding these degree options.

D. Human Resources

1. Have there been changes in the number of full-time or part-time faculty associated with your program since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12? If yes, briefly describe the changes.

A major loss our department experienced was the death of Coach Tony Costello in August 2013. He routinely taught Health 1 for the past several years (usually one section per semester) and passionately shared his wisdom with students. His presence in the classroom and participation in discipline meetings is deeply missed.

As in previous years, Kinesiology faculty continue to teach Health 1. We have one full-time faculty member, Elizabeth Hopkins-Kurz, who exclusively teaches health. Since 2011-2012, we have a range of one to three part-time faculty teaching one or two sections each. With the hire of Paul Sapsford as the Women's Soccer Coach starting in Fall 2014, we expect he will continue to teach Health 1 as a full-time Kinesiology faculty instead of part-time.

Lisa Everett, who taught Nutrition, Health, and Kinesiology, moved into an interim dean position in Spring 2013. She was hired as a permanent administrator in Fall of 2013. In Fall 2013, the department requested a nutrition faculty member be hired through the faculty prioritization process and were successful in securing this hire. Our new nutrition faculty, Marsha Vernoga, 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.

2. Have there been changes in the number of full-time or part-time classified staff associated with your program since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12? If yes, briefly describe the changes.

N/A

3. If applicable, describe how the changes indicated in 1 and 2 have impacted student learning?

We expect student learning and assessment will experience improvement with the hire of our full-time nutrition instructor.

E. Other information pertinent to the program

N/A

III. PLANNING

A. Planning Update

Summarize your program's plans, initiatives, and objectives accomplished since the Annual Program Review of AY 2011-12 (include accomplishments for the academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14).

In our previous program review, we planned to propose curriculum for a new Health GE course during the 2013-2014 year. Our full-time health faculty has not had the resources to research and write new curriculum. We have put this objective on hold for the next couple of semesters.

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 Nutrition and Dietetics transfer degree are greatly increased with the hiring of a full-time nutrition faculty. Our full-time health faculty has continued to follow curriculum-related information to assist our department in this area.

Our department has not followed up on gaining access to the Health and Nutrition web pages on the college website. We are putting this objective on hold until after the college redesigns its website.

Our department's efforts to continue to standardize the Health 1 Behavior Change Project have temporarily stalled. Between lack of participation by faculty in department meetings and new part-time faculty teaching the course, there is limited information and feedback on how this project is being taught and implemented, along with the results across sections at this point in time.

B. Program Planning for AY 2015-16

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans, initiatives, and objectives for the academic year 2015-16. Focus on how planning will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO assessments. NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. As a guideline, each program should be assessing 25% of its courses every semester.
 - a. How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning? Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):
 - changing number of units/lab hours
 - changing pedagogy/curriculum
 - changing assessments

Our program plans to continue to use assessment results to improve pedagogy and assignments in our Health and Nutrition course offerings.

Some assessments need to be modified or updated. For Health 3, the SLO demonstrate ability to locate credible health information needs revision to accurately reflect the question in the assignment that is used to assess this SLO. The assessment is focused on student’s evaluation of credibility skills, not locating credible sources, although students do locate credible sources as part of the assignment. This is an example where the SLO could be improved. Another example is the Health 1 SLO Demonstrate ability of utilizing MyPyramid.gov Food Tracker database to conduct simple nutrient analysis of two-day food record. A few years ago, MyPyramid was replaced by MyPlate. If this SLO is assessed in the future, it needs to be revised to reflect the current database or revised without the specific database name.

At this time, our program does not expect to change units or other major curriculum changes based on SLO assessment results.

- b. Have your assessment results shown a need for new SLOs? YES NO
 If yes, in the table below, state the number of courses in your program and estimate the percentage of courses for which your program will write new SLOs.

Number of Courses	Estimated Percentage for which new SLOs will be written
N/A	N/A

- c. What percentage of courses will your program assess in the next academic year (2015-16)?

We plan to assess 100% of our course offerings (HLTH 1, HLTH 3, and NUTR 1) in the 2015-2016 academic year.

- d. 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 and the percentage of them who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Estimated Number of Part-time faculty	Estimated Percentage who will participate in the SLO process
3	100%

4. Curriculum

- a. Considering the criteria of relevance, appropriateness, achievement of course objectives, currency, and future needs and plans, will your program be making any changes to **existing** curriculum to address any of these criteria? If yes, please describe the changes and your program's reasons for the changes. Please provide any data which supports your program's reasons for the changes to your curriculum. Include a discussion of how the changes will improve student learning.

(This response is the same as part of the response to the previous questions about curriculum in Section II)

Our department also plans to update NUTR 3 Nutrition for Health/Wellness (in either Spring 2015 or during the 2015-2016 year) so we can offer this course again in the future. This will provide a nutrition course option for students who do have the higher-level math and science skills recommended for NUTR 1. Our intent is for this to be a Wellness GE option for students in non-science or health-related majors.

There are two TMC degrees coming available that our department could develop in the future. They are Nutrition and Dietetics and Public Health Science. 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.

According to the C-ID website, the template for the Nutrition and Dietetics transfer degree is expected to be available April 1, 2015. The vetting period for the Public Health Science transfer degree closed September 5, 2014. The anticipated date for this degree template to be available is not yet published on the C-ID website as of early October 2014. Our department will continue to seek new information on these degrees as it becomes available and assess the feasibility of adding these degree options.

- b. Will new curriculum be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for the academic year 2015-2016? If yes, please describe briefly what new curriculum is planned and the rationale for the new curriculum. Please provide any data which supports your reasons for the new curriculum. Include a discussion of how the changes will improve student learning.

There is a possibility we will propose new curriculum in the 2015-2016 academic year. New curriculum most likely would be written to offer requirements for the TMC degree in Nutrition and Dietetics. We have decided to focus on the Nutrition TMC first as it is further along in the state-level TMC process.

5. General Program Planning

Use this area to describe any program plans, initiative, or objectives your program wishes to accomplish in 2015-16 and their impact on student learning or the student experience. Focus on what the plans are and how they are to be accomplished (not resources needed).

We do not have any new plans, initiatives, or objectives that have not already been mentioned in other sections.

IV. Resource Requests for AY2015-16

Complete all areas that apply to your program's resource needs for 2015-16 (**not all areas apply to all programs**).

For each request, in the rationale section:

- Describe how meeting this request will improve student learning or the student experience.
- Provide any data or evidence which supports this request.

A. Enrollment Management

1. Request: New FTEF. Indicate amount being requested.

We request 0.6 FTEF to offer an additional section of NUTR 3 during Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters for a total of 3 additional sections per year.

2. Rationale for request(s).

Adding nutrition FTEF will allow us to offer NUTR 3 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. Human Resources

1. Request: New or replacement faculty position(s).

N/A

2. Rationale for faculty position request(s).

N/A

3. Request: Classified staff position(s) (for example, new or replacement classified staff position(s) or increasing classified hours/position level).

N/A

4. Rationale for classified staff position request(s).

N/A

D. Financial

1. Request: Maintenance of, or increase in, existing program budget (e.g., for supplies, etc.).

We currently do not have a budget. We have asked for a program budget in previous program reviews to pay for part-time participation in meetings and staff development.

2. Rationale for financial request(s).

When our part-time faculty members need to cancel appointments with clients or pay for childcare to participate in our department meetings, it would be ideal to compensate them for their expertise and time.

E. Technology (software only – discuss hardware in section E)

1. Request: Upgrade existing software or purchase new software.

Our program does not currently have any software requests.

2. Rationale for technology request(s).

N/A

F. Facilities, Equipment (include technology hardware), and Supplies

1. Request: Renovation or upgrade of existing facilities or new facilities.

We requested classrooms 209 and 212 in the Physical Education Complex be furnished with new furniture that is safer and more comfortable for students. This small projects request was ranked and our division was told Facilities Committee approved the request. We are waiting for this project to be completed. We hope it will be completed during the 2014-2015 year. We do not have any additional renovation or upgrade requests at this time.

2. Rationale for facilities request(s).

See the Small Project Proposal already submitted and approved by Facilities Committee.

3. Request: Upgrading of existing equipment or purchase of new equipment.

Our program does not currently have any equipment requests.

4. Rationale for equipment request(s).

N/A

5. Request: New supplies

Our program does not currently have any new supplies requests.

6. Rationale for supplies request(s).

N/A

--