

Doisy College of Health Sciences

2021-2022 Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): BS in Nutrition and Dietetics (BSND) and DPD
Degree or Certificate Level: Degree - UG/Certificate - DPD
Date (Month/Year): September, 2022
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2021-2022
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? Reviewed 2022/Updated 2018-2019
Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? Yes - ACEND

Note to DCHS Programs:

Please use this format to title each report file- 2021-2022, program title abbreviation, Prog-Lvl Assess AnnualRpt

[example: 2021-2022,HSCI_ProgLvlAssessAnnualRpt]

Upload completed reports to the T-drive here: [each program has a separate folder]

Allied Health | Common | 1.2-2021-2022 DCHS ProgLvAssessRpts

Thank you!

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

PLO #1: Demonstrate effective professional communication in the transmission of food and nutrition information.
PLO #2: Demonstrate the ability to develop patient-centered care plans that reflect a value for the inherent worth of others.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail and identify the course(s) in which they were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

PLO #1: DIET 2510 Principles of Food Preparation – Food/cooking technique demonstration
DIET 3600 Food Science – Food science research project.

- PLO #1 – DIET 2510 – was assessed by the food/cooking technique demonstration. Assignment and rubric are detailed in 2021-2022,ND_ArtifactDescription4PLO1_DIET2510.
- PLO #1 – DIET 3600 - was assessed by the research project assigned to the students. Students are assigned a project in which they explore a concept of food science, conduct a food-based research experiment based on this concept, evaluate participants' perceptions on the recipe development, and then report their findings to a public audience.

PLO #2: DIET 4110 Clinical Practicum Lab I. Patient care plans that address the whole person (spirit, mind, and body).

- PLO#2 was assessed using the PDCF sheets students fill out for their assigned patients. Students are assigned patients at area hospitals each week with different disease states. They then fill out the PDCF form including their ADIME notes – comprehensive Assessment, nutrition Diagnosis using clinical PES (Program, Etiology, and Signs/Symptoms) statement, create an Intervention for the patient, and develop Monitoring and Evaluation plans to determine whether the Intervention was successful. PDCF Form is attached as 2021-2022,ND_Artifact4PLO2.

No Madrid artifacts were included, no courses were offered on-line, and no courses were at other off-campus locations

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

For all PLO's for the 2021-2022 academic year, the Program Director gathered results and data for each respective artifact from the course instructor. The course instructor assessed whether the students met the outcomes rubric and relayed that information to the PD. The PD reviewed all information for each student as required by our accrediting body.

PLO #1:

- The DIET 2510 Principles in Food Preparation project was evaluated using the assessment rubric (see Assessment Rubric for the Program Evaluation Plan, PLO #1 below). The instructor provided a summary of the graded rubrics; the program director identified the number of students that achieved a ranking of “reinforce” or higher and recorded the data in the 2021-2022 annual assessment report. All student projects were evaluated, which is consistent with the accreditation guidelines for the DPD Program.
- The DIET 3600 Food Science research project was evaluated using the assessment rubric (see Assessment Rubric for the Program Evaluation Plan, PLO #1 below). The instructor provided a summary of the graded rubrics; the program director identified the number of students that achieved a ranking of “reinforce” or higher and recorded the data in the 2021-2022 annual assessment report. All student projects were evaluated, which is consistent with the accreditation guidelines for the DPD Program.

PLO #2: The DIET 4110 Clinical Practicum Lab I patient care plans for the final week of the semester were evaluated using the assessment rubric (see Assessment Rubric for the Program Evaluation Plan, PLO #2 below). The assigned graduate assistants provided a summary of the graded rubrics to the instructor; the program director identified the number of students that achieved a ranking of “reinforce” or higher and recorded the data in the 2021-2022 annual assessment report. All student projects were evaluated, which is consistent with the accreditation guidelines for the DPD Program.

PLO #1 - Demonstrate effective professional communication in the transmission of food and nutrition information.			
Unacceptable	Introduce	Reinforce	Mastery
Unable to identify the importance of professional communication	Identifies importance of professional communication.	Explains principles of professional communication.	Demonstrates professional communication skills.
PLO #2 - Demonstrate the ability to develop patient-centered care plans that reflect a value for the inherent worth of others.			
Unacceptable	Introduce	Reinforce	Mastery
Unable to identify elements of patient-centered care or the inherent worth of others.	Identifies elements of patient-centered care or the inherent worth of others relevant to the assignment.	Explains principles of patient-centered care plans.	Integrates principles patient-centered care into a care plan for a patient.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

PLO #1:

- DIET 2510: An estimated 100% (31/31) of students earned “reinforce” or higher on the rubric. This exceeded the program target that 85% or more of students would earn “reinforce” or higher on the rubric.
- DIET 3600: An estimated 100% (20/20) of students earned “reinforce” or higher on the rubric. This exceeded the program target that 85% or more of students would earn “reinforce” or higher on the rubric.

PLO #2: An estimated 100% (27/27) of students earned “reinforce” or higher on the rubric. In particular, 21/27 (78%) of students earned “master” by the end of the fall semester. This exceeded the program target that 85% or more of students would earn “reinforce or higher on the rubric.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

Our findings from the 2021-2022 program assessment indicated that all students met the expectations for the course regarding principles of professional communication (PLO #1) and principles of patient-centered care plans (PLO #2). This is consistent with the accreditation guidelines for the DPD Program where all students are required to meet the student learning outcomes associated with each course; those that do not meet the outcome must be remediated until they are successful.

We further explored PLO #2 given that the majority (78%) of students earned the highest level of achievement on the assessment plan, which is associated with the expectation that the student “integrates principles of patient-centered care into a care plan for a patient.” This item was consistent with the overall course objectives for DIET 4110; therefore, it was expected that students would be successful on this outcome by the end of the course. Given that we evaluated the patient care plans from the last week of the semester for the annual assessment report, it seemed likely that students’ success on this measure evolved throughout the semester. Therefore, we reviewed the average grades on this assignment from the beginning to the end of the fall semester and found that scores improved from an average of 85.8/100 on 9/20/21 to an average of 97.96/100 on 11/22/21. Although the assignment grade differs from the rubric grade, it is likely that rubric scores would have followed a similar pattern if applied throughout the semester. In other words, students made progress on their ability to develop patient-centered care plans throughout the course of the fall semester.

While the data shows consistency over the years with 100% of students meeting or exceeding the “reinforce” rubric criteria or higher, we have had changeover in the role of primary instructor. However, the results suggest how successful we have been in ensuring consistent delivery of the course content among whomever is teaching the courses.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Results were shared at the 9/21/22 faculty meeting to all faculty. We discussed the findings and opened the floor for discussion. Everyone indicated they agreed with the findings and no one had any additional items to bring during the meeting. To provide additional opportunities for feedback, an email with the report was sent out to all faculty members for continued review with no additional feedback received. Additionally, the results were shared with the 2510 course instructor and agreed upon. The instructor for 3600 was not teaching during the fall semester, so we met and discussed the findings. Given the high rates of success in the classes with regards to these PLOs, no additional plan was deemed necessary at this time.

We will utilize this data to inform our ongoing strategic plan efforts. Additionally, given our national accreditation status, we continue to evaluate all courses on a regular basis to ensure we are meeting the needs of future professionals coming out of our program.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites

- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process

- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

N/A

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

N/A

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

We received the rating of “partially met” on the program-level assessment report feedback from (March 1, 2021) for: Findings identify learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies; program faculty have identified how they are using these findings to improve teaching and learning in their program; the actions identified are supported by their findings; and program faculty have identified how they plan to use this information moving forward.

In general, we recognize the need to apply the findings to our courses as an area of improvement. We have not been highly motivated to make changes given that students are meeting or exceeding expectations for the PLOs, as well as the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) collected by our accrediting body, or the Accreditation Council of Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND). Additionally, as mentioned before, there has been a change in instructor each year but still the students have been successful in meeting or exceeding expectations. Therefore, the change we plan to make in the coming year is to integrate the assessment findings more frequently into our biweekly faculty meetings (at least 2x/semester).

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

These changes will be assessed in next year's cycle given the timing of the data collection on the PLOs to collect data every other year.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The findings from the 2019-2020 annual report were that 100% of students met PLO #1 in DIET 3600 (82% meeting mastery), and 100% of students met PLO #2 in DIET 4110.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

PLOs will be continually reviewed alongside the SLOs required by ACEND.

IMPORTANT: *

Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. *Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.*

For DCHS Programs:

If you choose to copy/paste items from the list above* and those below^, clearly label them within the Word document. Example: PLO1 Rubrics

Submit a description of each artifact and whenever possible, an example of a student-completed artifact with the student's name removed.

Submit the actual analyzed data (not the raw data) for each PLO being assessed.

If the items below are submitted as separate documents^, label them following these examples:

2021-2022,HSCI_ArtifactDescription4PLO1

2021-2022,HSCI_CurrentAssessRubrics4PLO1

2021-2022,HSCI_AnalyzedData4PLO1

2021-2022, HSCI_Revised ProgLvlAssessPlan

Use the same labelling format for other separate documents germane to the PLO under assessment.