General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: NuFS/KIN 163, Physical Fitness & Nutrition          GE Area:  R

Results reported for AY 2015-16   # of sections: 22  (F & Sp: 8 each, Winter 2, Summer 4)  # of instructors: 8

Course Coordinator: Marjorie Freedman (on sabbatical) – submitted by Peggy Plato

E-mail: Marjorie.freedman@sjsu.edu  (Peggy.Plato@sjsu.edu)

Department Chair: Lucy McProud (NuFS), Matthew Masucci (KIN)  College: CASA

Instructions: Each year, the department will prepare a brief (two page maximum) report that documents the assessment of the course during the year. This report will be electronically submitted to curriculum@sjsu.edu, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by October 1 of the following academic year.

Part 1

To be completed by the course coordinator:

1. What GELO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?

   GELO 2: Students will be able to distinguish science from pseudoscience. Data submitted from 20 of the 22 sections.

2. What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?

   Students complete two Consumer Product Analyses where they select a nutrition product and a fitness product/program and critically evaluate the product, discussing how the claims made in the advertisement relate to scientific evidence from a minimum of 3 professional references. Feedback received on the first assignment should help students to improve their critical evaluation of the second product.

   Data: Out of 1,020 students, 559 (55%) were able to critically evaluate the claims made in the product advertisement using scientific literature at a high level (B+ or higher, or scored 13-15 out of 15 points), 288 (28%) at an average level (B- to C, or scored 11-12 out of 15 points), and 173 (17%) at a below average level (D or lower, or scored <10 out of 15 points).

   Some of the comments from faculty included: (a) Students who scored lower often chose professional references that were inappropriate or not peer-reviewed. (b) In some cases, students did not do as well on their second assignment, suggesting that faculty need to spend as much time in the 2nd half of the class as the 1st discussing how to critically analyze products and distinguish between scientific evidence and pseudoscience. (c) Students seem to appreciate the task of reading scientific research much more when it is applied to a real-world product. (d) Scores were a little lower during the summer session, possibly because the class moves so fast that there is less time for students to confer with faculty about their products and scientific evidence.

   Overall, faculty believe this assignment is a cornerstone of the course as it combines scientific literacy with real-world application. It requires students to take science out of the lab and evaluate
data in the context of a real product, which they may have used or seen being used. This helps students to begin asking interesting questions about the data behind the products and become better informed, data-driven consumers.

(3) What modifications to the course, or its assessment activities or schedule, are planned for the upcoming year? (If no modifications are planned, the course coordinator should indicate this.)

Although some faculty select one product that all students critically evaluate, others allow students to choose their product. If students select the product, suggestion to perhaps have students select from 5-8 products that have sufficient scientific research so students can find appropriate, peer-reviewed articles to use when critically evaluating the claims made in the product advertisement. Another suggestion is to spend more time teaching students how to identify and locate high quality, scientific evidence, including demonstrating how to conduct a search using appropriate databases such as Sport Discus and Pub Med.

Part 2

To be completed by the department chair (with input from course coordinator as appropriate):

(4) Are all sections of the course still aligned with the area Goals, Student Learning Objectives (GELOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?

Yes, the course is aligned with the Area R goal and GELOs. Both departments (NuFS and KIN) have a GE Coordinator to provide support to new faculty and ensure that assessment is taking place. Faculty members who teach the course meet each semester during a duty day to discuss assessment results, lessons learned, and possible modifications to enhance student achievement of the GELOs.

(5) If this course is in a GE Area with a stated enrollment limit (Areas A1, A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z), please indicate how oral presentations will be evaluated with larger sections (Area A1), or how practice and revisions in writing will be addressed with larger sections, particularly how students are receiving thorough feedback on the writing which accounts for the minimum word count in this GE category (Areas A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z) and, for the writing intensive courses (A2, A3, and Z), documentation that the students are meeting the GE GELOs for writing.

The enrollment cap for each section is 32 students. One assignment (Critical Analysis of Scientific Literature) requires each student to present a peer-reviewed study on a topic selected by the group. Students are divided into 8 groups of 4. Four writing assignments are required, 2 Critical Analyses of Scientific Literature and 2 Consumer Product Analyses. Each assignment is 3-4 pages. Students receive feedback on one assignment before submitting the second assignment. All instructors use the same assignments and common grading rubrics.