

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

| Discipline | Course Number | Title |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Culinary Arts | 230 | CUL 230 11/21/2016- Advanced Kitchen Operations: American Regional |
| Division | Department | Faculty Preparer |
| Business and Computer Technologies | Culinary and Hospitality Management | Derek Anders Jr |
| Date of Last Filed Assessment Report | | |

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Apply the concepts and principles of food service safety and nutrition, cost and quality controls, and organizational management for advanced kitchen operation.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student Project
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2015
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: All
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years below) | SP/SU (indicate years below) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2015, 2013, 2014 | 2015, 2014 | |

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 51 | 47 |

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Over the five baseload terms by which this course is being assessed, a total of 4 out of 51 students withdrew from the course. In particular, one student withdrew from each of the following terms; Fall 2013 and Winter 2014. In Fall 2014, two students withdrew. The latter two terms were not affected in this way as the number of students was consistent from the beginning to the end of the course. CUL 230 was offered as a single section for all terms highlighted in this sample data.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This course has only been offered as a face-to-face course on the main campus. Moreover, this course is traditionally offered as a day course to correspond with the laboratory activities of menu execution for patrons of Garrett's restaurant. There have been recent efforts to offer CUL 230 as a night course as a way to attract enrollment. However, the sample data of students were all day students for the range of terms being assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The goal of this course was to demonstrate and allow students to execute common managerial job tasks that allow for successful operation of a full-service restaurant. Student-assigned management teams were instructed to develop and execute a menu based on an assigned American region during Garrett's established operation times. Working with fellow classmates, student teams were also responsible for allocating preparation and service tasks, fostering a positive teamwork environment, and executing food safety standard procedures under timed situations in a live laboratory environment (i.e. Garrett's).

As part of the menu development and operations execution process, student teams were instructed to prepare recipes and food requisition (or food order); recipe costing sheets based on a provided price list; develop a vegetarian or vegan menu item in consideration for nutritional offerings of the menu overall; organizational management materials to work with fellow students regarding kitchen position placement and work schedule to execute their menu.

Students were provided templates to complete team project components and submitted project work was evaluated against a scoring sheet. Combined percentage score of

each of the project components equaled 20% of final grade. An example section of the scoring sheet is as follows:

Standardized Recipes:

| | |
|---|----|
| Adherence to Required Format (including: title, portion size, list of ingredients and amounts, method of preparation, equipment list) | 1% |
| Appropriate Ingredient Amounts for Required Numbers of Guests | 1% |
| Clear Directions and Sequential Steps in Method of Preparation | 1% |
| Proper Cooking Process & Techniques Listed in Method of Preparation | 1% |

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

| Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u> | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Overall, the collective grade percentage out of 100% for this sample size is 82%. Moreover, 4 out 5 course offerings of sample data show student groups collectively meeting and exceeding the standard of success, ranging from 78%-89%. One term, specifically Fall 2015 (one section offering), showed a collective result of 73%, a result below the 75% threshold. | | | |
| Consistently, student teams that did not meet the standard of success either did not complete project components, or if all components were submitted, the level of work presented was complete as intended. | | | |
| The following is a section of compiled assessment tool data results from Winter 2015 (one section offering): | | | |
| Winter 2015 | Term Project Grade=20% of Final Grade | Grade out of 100% | Meets Standard of Success Threshold- 75% |
| Group 1 | 14.14 | 71% | no |
| Group 2 | 17.138 | 86% | yes |
| Group 3 | 15.555 | 78% | yes |
| Group 4 | - | - | n/a- small class size |
| Class Average | 15.611 | 78% | yes/above |

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The strength of this learning outcome for students is based on the exposure of allowing students to emulate, to a degree, the real-world tasks of food service management. Based on our scaffolding approach to the program overall, students are exposed to cooking fundamentals, service principles, and theories behind leadership and management through various and strategically specific courses. As an advanced course, this project allows for the opportunity to bring the theory and separately developed fundamentals together for students to observe and experience the importance of the interconnected nature of creating dining experiences for successful restaurant operations from the back-of-house perspective.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

There are several project components with various due dates that students must manage. As this project began as a collaborative project with CUL 226, faculty of both courses agreed to a calendar of events. However, it ultimately became more confusing than helpful for students overall. In seeing such struggles early on, attempts were made to aid timely progress by emphasizing due dates in class schedule, first-day-handout materials and project component checklist.

Also, perhaps assigning more formal check-in periods before each due date would be better for the instructor to pre-evaluate the work to be submitted and offer guidance to ensure the student is on the right track overall.

Outcome 2: Plan and prepare foods with proper portion, temperature, and attractive plate presentation attributes as they relate to U.S. American regional cookery.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student Project
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2015
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: All
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed student project evaluation sheet
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty
1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years below) | SP/SU (indicate years below) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2015, 2014, 2013 | 2015, 2014 | |

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 51 | 47 |

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Over the five baseload terms by which this course is being assessed, a total of 4 out of 51 students withdrew from the course. In particular, one student withdrew from each of the following terms; Fall 2013 and Winter 2014. In Fall 2014, two students withdrew. The latter two terms were not affected in this way as the number of students was consistent from the beginning to the end of the course. CUL 230 was offered as a single section for all terms highlighted in this sample data.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This course has only been offered as a face-to-face course on the main campus. Moreover, this course is traditionally offered as a day course to correspond with the laboratory activities of menu execution for patrons of Garrett's restaurant. There have been recent efforts to offer CUL 230 as a night course as a way to attract enrollment. However, the sample data of students were all day students for the range of terms being assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Student-assigned management teams were instructed to develop and execute a menu based on an assigned American region during Garrett's established operation times. Working with fellow classmates, student teams were also responsible for allocating preparation and service tasks, fostering a positive teamwork environment, and executing food safety standard procedures under timed situations in a live laboratory environment (i.e. Garrett's).

As part of the process in executing student team-developed menus during restaurant operations, student teams were instructed to demonstrate proper food service professionalism and attitudes in working with others; employ time management/focusing on the task skills with fellow classmates; and represent a level of

quality of work/ craftsmanship in areas including sanitation and safety practices, cooking technique, flavor, texture, and presentation.

An operation day encompassed three major phases of observation: team briefing and food preparation from student-generated menu with recipes, service to the public during Garrett’s operations hour and fifteen minutes, and clear down/clean-up. During an assigned operations day, the instructor observed and evaluated student team performance in the areas of this assessment outcome during the previously mentioned execution phases. Combined percentage score of the project execution equaled 20% of the final grade. An example section of the execution scoring sheet with comment is as follows:

Professionalism and Attitude Working with Others:

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| Provide clear directives and instructions for BOH team | 5% | |
| Maintains appropriate level of involvement in the food production and delegation to BOH team | 4% | |
| Tries to positively motivate good teamwork behavior among BOH team | 3% | |
| Supports the efforts of others through listening and sharing constructive feedback | 3% | |

- Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

| |
|--|
| Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u> |
| -Overall, the collective grade percentage out of 100% for this sample size is 90%. Moreover, 5 out of 5 course offerings of sample data show student teams collectively meeting and exceeding the standard of success, ranging from 83%-93%. |
| According to this sample data, student teams adequately demonstrated their ability to lead, prepare, and guide their classmates as a kitchen team through the major phases of restaurant operations from food preparation, service execution, and clear down. Perhaps the resulting level of success is derived from term project coverage on day one with frequent check-ins, weeks of demonstration before their assigned operations day, and ultimately their commitment to display their best work in a live laboratory setting. |
| The following is a section of compiled assessment tool data results from Fall 2014 (one section offering): |

| Fall 2014 | Project Execution Grade=40% of Final Grade | Grade out of 100% | Meets Standard of Success Threshold- 75% |
|---------------|--|-------------------|---|
| Group 1 | 34.2 | 86% | yes |
| Group 2 | 37.9 | 95% | yes |
| Group 3 | 38 | 95% | yes |
| Group 4 | - | - | n/a- small class size |
| Class Average | 36.7 | 92% | yes/above |

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

A constant of the food service industry is how the strength of a team can directly impact the dining experience of patrons. As students are able to draw upon their previous experiences and development, it prompts a deeper understanding of the importance of teamwork regarding preparedness, timeliness, communication, and other relevant interpersonal skills matched with creative thinking skills to make impactful decisions toward restaurant operations within Garrett's. It also allows students to employ the synergy of fellow classmates to achieve the transformational task quality execution of their developed menu into live dining experiences for Garrett's patrons.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Based on the results of student performance for this sample data, this outcome is observably the highest achieving at 90%. Therefore, maintaining the course structure and format, along with the project components of outcome 1, will be of focus for future classes. However, with prominent changes within the administration, specifically the mandates for particular departmental policy and procedures, attempts to maintain such structure and format from the faculty's perspective has been impeded. Currently, changes to student project implementation and evaluation tools have been made to comply. However, such impeding, yet mandated, policy and procedures have made a contrary effect on the quality of student project execution since Winter 2016.

Outcome 3: Explore and compare classical and modern flavor profiles and techniques to develop a perception of American cuisine today.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Multiple-choice and short answer exams
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2015
 - Course section(s)/other population: All

- Number students to be assessed: All
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric and answer key.
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years below) | SP/SU (indicate years below) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2015, 2014, 2013 | 2015, 2014 | |

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 51 | 47 |

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Over the five baseload terms by which this course is being assessed, a total of 4 out of 51 students withdrew from the course. In particular, one student withdrew from each of the following terms; Fall 2013 and Winter 2014. In Fall 2014, two students withdrew. The latter two terms were not affected in this way as the number of students was consistent from the beginning to the end of the course. Furthermore, there was an issue of cheating on the final exam which occurred in Winter 2014. The students who cheated earned scores of zero, and their scores were included in the statistical data and not omitted. CUL 230 was offered as a single section for all terms highlighted in this sample data.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This course has only been offered as a face-to-face course on the main campus. Moreover, this course is traditionally offered as a day course to correspond with the laboratory activities of menu execution for patrons of Garrett's restaurant. There have been recent efforts to offer CUL 230 as a night course as a way to attract enrollment. However, the sample data of students were all day students for the range of terms being assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The departmental faculty-developed exam consists of 80 questions and is worth 100 points. The types of questions utilized for this exam are fill-in-the-blank, true/false, multiple choice, and short essay. The general areas of the types of questions asked are the following, based on the parameters of this outcome:

- Classical and Modern Flavor Profiles and Techniques
- Meat Fabrication
- American Regions, Regional Dishes and Ingredient Usage
- Factors in the Development of Regional Cuisine
- Kitchen Management

This tool is a cumulative exam by which the questions presented to the students are the same or similar to questions of previous tests or out-of-class assignments. For the span of sample data being assessed, the final exam questions and rubric have not changed to maintain a consistent control.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

Overall, the collective grade percentage out of 100% for this sample size is 73.76%, a result below the 75% threshold. Although there is built-in repetition of information, students seem to struggle a bit with retaining terminology. This was observed in the earlier terms of the course data sample, and an accompanying word bank was developed as an aid to the students.

Beginning in Fall 2014, to reduce chances for cheating on future tests, the instructor placed all written forms of assessment on Blackboard. Moreover, tests and exams are only accessible in the Testing Center. The downside to this is that students have a hard time finding their results to previous out-of-class assignments, tests, and mid-term to use as study materials. Also, with regard to Blackboard limitations, it was difficult developing a worksheet-based question where a visual display or diagram is present in association to the questions that reference the visual.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The strength of this learning outcome for students is their reflection and interpretation of the meaning of American Regional Cuisine. In keeping current with industry trends, there has been a movement to gain a better grasp of worldly cuisines and where the U.S. cuisine stands in comparison. Students were able to trace the lineage of American classics to the tapestry of influential food cultures and pathways based on the indigenous peoples of this land, settlers, and immigrants. Students were also able to discuss the meaning of fusion within regional cuisine across the U.S. based on the theory of the melting pot, or culmination of various cultural backgrounds that creates the Korean Taco of California to Lobster Mac'n'Cheese of the New England East.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The level of subject matter retention overall, that presented mostly within the first three or four weeks of the academic term, is less than desirable. The course structure of introducing most of the subject matter up front in the semester is due to the level of commitment of student preparedness for proceeding lab activities and class time restraints. Although students have access to previously graded submissions of assignments, tests, and mid-term exam, an observable outcome is the level of difficulty in finding such results via Blackboard, especially after the transition of assessment materials to Blackboard to reduce the chances of cheating. Also an area of improvement for this outcome (73.67% exam average for sample data) would be to present the subject material throughout a fifteen week term more so than front loading the material.

Outcome 4: Demonstrate proficiency at all kitchen stations using a variety of equipment, ingredients, and cooking methods.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Lab Performance
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2015
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: All
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher.

- Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

| Fall (indicate years below) | Winter (indicate years below) | SP/SU (indicate years below) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2015, 2014, 2013 | 2015, 2014 | |

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 51 | 47 |

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Over the five baseload terms by which this course is being assessed, a total of 4 out of 51 students withdrew from the course. In particular, one student withdrew from each of the following terms; Fall 2013 and Winter 2014. In Fall 2014, two students withdrew. The latter two terms were not affected in this way as number of students was consistent from the beginning to the end of the course. CUL 230 was offered as a single section for all terms highlighted in this sample data.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This course has only been offered as a face-to-face course on the main campus. Moreover, this course is traditionally offered as a day course to correspond with the laboratory activities of menu execution for patrons of Garrett's restaurant. There has been recent efforts to offer CUL 230 as a night course as a way to attract enrollment. However, the sample data of students were all day students for the range of terms being assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Within the area of student participation, the instructor assesses student demonstration of proficiency of this outcome. To aid in facilitating diversity of exposure to different ingredients, preparation methods, and various equipment usage; students rotate, or may be assigned, menu items from instructor and student-driven menus that are inherently designed to offer such diversity. Student can earn up to 14 points for participation. The participation evaluation are the following, based on the parameters of this outcome:

- Punctual daily arrival and dedicated attendance

- Complete uniform and professional appearance
- Station organization and mise en place
- Proper kitchen safety and sanitation practices
- Completion of lab assignments
- Speed and accuracy in menu preparations
- Effort and initiative
- Positive learning attitude
- Teamwork approach and cooperation
- Quality craftsmanship of foods prepared

Although students are evaluated in these areas from week one until week fifteen, the captured data is specific to the ten days of Garrett's service to the public. This is intended to display a more accurate interpretation of student evaluation in punctuality, lab performance from food preparation to sanitation practice, and craftsmanship of food preparation and presentation.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Overall, the collective grade percentage out of 100% for this sample size is 78%. Moreover, 4 out of 5 course offerings of sample data show student performance collectively meeting and exceeding the standard of success, ranging from 75%-88%. One term, specifically Fall 2014 (one section offering), showed a collective result of 64%, a result below the 75% threshold.

Consistently, students that did not meet the standard of success were late, prompting a deduction of daily score, and/or not attending class sessions. Uniform scores are generally high since in this course, based on the instructor who normally teaches it, a uniform inspection is required every class session after the first class meeting. Lack of full and presentable uniform results in deduction of participation score, or students are not allowed into the classroom. Many of these standards are prompted by our accrediting body, American Culinary Federation. Lastly, lab activities are mostly geared toward menu preparation and execution for Garrett's patrons. Students consistently receive high marks, which is ultimately reflected in their participation grade.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The strength of this outcome is to continue observing and guiding student development, and sometimes mastery, of such skill sets in tandem with an appropriate display of hospitality professionalism. The live laboratory setting, Garrett's, offers a great platform to allow for student development of skill sets under timed situations balanced with a level of rigor based on real world expectations. Averaged student participation scores suggest that performance results are in desirable correlation with the standard of measure.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

From the data, some student performances are at a level that is less desirable. This is primarily due to the amount of participation evaluation penalties from tardiness and absences throughout a given term. The plan for continuous improvement is to continue to impress upon students of the important relationship between professionalism and dependability, and its direct correlation to real world expectations.

Also, the basis for much of the evaluation of this assessment outcome is subjective, which is commonplace since there is room for much interpretation in many areas. Perhaps approaching this assessment with a more formal rubric will offer a better chance of capturing more objective results.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

The goal of this course was to create a fully engaging learning experience for students, beyond just the chef instructor dictating much of the creative and execution processes-which is certainly needed for introductory and intermediate level courses in the program. Although students are not quite Chefs, or managers, they are able to experience the process of restaurant operations from menu development to execution in a live environment from the back-of-house perspective. The outcomes for this course continues to allow students to take a more active role of their education in the latter advanced courses. Equally enjoyed by the students, they are able to showcase their critical and creative thinking, planning, and interpersonal skills culminated throughout their studies in the program and exhibit the hospitality spirit that is expected in the food service profession.

However, with current mandated departmental policy and procedures from administration, less than optimal changes were made to assessment tools and adherence to the originally intended outcomes. In Fall 2016 such changes took effect to comply, but this particular course section is not highlighted in the presented data of this overall

assessment. As change is ever present, and positive if properly implemented, it has been very challenging to maintain the original intended quality of the course. Ultimately, certain aspects of the student project and course structure have stifled the quality in delivery of course content.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

This information from this process will be shared with fellow departmental colleagues during upcoming department meeting(s) for future curriculum development.

3. Intended Change(s)

| Intended Change | Description of the change | Rationale | Implementation Date |
|------------------|---|--|---------------------|
| Outcome Language | To adjust the language and potentially reduce the amount of outcomes to a maximum of three. | Adjusting the language to keep current with industry trends and demands, better correlate the language to the tools for future assessment, and to adjust to current departmental policy and procedures mandated by administration. | 2018 |
| Assessment Tool | To potentially reduce the amount of assessment tools to match the number of outcomes. | To ensure current tools are best suited to assess upcoming changes to outcomes language. | 2018 |

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

III. Attached Files

[CUL 230 Assessment Data](#)

Faculty/Preparer:

Derek Anders Jr Date: 08/11/2017

Department Chair: Derek Anders Jr **Date:** 08/11/2017
Dean: Eva Samulski **Date:** 08/15/2017
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 10/24/2017