# 2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

**Program:** Nutrition

**Division:** PATH

**Writers:** Marsha Vernoga

**SLO/SAO Point-Person:**

---

**Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 2, 2026.**

**Helpful Links:**

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Discipline Data Packets – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ Course Success Rates Dashboard – allows you to research your program's success rates

**Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form**. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

# Section 1: Program Reflection and Planning

*These questions appear on all Program Reviews including comprehensive and updates.*

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 25-26.

- NTRN 1 (the Science of Nutrition) curriculum update was approved under CAL-GETC Area 5b (Life Science)
- More enrollments led to added section (s)
- Nutrition Club expands to "Health and Nutrition Club" to include Allied Health majors
- SLOs submitted for the upcoming 3-year cycle.
- For in-person classes, course materials revised to support the OER initiative and providing no-cost textbooks for those students.
- Revised online courses for accessibility and integrating assignments that use AI or cannot be done as easily with AI (to preserve critical thinking)

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 25-26

- Academic Integrity concerns in online classes due to AI misuse.

3. What are your upcoming **plans**? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- May need to hire adjuncts if enrollments continue to increase.  Waitlists for classes are full

# Section 2: SLOs/SAOs

*This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review, with brief annual check-ins on the Program Review Updates. The following resources will be useful when completing this section:*

- Three-Year Assessment Template
- Aggregated and Disaggregated Data from the following sources:
    - ELumen (if saved--no longer available online)
    - CurrIQunet
    - Student Success Dashboard

1. During the 2023-2026 three-year assessment cycle that just concluded, what did your program set out to learn through your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessments?

- I wanted to know whether my NTRN 1 (Introduction to Nutrition Science) students could take a Nutrition Facts label and use it to judge the quality of a food and make informed choices. This is one of the most practical, everyday skills I teach. I assessed this CSLO in Fall 2025 across four sections for 161 students in total.
- I also wanted to see whether my approach was working: teaching the label in lecture, then having students practice with hands-on activities again and again throughout the semester. I scored students on the label elements they are expected to know.
- Equity was a big part of my question. I looked at whether results differed by gender, age, ethnicity, first-generation status, Promise Grant, EOPS, veteran and foster youth status, and by modality (asynchronous vs. face-to-face), so that I could see which students might need more support.
- Finally, I wanted a starting point. No earlier comparable data was available, so these Fall 2025 results are my baseline for future cycles.

2. Based on your analysis of your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessment data, what conclusions did you draw about student outcomes and equity in your program?

- Overall, 57.76% of students (93 of 161) met the SLO, 30.43% (49) were developing, and 6.83% (11) did not meet it; 1.86% were not assessed and 3.11% were no longer attending. I'm encouraged that nearly 9 in 10 students either met the SLO or were well on their way. At the same time, nearly a third hadn't reached mastery yet when I assessed them, and I see real room to grow there.

- Modality: online (asynchronous) and face-to-face students did about equally well (59.04% vs. 56.41% met the SLO). Every student who stopped attending was in a face-to-face section (6.41% vs. 0% online).
- Age: my younger students (21 or under) met the SLO more often than students 22 and older (60.68% vs. 50%). Older students were more likely to still be developing (38.64% vs. 27.35%). Many of them are balancing work and family, and I want to make sure the course works for them.
- First-generation students: this is the clearest gap. 53.33% of first-generation students met the SLO, compared with 59.48% of their continuing-generation peers, and their "Does Not Meet" rate was more than double (11.11% vs. 5.17%).
- Gender: female students met the SLO more often than male students (60% vs. 54.1%), and male students were more likely to be developing (36.07% vs. 27%). The pattern varied from section to section, so I'll keep an eye on it over more terms.
- Ethnicity: "Meets" rates ranged from 50% (White) to 66.67% (African American, n=6). Asian American students had the highest "Does Not Meet" rate (14.81%), and White students had the highest "Developing" rate (42.11%). Several of these groups are small, so I'm reading these differences with caution.
- Most of my students are building this skill well, but first-generation students, students 22 and older, and male students are less likely to reach mastery. These are the students I'm focusing on as I plan improvements.

3. Explain potential plans to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps.

- I'm adding more Nutrition Facts label practice sets, in class and online, along with worked examples, step-by-step guides and side-by-side product comparisons. My goal is to move the roughly 30% of students who are "Developing" to mastery.
- For first-generation students, students 22 and older, and male students, I plan to use early alerts, check in with them before the assessment, and connect them with tutoring and peer mentoring.
- I'll offer options such as recorded label-reading walkthroughs and extra practice opportunities, so that older and working students can get the practice they need on their own schedule.
- In my face-to-face sections, I'll reach out early to students who stop coming to class, before they fall too far behind.
- I'll review my course materials and my asynchronous course design for equity, including pacing, accessibility and gender equity, so the course works for all of my students.
- I'll use the Fall 2025 results (57.76% met the SLO) as my baseline and reassess this CSLO in the next cycle, to see whether outcomes improve and whether the gaps narrow.

4. Describe any obstacles that you encountered in your assessment process and any supports that would be helpful.

- Comparable earlier data wasn't available (eLumen data is no longer accessible), so I couldn't compare this cycle to previous terms.
- About 5% of students either weren't assessed or had stopped attending, so their results aren't in the data.

# Section 3: Data Discussion

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review. Workshops and office hours will be offered in Fall 2026 to support Program Review writers.

**1. RPIE Data Review:** Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

*(**Note**: Not all Programs have RPIE data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to the RPIE team.)*

Data may come from:

- RPIE Data Packets
- Transfer data
- Succes Rates Dashboard (scroll down on page)
- Requested data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE)
- SLO/SAO data
- Data from program-created surveys or investigations
- Any other relevant source of quantitative or qualitative data

- Enrollment is growing!! ☺ AY25-26 was our strongest enrollment year in the five-year data packet. Headcount rose from 146 (Fall 2024) to 183 (Fall 2025), about 25%, and from 163 (Spring 2025) to 191 (Spring 2026), about 17%. FTES reached 18.0 in Fall 2025 and 18.8 in Spring 2026, the highest in five years.
- Fill rates were 84% in Fall 2025 and 87% in Spring 2026, after 95% in Spring 2025, and my waitlists are full. Productivity (WSCH/FTEF) was 557 in Fall 2025 and 576 in Spring 2026.
- The program runs on about 1.0 FTEF per term, and I teach nearly all of it as the only full-time faculty member. In Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 the share of FTEF from full-time faculty was 0% because I was on sabbatical; in every other term it was 60–100%. If enrollment keeps growing, we will need adjunct faculty to add sections.
- Success rates rose from 67% (Fall 2021) and 72% (Spring 2022) to 79% (Fall 2025) and 80% (Spring 2026), and have held at about 79–82% for the past three years. The lower rates in AY21-22 reflect the COVID-19 pandemic, when nearly all NTRN enrollments were online and withdrawals peaked (19% in Fall 2021). Our AY25-26 success rate on the Program-Set Standard report (83%) is the highest in six years and above the college-wide rate (79%), which I'm very proud of.
- Withdrawals dropped sharply, from 19% (Fall 2021) to 5% (Fall 2025) and 6% (Spring 2026). At the same time, the non-success rate (D/F) rose in Fall 2025 to 16% (11% F grades), up from 8% in Fall 2024. More students are persisting, but some of them still aren't passing, and I'm watching this closely.
- Most of my students are working toward transfer (79% in Fall 2025, 73% in Spring 2026), and many are just starting college (60% were 19 or younger and 27% were first-time college students in Fall 2025). About 60% are female.

- Most NTRN students now take a mix of face-to-face and online classes (57% in Fall 2025, 55% in Spring 2026). “Online only” students dropped from 89% (Fall 2021) to 28% (Spring 2026), and “face-to-face only” students grew to 17%.

**2. Equity:** Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns and any actions that should be taken at the program or college level.

- The data packet doesn’t break course success rates down by student group, so for equity I looked at who is enrolling and at my Fall 2025 SLO results (see Section 2). I also plan to dig into disaggregated success rates on the Success Rates Dashboard and with RPIE.
- The share of Latino students in NTRN has declined, from 37% (Fall 2021) to 29% (Fall 2025) and 24% (Spring 2026). Over the same period the share of Asian students grew from 14% to 30%. African American students remain a small share of enrollment (2–4%). I want our classes to reflect and serve our whole community, so the drop in Latino enrollment is something I want to understand and address.
- How students are doing (SLO data, Fall 2025): first-generation students (53% met the SLO vs. 59% of continuing-generation students, and twice the “Does Not Meet” rate), students 22 and older (50% vs. 61%), and male students (54% vs. 60%) were less likely to reach mastery.
- What would help at the college level… including course success rates disaggregated by ethnicity, first-generation status and age in future discipline data packets. That would make it much easier for small programs like ours to spot equity gaps.

**3. Course Modality (Instructional Programs Only):** In reviewing your program's data packet and Succes Rates Dashboard, are there differences in success rates by modality (i.e. face-to-face, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid, or hyflex)? If so, reflect on what might account for differences and any actions that should be taken. (Non-instructional programs may also choose to reflect on online vs. in-person services if applicable).

- My online and face-to-face students succeed at similar rates, with online sections equal to or slightly higher in most terms. In Fall 2025, face-to-face success was 78% vs. 79% online; in Spring 2026 it was 76% vs. 83%. In AY24-25 face-to-face success was 83% (fall) and 76% (spring), vs. 81% and 79% online.
- The bigger difference is what happens when students struggle. My face-to-face students rarely withdraw (1% in both Fall 2025 and Spring 2026), but more of them end with a D or F (21% and 23%). Online students withdraw more often (8–9%) but have lower D/F rates (12% and 9%).
- The flexibility of asynchronous classes may suit students balancing work and family. Face-to-face students who fall behind may stay enrolled rather than withdraw, and end up with a D or F. Students may also choose the modality that fits how they learn best.
- AI misuse in online courses (see Section 1) may be inflating some online grades, since unsupervised online assignments and exams are easier to complete with AI tools. This is one possible reason online success was higher than face-to-face success in Spring 2026 (83% vs. 76%), although the two were nearly equal in Fall 2025 (79% vs. 78%). In response, I’ve revised my online courses to include

assignments that use AI or cannot be done as easily with AI, to preserve critical thinking. I'll keep comparing course success with my directly assessed SLO results by modality to monitor this.
- My Fall 2025 SLO data show a similar picture: 59% of online students met the SLO vs. 56% face-to-face, and every student who stopped attending was in a face-to-face section.
- I'll add early-alert check-ins in my face-to-face sections before midterm, so struggling students get connected to support (or advised on their options) before they earn a D or F; bring what works online (practice sets, timely feedback, regular announcements) into my face-to-face classes; and keep tracking success by modality as more students choose face-to-face.

**4. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only):** The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly below 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There is no punishment for not meeting the standard, and many valid reasons this may occur. When a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | Program-set standard data can be found on this page

| 5a. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion in AY25-26? |
|---|

Yes__X__ No____

| 5b. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests. Success rates for individual courses can be found on the Success Rates Dashboard. |
|---|

- Not applicable. NTRN met its program-set standard for AY25-26: our course success rate was 83%, compared with a set standard of 73% (95% of the five-year rolling average). It's our highest success rate in the six years shown.

# Section 4: Special Topics

*These questions have been chosen for this year's Comprehensive Program Review to meet reporting mandates (for accreditation, Ed. Code, or other sources).*

**1. Mission:** Describe 1-3 examples of how your program's work has aligned with the college's mission, vision, values, and/or educational master plan over the past three years. (Possibilities might include new initiatives, resource allocation/use, program improvements, or other activities).

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Educational Master Plan

- Transfer and completion (Mission: “support for completion of students’ transfer, degree, and career-technical goals”): I updated the NTRN 1 (Introduction to Nutrition Science) curriculum, and it was approved for Cal-GETC Area 5B (Life Science), so the course now counts toward general education for transfer. That matters because most of my students plan to transfer (79% in Fall 2025). Demand keeps growing: headcount rose 25% from Fall 2024 to Fall 2025, and we added a section.
- Equity and access (Mission: “inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment”): I revised my in-person course materials to support the college’s OER initiative, so those students now have a no-cost textbook, and I revised my online courses for accessibility. I also now break my CSLO results down by student group, and the gaps I found (first-generation students, students 22 and older, male students) are shaping the support I provide.
- Engagement and leadership (Vision: “engaged participants and leaders in their local and global communities”; Values: lifelong learning): the Nutrition Club, which I advise, was reactivated and expanded into the Health and Nutrition Club to include Allied Health majors. It gives students a place to lead, to connect nutrition with health careers, and to promote wellness on campus and in the community.

2. Regular Substantive Interaction (Instructional Programs Only)

To meet our college, ACCJC, state, and federal standards, **all online instructors** must demonstrate “**regular and substantive interaction**” (RSI) with students. That is, we must be clearly providing instruction and interacting with our online students, just like we would in an on-campus class. The following reflection questions allow us to capture how RSI is occurring in our classes.

The following documents explain requirements and best practices for RSI:

- ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education
- Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements

| 2a. If your program offers DE courses, how are Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements met in your area? Examples appear on the DE addendums of your Course Outlines of Record. Place an X next to each method used in your courses. | |
|---|---|
| **X** | Course materials make clear to students how often and when the instructor will interact with students (e.g. syllabus/home page lists email/office hours/other ways to communicate and typical response times) |
| | Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses) |
| **X** | Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses) |
| **X** | Provides additional information from various sources/mediums to engage students with course content (e.g. instructor-curated content in Canvas pages that help deepen students understanding of course content) |
| **X** | Facilitates discussions (e.g. through Canvas discussion boards, Pronto, Studio, or Hypothesis) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **X** | Provides feedback on students' coursework (e.g. through detailed rubrics and/or assignment comments in Speedgrader; note: a grade alone does not quality as RSI, nor does auto-graded feedback students may get through completing publisher content) |
| **X** | Responds to students' questions (e.g. through timely responses to student messages in Canvas Inbox, discussion boards, social annotation assignments) |
| **X** | Facilitates student success through ongoing outreach (e.g. posts announcements; uses "Message Students Who" to encourage struggling students to attend office hours or access free tutoring) |
| | Other [explain]: |

2b. What challenges if any have you faced in implementing RSI? What additional training or resources might instructors in your program need to increase the quality of RSI in online courses?

- AI misuse in discussions and assignments: AI-written discussion posts and assignments make real interaction harder. When a post is written by AI, my replies and the peer conversation lose their meaning, and identifying and addressing misuse takes a lot of my time.
- Keeping up with feedback: personalized feedback is one of the most meaningful ways I connect with my online students. As enrollment has grown (headcount of 183 in Fall 2025 and 191 in Spring 2026), and with me teaching most sections, it is hard to keep giving timely, personalized feedback in SpeedGrader on every assignment.
- Professional development on designing discussions and assignments that resist AI or integrate it (e.g., Studio video responses, Hypothesis social annotation, prompts tied to students' own experiences); training on efficient feedback tools (rubric comment banks, audio and video feedback in SpeedGrader); clear college-wide guidance on AI use and academic integrity procedures in online courses; and additional instructors as sections are added, so class loads stay manageable.

# Section 5: Program Review Feedback

What questions or suggestions do you have about this year's Program Review forms or process?

- *N/A*

# Detailed Instructions

**Instructions**

1. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, November 2.
2. Please respond to questions with enough detail to present your information; it doesn't have to be long.
3. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
4. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.
5. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.

**Sections:** There are five sections to the document:

1. Program Reflection and Planning
2. SLO/SAO Review
3. Data analysis
4. Special topics
5. Feedback on the PR template and process

**Time Frame:** This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 25-26 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2026-27. It is fine to discuss topics beyond these time frames, but please specify the time frame in your responses.

**Audience:** Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

**Uses:** This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

**Equity**: Here is the LPC definition of equity, which is a guiding principle in reviewing programs: "Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus."

**Please note:** Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

**Helpful Links:**

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu