

ANNUAL REPORT FOR ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES

Culinary Assistant Program

- 1) Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from outcome assessments carried out in the previous academic year.

In Y09-10, the assessments on Critical Thinking Core Outcome were carried out in the second and the third/final term. The findings were quite disappointing, though the average score did improve from 1.14 to 1.50 (based on the Mapping Level Indicators Scale of 0 - 4). Nine out of the fourteen students had not shown any improvement, they remained having limited demonstration/application of knowledge and skills on critical thinking. Two students were able to show basic demonstration/application of knowledge and skills (Level 2), and only two out of fourteen could demonstrate comprehension and were able to apply essential knowledge and skills (Level 3).

Based on the above findings and the assumption by teaching critical thinking, self-reflection, cultural awareness, communication, and community and environmental responsibility, there would be an improvement in our program outcomes. So the SEC decided to develop a lesson plan to cover/teach five of the six learning core outcomes (all, except Professional Competence, which would be taught in the on-the-job training sessions). A direct assessment process, alongside with the ones already in place (the On-the-Job Training Evaluation, Behavior Review Report, and Grade Report), was added to evaluate students on the outcomes.

- 2) Identify the outcomes assessed this year, and describe the methods used. What were the results of the assessment (i.e. what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?

- a) Describe the method (s) you used.

A teaching plan that combines direct instructions, incidental teaching, and case studies was developed to teach the five learning core outcomes.

A direct assessment that combines open-end questions, face-to-face interview, and student-instructor dual evaluations, was added to assess the learning core outcomes. Assessments were given to each student in the beginning of his/her first term and at the end of the second and third term.

- b) Results: What did you learn?

The direct teaching plan could improve students' learning on outcomes. While the average score in the initial assessment on Critical Thinking was 0.50 (7 out of 14 students had not heard about Critical Thinking), the average score improved to 1.50 in the second term, and 1.86 in the third. Both the instructor and the students agreed that students had improved on overall performance and learning as well.

The face-to-face interview and student-instructor dual evaluation could be a very effective tool for assessing self-reflection.

Due to the inconsistency of individual rating/scoring style of our Work-experience Supervisors, the on-the-job training evaluated by them could be ineffective to provide a consistent score, for comparison purpose, on the performance of the same student over a period of three terms.

As expected, there were reports from the Program Coordinator and the Work-experience Supervisors that our 2010-11 students had been working more effectively with food operation personnel to perform jobs during training sessions; and demonstrated good job-related knowledge and job-success skills as well. A proof that shows in-line with our assumption mentioned earlier.

3) Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented towards improving students' attainment of degree and certificate outcomes.

A new On-the-Job Training Evaluation Form was designed using rubrics to help Work-experience Supervisors and the Program Coordinator to assess students' performance uniformly.

CORE OUTCOME ASSESSMENT – Culinary Assistant Program

Student Name: _____ **Evaluator:** _____

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Level Indicators: | 0 | Not Applicable. |
| | 1 | Limited demonstration or application of knowledge and skills. |
| | 2 | Basic demonstration and application of knowledge and skills. |
| | 3 | Demonstrated comprehension and is able to apply essential knowledge and skills. |
| | 4 | Demonstrates thorough, effective and/or sophisticated application of knowledge and skills. |

Term 1 Term 2 Term 3

Critical Thinking

Tell me about critical thinking. _____
Have you been implementing? _____
Give example(s): _____
How often? _____
Evaluator’s comment: _____

Self-reflection

Tell me about self-reflection. _____
Have you been implementing? _____
Give examples(s): _____
How often? _____
Evaluator’s comment: _____

Communication

Tell me about communication. _____
Have you been implementing? _____
Give example(s): _____
How often? _____
Evaluator’s comment: _____

Cultural Awareness

Tell me about communication. _____
Have you been implementing? _____
Give example(s): _____
How often? _____
Evaluator’s comment: _____

Community & Environment Responsibility

Tell me about communication. _____
Have you been implementing? _____
Give example(s): _____
How often? _____
Evaluator’s comment: _____

Rubrics for rating On-the-Job Evaluation

All Time = 100% of the time.

Miss Couple = Miss 1 or 2 times.

Most Time = Miss 3 to 5 times.

Often = Miss 6 to 10 times.

Some Time = Miss more than 10 times but better than only once-a-while.

Once-a-while = Seldom occur, may just take place a few times over a long period of time.

Rarely = Very seldom or never occur.

N/A = Not applicable or do not know.

Rubrics for rating Employability

Yes = Definitely, 100% chance.

Very-likely = Very high chance to be hired, about 84% chance.

Very-possible = High chance to be hired, about 67% chance.

Possible = Possible to be hired, about 50% chance.

Maybe = Lower than possible to be hired, about 34% chance.

Not-likely = very unlikely to be hired, about 17% chance.

No = absolutely no chance to be hired. 0% chance.