Associate of Science in Nursing Program

College: College of Nursing and School of Allied Health

Prepared by: Pamela Holcombe, Dr. Clark   Date: 6-21-2019

Approved by: Dr. Dana Clawson, Dean   Date: 6-21-2019

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

College of Nursing's Mission. Northwestern State University College of Nursing (CON) serves the people of Louisiana and in so doing improves the health of its citizens while advancing the mission of Northwestern State University through excellence in accessible undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education programs that are designed to assist individuals in achieving their professional goals as responsible and contributing members of their profession and society.

Associate of Science in Nursing's Mission Statement: Same as the CON

Purpose (optional): The Associate of Science in Nursing (ASN) degree program prepares graduates to function as registered nurses in hospitals, nursing homes, and other health care agencies. The curriculum is constructed to promote career mobility to the baccalaureate nursing educational level. Upon completion of the Program, the graduate is eligible to apply for the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN).

Methodology: The assessment process for the ASN program is as follows:
(1) Data from assessment tools (both direct & indirect, quantitative & qualitative) are collected and sent to the program director.

(2) The program director enters the data in the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) database.

(3) The results are shared with the Director of Assessment and analyzed at the ASN Assessment Committee meeting. The committee discusses data analysis, interpretation, actions, trends, results, and future plans to address needed improvements.

(4) The Assessment committee findings are discussed in the program curriculum committee meetings. Additional insights and actions are added to the SLOs based on faculty input.

(5) Significant findings are reported in the Administrative Council meeting.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Note[1]: Skyfactor™ Survey (a student satisfaction tool) is given the semester the student graduates. Skyfactor™ is a tool that is based on research and is designed to provide data for benchmarking and longitudinal comparisons. Questions utilized in Skyfactor™ are designed based on specialized/professional accreditation standards. The survey is administered by Skyfactor™, ensuring student anonymity. Results from the year are compiled by Skyfactor™ into an aggregate report which provides student responses and compares the NSU ASN program with like programs across the nation. Programs can choose 6 schools to be utilized for comparison (Select 6). The Skyfactor™ company then provides the NSU program mean, the Select 6 mean score, and Carnegie mean score. Since many ASN schools are in community colleges, the ASN program uses the Select 6 as a standard for comparison for most of the Skyfactor™ questions used as an SLO measure. The scale for responses to the Skyfactor™ questions ranges from one to seven with seven being the highest score.
Note [2]: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, the expected outcome measure (Select 6 mean score) for several measures using the Skyfactor survey was not available. This was due to Skyfactor removing the questions from a "Factor" component. The result was no comparative data for those questions. NSU was unable to resolve the issue or obtain the data for the 2016-2017 assessment year. As a result, faculty decided to continue to use the measure and change the expected outcome to the score 6.0. A score of 6.0 on the 1-7 scale is higher than any previous Select 6 mean scores for those questions and is a high mean score showing excellence. In addition, NSU will still be able to use previous data as comparison.
Note[3]: Assessment period. The ASN assessment data is based on the calendar year, Jan – Dec. For clarity and to be consistent with university programs, we will label the 2017 year as 2017-2018 and 2018 year as 2018-2019.

SLO 1. Provide nursing care founded upon selected scientific principles and evidence-based research utilizing the nursing process.

Measure 1.1.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Apply research-based knowledge as a basis for practice."
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than the Select 6 mean score

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.33; Select 6 mean score – 5.70
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.23; Select 6 mean score – 5.82
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.33; Select 6 mean score – 5.75

Trending:

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q61	Q61	Q61
	N=92	N=79	N=99
NSU	6.33	6.23	6.33
Select 6	5.7	5.82	5.75

Analysis. Faculty in the ASN program teach application of scientific principles and evidence-based knowledge and the need to be reflective of current research in both didactic and clinical nursing courses. Required textbooks were selected because the content was based on research and supported best nursing practice. Evidence-based content is threaded in each nursing course. Assignments made in each level require students to utilize research and evidence-based practices to develop care plans and implement teaching plans.

In 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 was to enhance student learning by: 1) faculty in each level review of other textbooks for possible adoption, and 2) faculty in third level utilizing care plans and case studies in class to lead discussions which include the use of research and evidence-based practice to support interventions.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 2nd level faculty reviewed textbooks to find those that best supported evidence-based practice and offered a variety of learning resources. In the Fall of 2018, 1st level adopted Course Point Plus – a Taylor Fundamentals (LWW) package which includes textbooks with adaptive quizzing, Virtual Simulations, drug guides, continuously updated information, links to research articles for specific content, dosage calculations, and a care plan section with references to associated scholarly articles. Faculty in other levels also reviewed texts and resources from this company. Course Point is used for Psych rotations in NURA 2100/2110. Additionally, faculty in 3rd level incorporated care plans in orientation and in each clinical rotation (psych, neuro, and OB).

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.33, which exceeded the benchmark of the Select 6 mean score of 5.75. Therefore, the expected outcome was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of these results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is for faculty to 1) review texts for med-surg nursing, 2) explore and utilize more LWW resources, and 3) plan meeting with LWW representative to discuss online resources.

Measure 1.2.
Assessment Method: Care Plans (2nd Level and 4th Level)
Expected Outcome: 90% of 2nd and 4th level students will achieve a final score of satisfactory

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final score of Satisfactory on the care plan assignment in levels 2 & 4.

AY 2017-2018: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final score of Satisfactory on the care plan assignment in levels 2 & 4.

AY 2018-2019: Target Met   100% of 2nd and 4th level students achieved a score of Satisfactory on the first and final attempts of the care plan assignment

First Year Trending the First Attempt on Graded Care Plans

First Attempt Trending:

	2018-2019		2019-2020		2020-2021	
Level 2	Shreveport n = 66/66	100%	Shreveport n=		Shreveport n=	
	Leesville n = 28/28	100%	Leesville n=		Leesville n= /	
	Alexandria n = 29/29	100%	Alexandria n=		Alexandria n= /	
Total	N =123/123	100%				
Level 4	Shreveport n = 73/73	100%	Shreveport n=		Shreveport n= /	%
	Leesville n = 34/34	100%	Leesville n=		Leesville n= /	%
	Alexandria n = 18/18	100%	Alexandria n=		Alexandria n= /	%
	*Natchitoches n = 3/3	100%				
Total	N = 128/128	100%				
	Generic n = 99/99	100%				
	Transition n = 29/29	100%				
Total	N = 128/128	100%				

*Natchitoches: Alexandria clinical students in Natchitoches for didactic course only

Final Attempt Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Level 2	Shreveport n = 44/44	100%	Shreveport n = 31/31	100%	Shreveport n= 66/66	100%
	Leesville n = 33/33	100%	Leesville n = 14/14	100%	Leesville n= 28/28	100%
			Alexandria n =10/10	100%	Alexandria n=29/29	100%
Total	N=77/77	100%	N=55/55	100%	N=123/123	100%
Level 4	Shreveport n=57/57	100%	Shreveport n = 50/50	100%	Shreveport n= 73/73	100%
	Leesville n=13/13	100%	Leesville n = 32/32	100%	Leesville n= 34/34	100%
	Natchitoches n=16/16	100%	Natchitoches n =7/7	100%	Alexandria n= 18/18	100%
					Natchitoches n=3/3	100%
Total	N=86/86	100%	N=89/89	100%	N=128/128	100%
	Generic n=68/68	100%	Generic n=60/60	100%	Generic n= 99/99	100%

	Transition n=18/18	100%	Transition n=29/29	100%	Transition n= 29/29	100%
Total	N=86/86	100%	N=89/89	100%	N=128/128	100%

Analysis. For the care plan assignment, students utilize the nursing process to analyze a patient's health record, perform a physical assessment, and develop a plan of care for the assigned patient. The care plan must be individualized and based on patient specific data. If students do not receive a satisfactory on the first care plan submission, they are given feedback and allowed to resubmit the assignment. Students must obtain a satisfactory score on the care plan as it is a critical behavior (meaning a student must achieve a satisfactory to pass the course).

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. 100% of students in the 2nd and 4th level clinical courses were able to achieve a final score of satisfactory on the care plan assignment. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to 1) collect data on what percent of students are able to complete the care plan on the first submission, 2) continue to collect data on achievement a score of satisfactory on the final submission, and 3) require students to document rationale for interventions listed in the care plan.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year 2nd through 4th level students completed a patient daily profile (PDP) which addressed the client priority problems and correlating diagnoses and interventions. This activity helps students to prepare for the care plan. Consequently, by the time students do the care plan, they have received ample feedback on the entire nursing process and generally do well on the care plans. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 100% of students earned a satisfactory on the first attempt of the care plan. Therefore, the target was met.

Decision. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is: 1) for 1st level students to complete three practice care plans before turning in the graded care plan, 2) faculty to give feedback on each care plan submission, and 3) continue to track success in achieving a score of satisfaction on first attempt of the graded care plan.

Measure 1.3.
Assessment Method: NURA 1050 Research Assignment
Expected Outcome: 80% of students will achieve a score of $\geq$ 86%

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Not Met   59.2% of students scored at or above 86%.
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   81.7% of students scored at or above 86%
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   84.3% of students scored at or above 86%

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
	Shreveport n= 75/131	57%	Shreveport n= 84/87	96.55%	Shreveport n=83/92	90%
	Leesville	54%	Leesville	66%	Leesville	73%

	n= 48/88		n= 66/100		n=66/91	
	Alexandria n= 18/19	94.7%	Alexandria n= 47/54	87%	Alexandria n= 66/72	92%
TOTAL	N=141/238	59%	N=197/241	81.7%	N=215/255	84%

Analysis. An assignment in the pre-clinical course, NURA 1050, requires students to find a research article from a nursing journal and document: 1) what in the article lead them to believe it was a research article, 2) the name of the nursing journal in which it was published, 3) the year the article was published, 4) the name of a nurse in the article who assisted with the research, and 5) identify where in the United States was the research conducted. In addition, students are required to attach the article and turn the assignment in on time. This activity is a first step in the student being able to correctly identify a research article that may guide nursing care plan development in future nursing courses.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plans for 2018-2019 were as follows: 1) one faculty would be identified as the lead faculty for the course and would ensure that new faculty teaching this course received an orientation to the course, 2) all faculty teaching this course would meet each semester to ensure consistency in course requirements and grading practices, 3) allow students to resubmit the assignment after it was initially graded to earn a higher grade, and 4) maintain previous methods to assist students with the research assignment.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the Leesville campus coordinator was identified as the lead faculty for all sections of NURA 1050. Faculty teaching NURA 1050 met at the beginning and end of each semester to review course assignments, ensure consistency in teaching the course, orient new faculty, address issues, and update the syllabus. Faculty allowed students who desired a higher grade to resubmit the assignment. All other practices to assist/teach for this assignment were continued. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 84.3% of students scored at or above an 80%, which met the expected outcome of 80%. Therefore, the target was met. This results in a three year upward trend in this measure.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 results for measure 1.3, as well as results from previous years, measure1.3 will no longer be used as a measure for the 2019-2020 assessment year. SLO 1 will be measured by one objective (1.2) and one subjective (1.1) measure. Faculty decided that those two measures were sufficient to address SLO 1.

SLO 2. Perform caring interventions which assist the person to achieve dynamic equilibrium by facilitating the satisfaction of needs.

Measure 2.1.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Assist patients to interpret the meaning of health information."
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than 6.0 on a 7.0 scale in the ASN Skyfactor ™ survey.

Finding. The target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.44; Select 6 mean - unavailable
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.36; Score of 6.0
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.37; Score of 6.0

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017		2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q76		Q76	Q76
	N=90		N=78	N=101
NSU	6.44		6.36	6.37
Select 6	Not available	New Benchmark 6.0	6.0	6.0

Analysis. ASN faculty teach communication skills and the meaning of health information throughout the ASN program. Students demonstrate their ability to assist patients in interpreting the meaning of health information through teaching plan assignments and in providing nursing care for patients. The teaching plan assignment requires the student to identify a teaching need for the patient, develop a teaching plan, get approval of the faculty, and implement the teaching plan.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plans for 2018-2019 were for: 1) students in the 1st level clinical course to watch students in the 2nd level clinical implement a teaching plan in the clinical setting, 2) students in upper level clinicals (2nd through 4th levels) to show 1st level students (in lab) how to implement a teaching plan, and 3) faculty and students to utilize new patient teaching resources for the teaching plan. The first two practices were to help 1st level students to prepare for the next clinical levels and help the upper level clinical students practice their teaching skills and role model patient teaching for lower level students.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the 1st level students in the fall watched 2nd level students present service-learning projects over distance learning to ensure that all campuses were able to participate. First level students gave faculty positive verbal feedback after the activity. In Spring 2019, students currently in 2nd level (who were in 1st level in Fall 2018) expressed to faculty they were appreciative of being able to see/know what to do and what was expected. There were some issues initially with Distance Learning sites being able to ask questions, see audience, etc. However, these issues were resolved.

Students progressing to 2nd level had access to new teaching resources, including Course Point for one year, and were able to use the new learning resources. Course Point included evidence-based practice articles which were helpful in completing assignments (care plans, teaching plans, etc.). In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.37 which exceeded the expected outcome, the Select Six mean score of 6.0.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year will be to: 1) encourage students to use Advisor for Education (a resource from Course Point Plus) to assist in identifying patient teaching

resources that can be integrated into their teaching plans. This resource also provides information which students can print off as handouts; 2) ensure all 1st level students watch 2nd level students present their service learning projects, which include teaching plans; and 3) distance learning will not be used; each campus will do their own presentations in a face-to-face environment.

Measure 2.2.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Survey: Factor 10 – Technical Skills
Expected Outcome: Achieve a mean score of >5.5 on the ASN Skyfactor™ survey

Factor 10 on the Skyfactor™ Assessment consists of 2 questions:
1) To what degree did this nursing program teach you to: Provide physical support in preparation for therapeutic procedures
2) To what degree did this nursing program teach you to: Provide emotional support in preparation for therapeutic procedures

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.53; Expected Outcome – 5.5
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.44; Expected Outcome – 5.5
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.42; Expected Outcome – 5.5

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Factor 10	Factor 10	Factor 10
	N=92	N=80	N=100
NSU	6.53	6.44	6.42
Skyfactor™ score	5.5	5.5	5.5

Analysis. Faculty teach students how to provide emotional and physical support to patients from the beginning of the first clinical/lab and didactic courses (NURA 1100/1110) through the last courses (NURA 2500/2510). Communication, a large component of both physical and emotional support is emphasized in first and third clinical levels. Faculty teach effective communication in class, demonstrate it in clinical and lab settings, and give feedback to students in the lab and clinical settings. Students are also tested on communication in didactic courses.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to increase student teaching related to emotional support. In the 3rd level, students were instructed to teach patients coping skills aimed at decreasing anxiety, building self-esteem, and increasing mindfulness.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Students developed and implemented a patient teaching plan related to coping skills while in 3rd level clinical. Faculty stated that the students who put more into the project, perceived more benefit than students who just did the minimum. Staff at the clinical facilities liked

the increased interaction between students and patients and requested the students continue to provide the coping skills teaching plan.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score for Factor 10 was 6.42, which exceeded the expected outcome of the Select Six mean score of 5.5. This mean score is evidence that students believed that the program taught them to provide physical and emotional support.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year are to: 1) have students teach these skills coping skills throughout the program, 2) provide a LGBT+ advocacy presentation for faculty and students in Spring 2019, and 3) use the teaching plan assignment to teach patients coping skills as started in 2018 in the psych/mental health clinical rotation.

Measure 2.3.
Assessment Method: ATI Comprehensive Predictor
Expected Outcome: At least 85% of first-time takers will achieve a score equal to 94-95 percentile prediction of passing the NCLEX-RN

Finding. Target not met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Not Met   Overall 83.7% scored at a 94/95 percentile
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   Overall 85.4% scored at a 94/95 percentile
AY 2018-2019: Target Not Met   Overall 84.4% scored at a 94/95 percentile

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Comprehensive Predictor	Shreveport n = 45/57	78%	Shreveport n = 43/50	86%	Shreveport n = 62/73	85%
	Leesville n = 13/13	100%	Leesville n = 27/32	84%	Leesville n = 30/34	88%
	Natchitoches n = 14/16	87.5%	Natchitoches n =6/7	86%	Natchitoches n =3/3	100%
					Alexandria n= 13/18	72%
	Total N=72/86	83.7%	Total N=76/89	85.4%	Total N=108/128	84.4%
	Generic n = 57/68	83%	Generic n = 50/60	83.3%	Generic n = 84/99	85%
	*Transition n = 15/18	83%	*Transition n = 26/29	90%	*Transition n =24/29	83%
TOTAL	N= 72/86	83.7%	N=76/89	85.4%	N = 108/128	84.4%

*Transition students are LPN to ASN students

The data for measure 2.3 are presented by campus and by type of student. Generic Students are students without previous nursing experience and Transition Students are LPN students returning for their ASN degree.

Analysis. The ATI Comprehensive Predictor is a standardized exam given for the purpose of predicting success on the NCLEX-RN licensing exam. The score on the exam provides the probability that the student will be able to pass the NCLEX-RN and provides information on the student's strong and weak content areas. This report is used for remediation to strengthen areas of weakness. The ATI Comprehensive Predictor is given in 4th Level and the student's score counts as a part of the NURA 2500 course grade. The material tested on the ATI Comprehensive Predictor is a reflection of student learning throughout the ASN program.

      In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to 1) require weekly ATI practice exams for students, 2) require students to submit their ATI transcript showing completion of all required practice before taking the ATI Comprehensive Predictor, and 3) provide an ATI NCLEX-RN review in 4th level. The cost of the ATI NCLEX-RN was included in the fees that students pay throughout the program.

      In the 2018-2019 assessment year, students were required to complete weekly ATI exams and submit their ATI transcript. Students were given the opportunity to attend a live ATI NCLEX-RN review in 4th level. The review was not mandatory; therefore, some students did not attend. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 84.4% of students scored at the 94-95% on the ATI Comprehensive Predictor. The target was not met by 0.6%.

Decision. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for the 2019 assessment year is to: 1) require the ATI review be attended by all 4th level students, and 2) provide all students an additional review resource that focuses on key content presented throughout the program.

Measure 2.4.
Assessment Method: Clinlical Evaluation
Expected Outcome: At least 90% of 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, level clinical students will achieve a final grade of PASS.

Finding. The target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final grade of pass.
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final grade of pass.
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final grade of pass.

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Level 2	Shreveport n = 44	100%	Shreveport n =31/31	100%	Shreveport n= 66/66	100%
	Leesville n = 33	100%	Leesville n =14/14	100%	Leesville n= 28/28	100%
			Alexandria n=10/10	100%	Alexandria n=29/29	100%
	N=77/77	100%	N=55/55	100%	N=123/123	
	Shreveport	100%	Shreveport	100%	Shreveport	100%

Level						
Level 3	n =47		n =56/56		n =39/39	
	Leesville n = 18	100%	Leesville n =32/32	100%	Leesville n =16/16	100%
	Natchitoches n = 15	100%	Natchitoches n =4/4	100%	Natchitoches N/A not active campus	N/A
			Alexandria n=10/10	100%	Alexandria n= 19 / 19	100%
	N=80/80	100%	N=102/102	100%	N=74/74	100%
	Generic n =61	100%	Generic n =27/27	100%	Generic n =60/60	100%
	Transition n = 19	100%	Transition n =75/75	100%	Transition n =14/14	100%
	N=80/80	100%	N=102/102	100%	N=74/74	100%
Level 4	Shreveport n = 57	100%	Shreveport n =50/50	100%	Shreveport n= 73/73	100%
	Leesville n = 13	100%	Leesville n =32/32	100%	Leesville n= 34/34	100%
	Natchitoches n = 16	100%	Natchitoches n =7/7	100%	Alexandria n= 18/18	100%
					Natchitoches n=3/3	100%
	N=86/86	100%	N=89/89	100%	N=128/128	100%
	Generic n = 68	100%	Generic n =60/60	100%	Generic n= 99/99	100%
	Transition n = 18	100%	Transition n =29/29	100%	Transition n= 29/29	100%
	N=86/86	100%	N=89/89	100%	N=128/128	100%

Assessment Method: Clinlical Evaluation
Expected Outcome: 75% of students will score a 4 or 5 on the Clinical Evaluation.

Finding. The target was met.

AY 2018-2019: 319/325 or 98% of students scored a 4 or 5 on their Clinical Evaluation

Trending:

	2018-2019 (First year)	
Level 2	Shreveport n= 66/66	100%
	Leesville n= 28/28	100%
	Alexandria n=29/29	100%
	N=123/123	100%
Level 3	Shreveport n =33/39	84.6%
	Leesville n =16/16	100%
	Natchitoches n =/	N/A
	Alexandria	100%

	n=19 /19	
	68/74	92%
	Generic n =54/60	90%
	Transition n =14/14	100%
	N=68/74	92%
Level 4	Shreveport n= 76/76	100%
	Leesville n= 34/34	100%
	Alexandria n= 18/18	100%
	Natchitoches N/A no students in Nat	N/A
	N=128/128	100%
	Generic n= 99/99	100%
	Transition n= 29/29	100%
	N=128/128	100%
Total	N=300/306	98%

Analysis. Students are taught to provide caring interventions in the clinical setting throughout the program and receive feedback on their ability to do so during clinical. Students are evaluated in the clinical setting using a tool (which scores the students on a scale of 1-5, where 1=unsafe and 5=proficient without assistance) based on the following behavioral expectations: 1) explains to client the rationale for nursing measures performed, 2) performs nursing measures according to accepted procedure and professional standards, 3) actively listens to client's perception of his/her needs, 4) provides effective patient care without allowing one's own value system to interfere, 5) demonstrates a caring and respectful attitude to client while delivering care, 6) verbalizes and examines own emotional response to interactions, and 7) selects an affective response appropriate for the situation. If a student is not meeting a criterion on the evaluation tool, faculty meet with the student to institute a learning contract outlining specifically what the student is lacking and what needs to happen for that student to pass the course. Feedback is given to the student regarding their progress toward meeting those goals for the rest of the semester.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 was for faculty to 1) measure the percentage of students scoring a four or five on the clinical evaluation tool. The expected outcome for the percent of students achieving a four or five on the clinical evaluation was 75%; and 2) measure the percentage of students achieving a "pass" in the 2nd through 4th level clinical courses.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, faculty recorded the number of students scoring a 4 or 5 on the clinical evaluation, in addition to the overall final pass rate. All (100%) of students of clinical students in the 2nd through 4th level scored a final grade of

"pass" on their clinical evaluation. This met the expected outcome of 90%. Additionally, 98% of students scored a 4 or 5 (scale 1-5), meeting the expected outcome of 75%. Therefore, the target was met for both measures.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) assess students achievement of a final score of 4 or above each clinical rotation; 2) encourage students to use Advisor for Education (a resource from Course Point Plus) which assists students determine patient teaching needs based on the patient's diagnoses, medication, etc. This resource also provides printable information for use in patient teaching; 3) provide 1st level students the opportunity to observe 2nd level present service-learning presentations; and 4) provide a LGBT+ advocacy presentation for faculty and students in Spring 2019.

SLO 3. Communicate effectively with the person and health care team members to promote, maintain and restore health.

Measure 3.1.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Assist patients to interpret the meaning of health information."
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than 6.0 on a 7.0 scale in the ASN Skyfactor™ survey.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.44; Select 6 mean - unavailable
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.36; Score of 6.0
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.37; Score of 6.0

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2015-2016	2016-2017		2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q76	Q76		Q76	Q 76
		N=90		N=78	N=101
NSU	6.39	6.44		6.36	6.37
Select 6	5.75	Not available	New Benchmark 6.0	6.0	6.0

Analysis. (See Note[2]) ASN faculty teach communication skills and how to interpret health information throughout the ASN program. Students demonstrate their ability to assist patients in interpreting the meaning of health information through teaching plan assignments and in providing nursing care for patients. The teaching plan assignment requires the student to identify a teaching need for the patient, develop a teaching plan, get approval of the faculty, and implement the teaching plan.
       In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plans for 2018-2019 were for: 1) students in the 1st level clinical course to watch students in the 2nd level clinical implement a teaching plan in the clinical setting, 2) students in upper level clinicals (2nd through 4th levels) to demonstrate

for 1st level students (in lab) how to implement a teaching plan, and 3) faculty and students to utilize new patient teaching resources for the teaching plan. The first two practices were to help 1st level students to prepare for the next clinical levels and help the upper level clinical students practice their teaching skills and role model patient teaching for lower level students.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the 1st level students in the fall observed 2nd level students present service-learning projects over distance learning to ensure that all campuses were able to participate. First Level students gave faculty positive verbal feedback after the activity. In Spring 2019, students currently in 2nd level (who were in 1st level in Fall 2018) expressed to faculty they were appreciative of being able to see/know what to do and what was expected. There were some issues initially with Distance Learning sites being able to ask questions, see audience, etc. However, these issues were resolved.

Students progressing to 2nd level had access to new teaching resources, including Course Point for one year, and were able to use the new learning resources. Course Point included evidence-based practice articles which were helpful in completing assignments (care plans, teaching plans, etc.). In the 2018-2019 assessment year, NSU's mean score was 6.37 which exceeded the expected outcome of 6.0. Therefore, the target was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year will be to: 1) encourage students to use Advisor for Education (a resource from Course Point Plus) to assist in identifying patient teaching resources that can be integrated into their teaching plans. This resource also provides information which students can print off as handouts; 2) ensure all 1st level students watch 2nd level students present their service learning projects, which include teaching plans; and 3), distance learning will not be used; each campus will conduct the presentations in a face-to-face environment.

Measure 3.2.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Evaluate individual's ability to assume responsibility for self-care?"
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than 6.0 on a 7.0 scale in the ASN Skyfactor™ survey.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.43; Expected Outcome – not available
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.24; Expected Outcome - 6.0
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.24; Expected Outcome - 6.0

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017		2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q81		Q81	Q81
	N=92		N=80	N=101
NSU	6.43		6.24	6.36
Select 6	Not available	New	6.0	6.0

		Benchmark 6.0		

Analysis. (See Note[2]) For students to accomplish this measure, they must be able to effectively communicate with the patient and evaluate the patient's perception of the communication. Students learn these skills through faculty demonstration, practicing communication with patients and their significant others, and in analyzing a documented conversation (process recording assignment). Students demonstrate these skills through the teaching plan assignment. The teaching plan assignment requires the student to assess the patient and identify a knowledge deficit, research and learn about the identified deficit, develop a teaching plan, get approval from faculty, implement the teaching plan, and document the evaluation of the teaching. The teaching plan is a clinical assignment in 2nd and 3rd Levels. In addition, students are evaluated on communication skills each semester and identify teaching needs for patients in all clinical levels.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to 1) utilize the Virtual Simulation resource related to patient teaching in the new text, and 2) ensure that students utilized return demonstration or return verbalization techniques to evaluate patient comprehension of student teaching.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plans were implemented. Virtual Simulation was utilized in first level as a new resource. However, not all teaching materials were explored. As faculty become more knowledgeable of new resources, students will be given instructions on how to utilize the new teaching plan resources. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.36, which met the expected outcome of 6.0. Therefore, the target was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year are to: 1) make up missed clinical hours with Virtual-Sim [Virtual-Simulation aid in recognition of patient teaching needs], 2) utilize Virtual-Sim in teaching first level courses, 3) investigate the use of Virtual-Simulation for the psych portion of NURA 2100/2110, 4) encourage students with access to Course Point Plus to utilize patient teaching resources in the clinical setting.

Measure 3.3. & 3.4.
Measure 3.3 and 3.4 are similar in how they are taught and methods to improve. Each question and findings will be presented first, and the analysis and decision will be addressed together.

Measure 3.3.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Communicate with healthcare professionals to deliver high quality patient care?"
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than the mean score of the Select 6 in the ASN Skyfactor™ survey

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.32; Select 6 mean score - 5.67
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.46; Select 6 mean score - 5.76
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.39; Select 6 mean score - 5.69

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q68	Q 68	Q68
	N=91	N=79	N=98
NSU	6.32	6.46	6.39
Select 6	5.67	5.76	5.69

Measure 3.4.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Work with inter-professional teams?"
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than the mean score of the Select 6 in the ASN Skyfactor™ survey

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.36; Select 6 mean score – 5.61
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.18; Select 6 mean score – 5.72
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.36; Select 6 mean score – 5.62

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q69	Q69	Q69
	N=91	N=80	N=100
NSU	6.36	6.18	6.36
Select 6	5.61	5.72	5.62

Analysis. Students learn communication skills and interprofessional teamwork through a variety of methods, which include: didactic course work, practicing in the clinical setting, simulation with classmates, mock code simulation, receiving report from the nurse when initiating care for patients, and reporting about the care given to their assigned patients to the oncoming nurse when leaving the clinical setting. In the simulation scenarios, NSU students may work with physician's assistant, pharmacy, and physical therapy students.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 was to initiate interprofessional simulation training in the last semester of the program.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. However, not all students were able to attend interprofessional simulation as space was not available for all students due to several factors (e.g. scheduling, student availability from different professions, and facility availability). Consequently, fourth level faculty: presented a lecture on interprofessional communication; presented a post conference focused on interprofessional collaboration in the clinical setting; and added a discussion board in NURA 2550 focused on interprofessional collaboration.

Feedback from students on interprofessional simulation was positive. Comments from students about the interprofessional simulation included: "It was helpful seeing the other side of things and challenged us as nurses to think critically and be an advocate", "Very much enjoyed this simulation. It challenged me to think critically and see how other roles are performed", "It felt more real world and experiencing collaboration was fun", "This was fun and informative. It was nice to have the collaboration with the PA students." In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score for Measure 3.3(Skyfactor Question #68) was 6.39, which exceeded the expected outcome of the Select Six mean score of 5.69. Additionally, the NSU mean score for Measure 3.4 (Skyfactor Question #69) was 6.36, which also exceeded the expected outcome of the Select Six mean score of 5.62. Therefore, the target was met for measures 3.3 and 3.4.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year are to: 1) review and revise interprofessional content initiated in 4th level in 2018, 2) initiate identification of interprofessional collaboration in first level, and 3) thread identification of interprofessional collaboration actions and opportunities throughout each clinical level.

Measure 3.5.
This measure comes from the Clinical Evaluation Tool of the clinical courses (NURA 1110, 1510, 2110, and 2510). As a component of the evaluation tool, Critical Element #2 is an evaluation of the ability of the student to use therapeutic verbal and written communication skills in the clinical course. Students must score a *satisfactory* on this critical element to pass the course.

Assessment Method: Clinical Evaluation: Critical Element #2 Communication Demonstrates therapeutic verbal and written communication skills with faculty, clients, family/significant others, and health care team members with minimal assistance.
Expected Outcome: At least 90% of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th level students will achieve a final grade of Satisfactory.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final grade of Satisfactory
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final grade of Satisfactory
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   100% of students achieved a final grade of Satisfactory

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Level 1	Shreveport n = 46/46	100%	Shreveport n = 69/69	100%	Shreveport n= 96/96	100%
	Leesville n = 26/27	96.3%	Leesville n = 32/32	100%	Leesville n = 39/39	100%
	Alexandria n= 12/13	92.3%	Alexandria n= 22/22	100%	Alexandria n= 33/33	100%
	N=84/86	97.7%	N=123/123	100%	N=168/168	100%

Level 2	Shreveport n =44	100%	Shreveport n =31	100%	Shreveport n = 66/66	100%
	Leesville n = 33	100%	Leesville n =14	100%	Leesville n= 28/28	100%
			Alexandria n= 10	100%	Alexandria n=29/29	100%
	N=77/77	100%	N=55/55	100%	N=123/123	100%
Level 3	Shreveport n = 47	100%	Shreveport n =56	100%	Shreveport n =39/39	100%
	Leesville n = 18	100%	Leesville n =32	100%	Leesville n =16/16	100%
	Natchitoches n = 15	100%	Natchitoches n =4	100%	Natchitoches n =	N/A
			Alexandria n=10	100%	Alexandria n=19/19	100%
	N=80/80	100%	N=112/112	100%	N=74/74	100%
	Generic n = 61	100%	Generic n =27	100%	Generic n =60/60	100%
	Transition n = 19	100%	Transition n =75	100%	Transition n =14/14	100%
	N=80/80	100%	N=112/112	100%	N=74/74	100%
Level 4	Shreveport n = 57	100%	Shreveport n = 50	100%	Shreveport n= 73/73	100%
	Leesville n = 13	100%	Leesville n = 32	100%	Leesville n= 34/34	100%
					Alexandria n= 18/18	100%
	Natchitoches n = 16	100%	Natchitoches n = 7	100%	Natchitoches n=3/3	100%
	N=86/86	100%	N=89/89	100%	N=128/128	100%
	Generic n = 68	100%	Generic n = 60	100%	Generic n= 99/99	100%
	Transition n = 18	100%	Transition n = 29	100%	Transition n= 29/29	100%
	N=86/86	100%	N=89/89	100%	N=128/128	100%

Analysis. ASN faculty teach communication skills throughout the ASN program. Students demonstrate communication skills each clinical day by communicating with patients, faculty, nurses, and other health care providers. In addition, students communicate by written means through documenting assessments, nursing notes (patient care documentation), care plans, process recordings (analysis of a conversation), and teaching plans. Students are initially taught the principles of therapeutic communication in the first clinical courses and use those principles more in depth in subsequent nursing courses. The ability to communicate efficiently is a critical behavior in clinical courses. On the clinical evaluation tool, students must score a satisfactory to pass the course. If a student is not meeting the criteria for this element during the semester, faculty counsel the student regarding the deficit and develop a plan of action for the student to be successful. The faculty and the student sign a learning contract outlining specific behaviors that must be demonstrated to be successful and pass the course.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for 2018-2019 was to initiate interprofessional

simulation training in the last semester of the program. Interprofessional simulation experiences would give students opportunities to communicate with students from other professions.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. However, not all students were able to attend interprofessional simulation as space was not available for all students due to several factors (e.g. scheduling, student availability from different professions, and facility availability). Consequently, fourth level faculty: presented a lecture on interprofessional communication; presented a post conference focused on interprofessional collaboration in the clinical setting; and added a discussion board in NURA 2550 focused on interprofessional collaboration. Feedback from students on interprofessional simulation was positive. Comments from students about the interprofessional simulation included: "It was helpful seeing the other side of things and challenged us as nurses to think critically and be an advocate", "It felt more real world and experiencing collaboration was fun", "This was fun and informative. It was nice to have the collaboration with the PA students." In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 100% of students achieved a satisfactory on Critical Element #2 Communication of the clinical evaluation tool. This met the expected outcome of 90%, therefore, the target was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year are to: 1) review and revise the interprofessional content initiated in 4th level during 2018, and 2) integrate virtual-simulation in each level of ASN program as each simulation requires the student to communicate with the patient and other healthcare providers and demonstrates professional communication with the patient and other healthcare providers.

SLO 4. Provide health education to reduce risk, promote and maintain optimal health

Measure 4.1.
Assessment Method: Teaching Plan (3rd Level)
Expected Outcome: At least 80% of students will achieve a score of 3 or higher on scale of 1-5.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of $\geq$ 3
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of $\geq$ 3
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of $\geq$ 3

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
3rd Level	Shreveport n = 47	100%	Shreveport n =56/56	100%	Shreveport n =77/77	100%
	Leesville n = 18	100%	Leesville n =32/32	100%	Leesville n =28/28	100%
	Natchitoches n = 15	100%	Natchitoches n =4/4	100%	Natchitoches N/A	N/A
			Alexandria	100%	Alexandria	100%

			n=10/10		n=31/31	
					Total N=136/136	100%
	Generic n = 61	100%	Generic n =27/27	100%	Generic n =107/107	100%
	Transition n = 19	100%	Transition n =75/75	100%	Transition n =29/29	100%
					Total N=136/136	100%

Analysis. ASN faculty teach communication skills throughout the ASN program. Students learn these communication skills through didactic courses, faculty demonstration of communication, practicing communication with patients and their significant others, and when analyzing documented conversations (process recording assignment). In addition, students are evaluated on communication skills each semester in clinical and identify teaching needs for patients in all clinical levels.

Students demonstrate their ability to provide health education for patients through teaching plan assignments and in providing nursing care for patients. The teaching plan assignment requires the student to assess the patient and identify a knowledge deficit, research and learn about the topic, develop a teaching plan, get approval from faculty, implement the teaching plan, and document evaluation of the teaching. For students to score a "three" on the teaching plan, they must communicate well with the patient and evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. For the 2018-2019 assessment year, the plan was to add a teaching plan in the psych-mental health rotation. Previously, students did not have a teaching plan assignment in the Psych-Mental Health rotation (3rd level). The focus of the teaching plan was for students to teach patients appropriate coping skills.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Students developed and implemented a teaching plan while in their psych/mental health rotation in 3rd level. Staff at the clinical facilities reported to faculty that the increased interactions between students and patients were beneficial and requested the students continue this assignment. All students (100%) in the third level clinical rotations passed the teaching plan assignment in their mental health rotation. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 100% of students achieved a score of 3 or better on the teaching plans required in 3rd level. This exceeded the expected outcome of 80%. Therefore, the target was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) use the teaching plan assignment to teach patients coping skills as started in 2018 in the psych/mental health clinical rotation; and 2) encourage students to use Advisor for Education (a resource from Course Point Plus) to assist in identifying patient teaching resources that can be integrated into their teaching plans. This resource also provides information which students can print off as handouts.

Measure 4.2.
Assessment Method: Service-Learning Project (2nd Level)
Expected Outcome: At least 95% of students will achieve a score of PASS.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of PASS
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of PASS
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of PASS

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Level 2	Shreveport n= 44	100%	Shreveport n= 31/31	100%	Shreveport n= 66/66	100%
	Leesville n= 33	100%	Leesville n= 14/14	100%	Leesville n= 28/28	100%
			Alexandria N=10/10	100%	Alexandria n=29/29	100%
	TOTAL:		N=55/55	100%	N=123/123	100%

Analysis. The service-learning project involves groups of students performing a community needs assessment, identifying a project from the needs assessment, obtaining faculty approval, developing a teaching plan, and presenting the project incorporating a PowerPoint presentation. Groups consist of three to four students who select a project, such as teaching health food choices to a group in the community (e.g. seniors, youth groups).

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to revise the rubric for the presentation portion of the service-learning project and allow the students to use not only PowerPoint, but to use other modalities to enhance their presentation (e.g. display board, pamphlets, apps, technology)

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. The rubric was revised to offer the student options of presentation formats for the service-learning project. As a result, students used a variety of teaching methods in their presentations. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 100% of students achieved a score of "Pass" on their service-learning project, exceeding the expected outcome of 95%. Therefore, the target was met.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) encourage students to use Advisor for Education (a resource from Course Point Plus) to assist in identifying patient teaching resources that can be integrated into their teaching plans. This resource also provides information which students can print off as handouts; and 2) ensure all 1st level students observe 2nd level students present their service learning projects, which include teaching plans; It is expected that first level students will gain a better understanding of expectations for service-learning assignments for the next clinical level.

SLO 5. Manage nursing care effectively utilizing human, physical, financial, and technological resources to meet the needs of the person.

Measure 5.1.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Delegate nursing care while retaining accountability?"
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than 6.0 on a 7.0 scale in the ASN Skyfactor™ survey.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.39; Expected Outcome – not available
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.14; Expected Outcome - 6.0
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.31; Expected Outcome - 6.0

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017		2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q83		Q83	Q83
NSU	6.39		6.14	6.31
Select 6	Not available	New Benchmark 6.0	6.0	6.0

Analysis. (Note[2]) Faculty teach delegation in the classroom and the clinical setting starting with NURA 1100 & 1110 and continue through the last courses (NURA 2500/2510/2550). Principles and important considerations regarding delegation are also part of the didactic content taught in the classroom, as well as specific application in the clinical setting. In the 4th Level course, NURA 2550, skills are further refined through Discussion Board assignments.

   In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to utilize the new text resources (multi-media) to enhance teaching of delegation content in each level.

   In the 2018-2019 assessment year, first level faculty were able to use the new text resources. The remaining levels will be using the new text resources as students with the resources progress. Delegation content was threaded throughout courses in first through fourth levels. In fourth level, delegation test questions were added to lectures and exams, and a discussion board was added in NURA 2550 specific to delegation. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.31, which exceeded the expected outcome of 6.0, and increased from the previous year of 6.14.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) begin utilizing new LWW texts and online resources in all levels, and 2) augment delegation content that was initiated in the past assessment year.

Measure 5.2.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Use appropriate technologies to assess patients?"
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than the mean score of the Select 6 in the ASN Skyfactor™ survey.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.32; Expected Outcome – 5.63
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.28; Expected Outcome – 5.74
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.39; Expected Outcome – 5.71

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q64	Q64	Q64
NSU	6.32	6.28	6.39
Select 6	5.63	5.74	5.71

Analysis. Students are taught to use technology while in the ASN program. A few examples of the technology are medication dispensing machines, IV infusers, vital sign machines, and telemetry. Use of this technology is taught in the didactic courses (limited), in the lab, and in clinical settings. Students in the Leesville and Alexandria clinical sites had access to the healthcare facilities electronic health record (EHR). However, students in the Shreveport area did not have access to any EHR. In addition, the healthcare facilities in the Shreveport area commented at the Advisory Council that the graduates had a difficult time learning how to use the EHR as new graduates/employees.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to utilize the new resources that would be available with the new texts selected for 2018-2019 assessment year. Resources included online textbooks, quizzes, a drug resource, virtual simulations, and care plan resources and templates.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented in first and second level. Feedback from students and faculty was positive. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.39, which exceeded the expected outcome of the Select Six mean score of 5.71.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) eliminate Electronic Health Record Tutor requirement as all clinical facilities are increasingly providing student access to the electronic health record, 2) educate students on new technologies in the health care setting, and 3) begin use of iPads for student testing and resources in Fall 2019, starting with 1st level and progressing to the next level each semester.

Measure 5.3.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Incorporate knowledge of cost factors when delivering care?"

Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than the mean score of the Select 6 in the ASN Skyfactor™ survey.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.19; Expected Outcome – 5.47
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.01; Expected Outcome – 5.61
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean score – 6.02; Expected Outcome – 5.49

Trending:

Skykfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q67	Q67	Q67
NSU	6.19	6.01	6.02
Select 6	5.47	5.61	5.49

Analysis. Students begin learning about cost factors associated with delivering healthcare in the first pre-clinical nursing course, NURA 1050. First level and subsequent levels also contribute in teaching this concept, including the cost of healthcare and the cost of high-risk areas that contribute to the cost burden for healthcare facilities.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to incorporate cost factors to all content (as appropriate) in the nursing courses with statistics that show the cost associated with delivering care.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Second level added information related to cost of health care and preventive care. Faculty ensured that cost of care was threaded throughout the program in preventive care, judicious use of supplies, documentation of equipment use, etc. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.02, which exceeded the expected outcome of the Select Six mean score of 5.49. Therefore, the expected outcome was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) update information on technology and cost factors in delivering health care in each didactic and clinical course.

SLO 6.   Demonstrate professional behaviors including adherence to standards of practice and legal and ethical codes of nursing conduct and accountability to the profession of nursing and society.

Measure 6.1.
Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – "To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Apply an ethical decision-making framework to clinical situations."
Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than 6.0 on a 7.0 scale in the ASN annual Skyfactor™ survey.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.48; Select 6 mean score – not available
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.50; Expected Outcome - 6.0 (Scale 1-7)
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   ASN mean – 6.52; Expected Outcome - 6.0

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017		2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q75		Q75	Q75
NSU	6.48		6.5	6.52
Select 6	Not available	New Benchmark 6.0	6.0	6.0

Analysis. (See Note[2]) Students in the ASN program learn about standards of practice, ethical and legal codes of nursing conduct, and accountability throughout nursing course. These concepts are integrated in didactic and clinical courses. Teaching these topics begins in NURA 1050 where students are introduced to the ANA Code of Ethics and continues in 1st Level through 4th level with discussions and scenarios incorporating the ANA Code of Ethics.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was for the 1) faculty in 2nd Level ASN to share with all campuses and faculty how they implemented an ethical simulation scenario followed by a debate related to issues in the simulation. The expectation was for ASN clinical levels to have one activity/exercise/assignment related to ethics.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented in second and fourth levels. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.52, which exceeded the expected outcome of 6.0. This continued a five year upward trend on this measure and is evidence that students felt that the ASN program taught them to apply an ethical decision-making framework to clinical situations.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) add a specific assignment related to ethics in the first and third level clinical courses, along with the current assignments in 2nd and 4th levels.

Measure 6.2.
Professional Values are measured by the Skyfactor™ Survey Factor 8 which is comprised of five questions: To what degree did this nursing program teach you to: 1) provide culturally competent care, 2) support fairness in the delivery of care, 3) act as an advocate for vulnerable patients, 4) demonstrate accountability for your own actions, and 5) honor the right of patients to make decisions about their health care? Students can score these items from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Exceptional).

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Factor 8 (comprised of 5 questions)

Expected Outcome: Equal or greater than a mean score of 5.5 on a 7.0 scale on the ASN Skyfactor™ survey.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Outcome Met   ASN mean – 6.54; Expected Outcome - 5.5
AY 2017-2018: Outcome Met   ASN mean – 6.46; Expected Outcome - 5.5
AY 2018-2019: Outcome Met   ASN mean – 6.48; Expected Outcome - 5.5

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Factor 8	Factor 8	Factor 8
NSU	6.54	6.46	6.48
Benchmark	5.5	5.5	5.5

Analysis. Each of the questions in Factor 8 is a part of the American Nurses' Association (ANA) Code of Ethics for Nurses. Students in the ASN program are introduced to the ANA Code of Ethics for Nurses in NURA 1050. Faculty teach professional values in each nursing course (didactic and clinical) and are role models for this behavior. Professional behaviors that are taught and modeled include cultural competence, patient advocacy, patient rights, communication skills, integrity, accountability, and collaboration. Additionally, in the clinical courses, students are evaluated on professionalism (accountability, responsibility, honesty, integrity, respectfulness, and adherence to professional standards), which is a critical behavior (required to pass the course).

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for 2018-2019 to enhance student learning is to add a cultural diversity project to the NURA 2550 course.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. A cultural diversity project was added to NURA 2550. Student reported that they "learned a lot about different cultures" and would be able to address needs related to culture when they become a nurse. Students also stated that they liked seeing the other student's assignments. This assignment also promoted group learning and teamwork. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean was 6.48, which exceeded the expected outcome of the Select Six mean score of 5.88. This score and qualitative data is evidence that students felt the ASN program taught them to: 1) provide culturally competent care, 2) support fairness in the delivery of care, 3) act as an advocate for vulnerable patients, 4) demonstrate accountability for their own actions, and 5) honor the right of patients to make decisions about their health care.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is for faculty to: 1) provide a LGBT+ advocacy training for students and faculty, and 2) make assignments in NURA 2550 relevant to cultures reflective of the geographic area in which the students live.

Measure 6.3.
Assessment Method: Clinical Evaluation Item #4 in NURA 2110. Formulate appropriate plan of nursing interventions which adequately meets client needs relevant to formulated goal(s).
Expected Outcome: 90% of students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.

This outcome is measured by collecting the data from the evaluation of care plans developed by students in NURA 2110, which is the third clinical course for ASN Students. Item #4 on the evaluation tool indicates the score the student achieved on this assignment. Scores can range from 1-5. During the semester, the students have three rotations. For each of the three clinical rotations in NURA 2110 the students receive a score between 1 and 5. The scores for each rotation are averaged for one score. Measure 6.3 consists of the percentage of students who achieve an average score of 3 (passing) on the final attempt of the care plan assignment. The outcome measure states that 90% of students achieve a score of 3 or higher.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of ≥ 3
AY 2017-2018: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of ≥ 3
AY 2018-2019: Target Met   Finding – 100% of students achieved a score of ≥ 3

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018 (Corrected 2018-2019)		2018-2019	
Level 3	Shreveport n = 47	100%	Shreveport n = 59/59	100%	Shreveport n = 77/77	100%
	Leesville n = 18	100%	Leesville n = 36/36	100%	Leesville n = 28/28	100%
	Natchitoches n = 15	100%	Alexandria n = 10/10	100%	Alexandria n =31/31	100%
TOTAL	N=80		N=105/105	100%	N=136/136	100%
	Generic n = 61	100%	Generic n = 78/78	100%	Generic n = 107/107	100%
	Transition n = 19	100%	Transition n = 27/27	100%	Transition n = 29/29	100%
TOTAL	80/80	100%	105/105	100%	136/136	100%

Trending:

	2018-2019	
Level 3 Three or better on first attempt	Shreveport n = 77/77	100%
	Leesville n = 28/28	100%
	Alexandria n =31/31	100%
	Generic n = 107/107	100%
	Transition	100%

	n = 29/29	
TOTAL	N=136/136	100%

Analysis.   For the care plan assignment, students utilize the nursing process to analyze a patient's health record, perform a physical assessment, and develop a plan of care for the assigned patient. The care plan must be individualized and based on patient specific data. If students do not receive a satisfactory on the first care plan submission, they are given feedback and allowed to resubmit the assignment. Students must obtain a satisfactory score on the care plan as it is a critical behavior (meaning each student must achieve a satisfactory to pass the course).

Students in the ASN program are introduced to the ANA Code of Ethics for Nurses in NURA 1050. Faculty teach professional values in each nursing course (didactic and clinical) and are role models for this behavior. Professional behaviors that are taught and modeled include cultural competence, patient advocacy, patient rights, communication skills, integrity, accountability, and collaboration.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to: 1) collect data on what percent of students are able to score a three or better on the care plan on the first attempt, and 2) continue to collect data on achievement of a score of three or better on the final submission. Having additional data to analyze will give more information on how much students understand about creating a care plan initially. This will help faculty revise teaching methods, offer more resources, and generally guide faculty in ways to facilitate student learning.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year the above plan was implemented. All students (100%) achieved a score of 3 or better on the care plan. This year the faculty also collected data on if the students achieved a 3 or better on the first attempt. All (100%) students achieved the score of 3 or better on their first attempt. This means that students understand how to develop a plan of care for a patient. Therefore, the expected outcome of 90% was met and the target was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) practice care plans in groups of a combination of generic and LPN students, 2) have groups give feedback to each other on developed care plans, and 3) complete a care plan all clinical rotations in 3rd level (Neuro, Psych, OB), 4) re-evaluate the use of 6.3 as a measure. Though this measure is an indication of the ability to develop a plan of care, measure for SLO 6 should focus more on the demonstration of behaviors.

Comprehensive summary of key evidence of improvements based on analysis of results.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the ASN program implemented several actions to enhance student learning, achieve programmatic student learning outcomes, aid students graduating on-time, successfully passing the NCLEX-RN, and becoming

employed as registered nurses. Evidence supporting achievement of these goals include:

- A live ATI NCLEX-RN review was offered to all students in their last semester (4th level) prior to administering the ATI Comprehensive Predictor.

- The ATI Comprehensive Predictor (predictive test of success on the NCLEX-RN) given in fourth level produced individualized student reports of strengths and deficits in knowledge which were utilized to facilitate student remediation on those concepts in 4th Level, thereby helping students prepare for the NCLEX-RN exam.

- Students participated in interprofessional simulation for the 2018-2019 assessment year.

- Students participated in ethical decision-making simulations and debates.

- All clinical students gained access to Electronic Health Records in all health care facilities.

- Students and faculty utilized Course Point Plus (electronic resources associated with LWW Taylor Fundamentals book) which has adaptive quizzing, Virtual-Simulations, a drug guide, continuously updating information, links to research articles for specific content, dosage calculations, and care plan sections with references to associated scholarly articles.

- Third Level students developed care plans in each clinical rotation (Psych, Neuro, and Women's Health)

- Students began prioritizing patient care needs daily in their clinical rotations, utilizing the patient daily profile (2nd – 4th level).

- First Level students learned about service learning and teaching through peer collaboration with 2nd level students.

- Fourth Level students were required to take practice exams before taking the ATI Comprehensive Predictor exam.

- Students were encouraged to use different presentation modalities to enhance dissemination of their service-learning projects.

- Faculty incorporated ATI standardized exams in each clinical level to assess and inform students of content areas of competency and deficiency.

- Faulty implemented learning contracts for students not successful in passing required criteria throughout the semester.

- Faculty addressed deficiencies related to unprofessional behaviors or conduct in formative student evaluations.

- Faculty met individually with students to review tests and counsel on study habits

for all students who scored an 82% or lower on a test or who had an overall average of 82% or less in the course.

- Students in 4th level video-taped themselves answering interview questions, posted the video to the course Moodle shell, and provided feedback to all students on their video. Faculty and students loved the assignment and thought it gave great feedback and assistance in learning how to interview in a professional manner.

- Faculty added content related to interprofessional communication in NURA 2500, NURA 2550, and in NURA 2510 in post conference.

- Students gained access to high fidelity simulation through healthcare partners of NSU (Willis-Knighton Health Systems and Christus St. Frances Cabrini Hospital).

- Faculty were provided access to Nurse Tim online faculty development continuing education options at no personal cost.

- Faculty implemented the use of new LWW text and online resources for first level. Resources that were utilized included an online text, adaptive testing, drug guidebook, care plans, and disease profiles.

- Initial steps were taken to obtain iPads for student testing and resources with plans to implement in Fall 2019.

- Third Level mental health students developed and implemented a teaching plan for patients related to improving coping skills. Nurses at the facility requested that the students continue to conduct teaching plans for patients.

- Faculty elected to make participation at the live ATI NCLEX-RN review mandatory for all students after the Spring 2018 semester.

- Faculty continued the practice of reviewing clinical skills in 4th level on all campuses.

Other data that demonstrated program success or benefitted the program included:

- Faculty advised students before pre-clinical courses and each clinical semester thereafter.

- Two (2) ASN faculty positions were funded through the healthcare partnership with the Willis-Knighton Health Systems.

- Five (5) ASN faculty continued work on a doctoral degree.

- One ASN faculty earned a DNP degree.

- Five faculty achieved CNE certification.

- The practice of admitting an ASN nursing cohort on the Alexandria campus and

the Leesville campus twice a year continued.

Some interventions implemented will not result in immediate improvements on SLO measures, like the Skyfactor survey. Some measures initiated affected the beginning students (i.e. ethical simulation and debate) and those students will not take the Skyfactor survey until those students graduate and the data is aggregated for the year and sent to NSU.

Plan of action moving forward.

In the 2019-2020 assessment year, the ASN program will begin admitting students to the new ASN track – Medic/Paramedic to ASN – on the Leesville and Shreveport campuses. This new program comes at the request of the communities of interest. Additionally, the ASN program will utilize i-Pads for student testing and course resources starting with the First Level in the Fall 2019 and with each incoming first level cohort thereafter. Thus, all levels will be using the technology within four semesters. This addition will make student resources more accessible, portable, and offer many more resources for the student.

The ASN program will also be implementing the revised ASN curriculum, which adds the NURA 1160 Dosage Calculations and NURA 1550 Pharmacology courses. Below are additional plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year.

- Provide LGBT+ advocacy training for students and faculty in 2019.

- Increase teaching with virtual simulations in all level.

- Utilize virtual simulations to make up a portion of missed clinical hours.

- Review books for Second Level to determine whether to use LWW books.

- Incorporate the use of LWW resources in 2nd-4th levels – 1st level to learn more of what is offered and how they can be used (i.e. Advisor for Education to teach patients).

- Require all 4th Level students to attend the NLCEX-RN review.

- Provide a resource from ATI that focuses on key content presented throughout the program.

- Investigate how to add more interprofessional collaboration training for students. Ideas include working with social workers, and other professionals, holding a forum/panel which introduces other professions (multiple disciplines) – starting in 2nd level (include NURA 1060).

- Begin identifying interprofessional collaboration in 1st Level clinicals and continue through all levels.

- Engage 1st Level ASN students by incorporating i-Pad use for resources and testing in Fall 2019; each semester after that, the incoming 1st Level students will be added for i-Pad use.

- Have 1st Level students complete three practice care plans, which they receive feedback on, before turning in the graded care plan.

- Update information used in teaching nursing care utilizing financial, technological, human, and physical resources.

- Begin initiation of interlevel collaboration, students working in pairs (faculty investigating initiating this in the program or certain levels- across campuses and between levels).

- Enhance delegation content in each level.

- Eliminate the EHR Tutor as all students have access to the electronic health records for clinical. This will decrease expenses for students.

- Critically evaluate use of measures for each SLO and revise for use in 2019.