

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Bachelor of Science in Nursing

College: College of Nursing (College of Nursing and School of Allied Health)

Prepared by: Pamela Holcombe/Dr. Debra Clark

Date: 6-14-2019

Approved by: Dr. Dana Clawson, Dean

Date: 6-14-2019

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 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.

Bachelor of Science in Nursing's (BSN) Mission Statement: Same as the CON

BSN Program Goals:

1. To prepare beginner, professional nurses who provide direct and indirect care to individuals, families, groups, communities, and populations.
2. To prepare beginner, professional nurses who design, manage, and coordinate care.
3. To prepare beginner, professional nurses to become members of the nursing profession.
4. To provide a foundation for graduate education

BSN Objectives:

The Bachelor of Science in nursing graduate will be able to:

1. Integrate theory from nursing, the arts, humanities, and sciences to provide culturally sensitive care in the global community.
2. Apply the nursing process using critical thinking, communication, assessment and technical skills.
3. Collaborate with clients and other members of the interdisciplinary health care team for health promotion, risk reduction, disease prevention, disease management, and health restoration.
4. Utilize information and health care technologies in nursing practice.
5. Integrate research findings to promote evidence-based nursing practice.
6. Incorporate knowledge of economic, legal, ethical, and political factors influencing health care systems and policy to advocate for recipients of nursing care.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

7. Apply principles of leadership to design, manage, coordinate and evaluate health care delivery.
8. Demonstrate professional nursing standards, values, and accountability.
9. Assume responsibility for professional development and lifelong learning

Methodology: The assessment process for the BSN 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 the BSN Assessment Committee and analyzed at the BSN Assessment Committee meeting. The committee discusses data analysis, interpretation, actions, trends, results, and future plans to address needed improvements.
- (4) The Assessment committee's analysis, interpretation, and results of data trending are discussed in the program curriculum committee meetings. Action plans are developed with faculty input.
- (5) Significant findings are reported in the Administrative Council meeting.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Note¹: 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 BSN program with like programs across the nation. The Skyfactor™ company then compares the NSU program mean to schools with the same Carnegie classification. The NSU BSN program uses the Carnegie classification as a standard of comparison for the Skyfactor™ questions that are used as an assessment measure. The scale for responses to the Skyfactor™ questions ranges from one to seven with seven being the highest (or most positive) score.

Note²: Assessment period. The BSN 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.

Note³: The BSN program has five (5) clinical levels. The entry clinical level is referred to as 1st level. The last level before graduation is the 5th level.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

SLO 1. Integrate theory from nursing, the arts, humanities, and sciences to provide culturally sensitive care in the global community.

The findings for the two measures of this SLO will be presented separately. Analysis and the decisions for the measures will be presented together, as the Comprehensive Predictor is a practice NCLEX-RN test and interventions to address the Comprehensive Predictor measure (1.1) also address the NCLEX-RN measure (1.2).

Measure 1.1.

Assessment Method: Comprehensive Predictor

The ATI Comprehensive Predictor is a standardized exam given for the purpose of predicting success on the NCLEX-RN licensing exam. This 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.

Expected outcome: 80% of students will score 94% within two attempts of taking the ATI Comprehensive Predictor

Finding. Target was met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; 100% of students achieved a 94%
AY 2017-2018: Target Met; 95% of students achieved a 94%
AY 2018-2019: Target Met; 82% of students achieved a 94%

Trending:

Comp Predictor	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
1 st Attempt	Shreveport n = 86/121	71%	Shreveport n = 85/127	66.9%	Shreveport n = 85/128	66%	Shreveport n = 82/117	70%
	Alexandria n = 30/33	90.9%	Alexandria n = 25/27	92.5%	Alexandria n = 10/17	59%	Alexandria n = 25/36	69%
							Natchitoches N=11/16	69%
	Total 116/154	75.3%	Total 110/154	71.4%	Total 68/103	66%	Total 118/169	70%
2 nd Attempt			Shreveport 33/42	78.6%	Shreveport N=29/36	81%	Shreveport 12/33	36%
			Alexandria 2/2	100%	Alexandria N-6/6	100%	Alexandria 5/8	62.5
							Natchitoches 4/5	80%
					Total 130/137	95%	Total 139/169	82%

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Measure 1.2.

Assessment Method: NCLEX-RN: The NCLEX-RN is the licensing exam for Registered Nurses.

Expected outcome: 90% of graduates who take the NCLEX-RN will be successful on the first attempt

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met 96% passed the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt

AY 2017-2018: Target Met 96% passed the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt

AY 2018-2019: Target Met 99% passed the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
NLCEX-RN Pass Rate on First Attempt	Shreveport N=104/109	95.5%	Shreveport N = 109/115	95%	Shreveport 100/100	100%
	Alexandria N = 27/27	100%	Alexandria N = 23/23	100%	Alexandria 33/33	100%
					Natchitoches 16/17	94%
Total	N=131/136	96.3%	N=132/138	96%	149/150	99%

Analysis. The ATI Comprehensive Predictor is a standardized examination that evaluates student's future ability to be successful on the NCLEX-RN. The overall score is based on the percent probability of the student passing the NCLEX-RN. The NCLEX-RN is the licensing exam graduates must pass to become a registered nurse.

In the 2017-2018 AY the target was met. Based on analysis of the results, the plans for the measure 1.1 for the 2018-2019 assessment year were to 1) give the ATI Comprehensive Predictor at the end of 4th level, and 2) require students who did not achieve a score of 94% on the Comprehensive Predictor to take NURB 4950 the following semester and follow an ATI remediation plan, which is based on areas of the student's weakness. Students in NURB 4950 would retake the Comp Predictor.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met (96%). The plans for measure 1.2 for the 2018-2019 assessment year were for faculty to: 1) give the ATI Comprehensive Predictor at the end of 4th level, and 2) require students who did not achieve a score of 94% to take NURB 4950 and remediate based on their area of deficiency. Students in NURB 4950 would retake the Comp Predictor as part of their course requirement.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 4th level students had a live ATI NCLEX review and the ATI Comprehensive Predictor was given in 4th level. If the student made a 94% probability of passing the NCLEX based on the ATI Comprehensive Predictor, they did not have to take NURB 4950. If they scored below the 94%, they had to enroll in NURB 4950, remediate on areas of academic weakness indicated by ATI Comprehensive Predictor report, and retake the Comprehensive Predictor. In the 2018-

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

2019 assessment year, 82% of students achieved a score of 94% by the 2nd attempt, meeting the target of 80%. For measure 1.2, 99% of graduates passed the NCLEX on the first attempt, meeting the expected outcome of 90%.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) provide the live ATI NCLEX review in the 5th level prior to students taking the Comprehensive Predictor, 2) give the Comprehensive Predictor within a few weeks of the review, and 3) make the student's earned score on the Comprehensive Predictor a portion of the course grade in NURB 4230 Leadership.

It is expected that by making the Comprehensive Predictor count as a portion of the course grade in NURB 4230, instead of a mandatory requirement in 4th level, students will be better prepared and more motivated to do well on the exam. Additionally, providing the NLCEX review prior to administration of the ATI Comprehensive Predictor will provide students with the additional review/knowledge needed to do well on the exam.

SLO 2. Apply the nursing process using critical thinking, communication, assessment, and technical skills.

The first three measures for SLO 2 are from the Skyfactor™ student satisfaction survey. Findings for the three measures will be presented separately. Analysis and decisions for the measures will be presented together.

Measure 2.1.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Survey "To what degree did your non-nursing courses enhance your ability to: integrate theories and concepts from liberal education into nursing practice."

Expected outcome: NSU mean score will be equal to or greater than the Carnegie mean score

Finding. Target Met

AY 2016-2017: Target Not Met; NSU mean score – 4.85; Carnegie mean score – 4.88

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met; NSU mean score – 4.64; Carnegie mean score – 4.91

AY 2018-2019: Target Met; NSU mean score – 4.93; Carnegie mean score – 4.83

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q66	Q 65	Q65
	N=212	N=165	N=163
NSU	4.85	4.64	4.93
Carnegie	4.88	4.91	4.83

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Measure 2.2.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Survey “To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: Integrate theory to develop a foundation for practice.”

Expected outcome: NSU mean score will be equal to or greater than the Carnegie mean score

Finding. Target was met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; NSU mean score – 5.94; Carnegie mean score – 5.76

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met; NSU mean score – 5.75; Carnegie mean score – 5.78

AY 2018-2019: Target Met; NSU mean score – 5.86; Carnegie mean score – 5.75

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q70	Q69	Q69
	N=213	N=172	N=166
NSU	5.94	5.75	5.86
Carnegie	5.76	5.78	5.75

Measure 2.3.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Survey “To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: Provide culturally competent care.”

Expected outcome: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification

Finding. Target was not met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; NSU mean score – 5.99; Carnegie mean score – 5.92

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met; NSU mean score – 5.76; Carnegie mean score – 5.96

AY 2018-2019: Target Not Met; NSU mean score – 5.90; Carnegie mean score – 5.95

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q79	Q78	Q78
	N=210	N=168	N=78
NSU	5.99	5.76	5.90
Carnegie	5.92	5.96	5.95

Analysis. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcomes for measures 2.1-2.3 were not met. The plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to: 1) promote the English 2110 section that was specifically designated for healthcare majors, 2) talk to university faculty teaching Math 1020 to see if a section of Math 1020 could be augmented to include content reflect math skills relevant to nursing, 3) ensure integration of culture in all courses, and 4) discuss the need for the NURB 2160 course and/or moving it's placement in the curriculum.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, students were advised to take the English 2110 section for nursing students. Additionally, students with a nursing major took University 1000 designated for nursing majors. No math sections were developed or changed for nursing majors. However, MATH 1021 Math Recitation was required as a companion course for MATH 1020 College Algebra for students not meeting the ACT benchmark for university admission. New Lippincott text and resources were adopted for first level. These resources heavily address culture. The BSN PCC worked on curriculum revisions and made changes to the curriculum that will delete NURB 2160 and integrate culture into nursing level courses. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the mean Skyfactor scores for questions in each of these measures increased, resulting in measures 2.1 & 2.2 meeting the expected outcome. Measure 2.3 was less than the Carnegie mean score by 0.05 points, therefore the expected outcome was not met. However, with a mean score of 5.90, this result is still seen as positive. (Skyfactor range 1-7).

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to 1) move measure 2.3 to 4.2 as it is more applicable to SLO 4, 2) provide a workshop for faculty and students on advocacy for LGBT+ populations, and 3) add an objective specific to culture/diversity in each level.

Measure 2.4.

Assessment Method: ATI Critical Thinking Exit Examination. This exam is a standardized exam that is given in the last semester of the BSN curriculum.
Expected Outcome: 80% of students will achieve the ATI National Program Mean on the ATI Critical Thinking Exit exam.

Finding. Target was not met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Not Met; 73% achieved the ATI National Program Mean

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met; 59% achieved the ATI National Program Mean

AY 2018-2019: Target Not Met; 57% achieved the ATI National Program Mean

Trending

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
	Critical Thinking Exit	Shreveport n = 92/127	72%	Shreveport N=66/111	59%	Shreveport N=64/102
	Alexandria n = 20/27	74%	Alexandria N=9/17	53%	Alexandria N=14/32	44%
					Natchitoches 7/16	44%
Total	112/154	73%	75/128	59%	85/150	57%

Analysis. Students take a Critical Thinking Exit exam in their last clinical semester. Students are taught the nursing process, problem solving, and critical thinking in didactic and clinical courses throughout the program.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was not met.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Based on the analysis of the results, the plans for 2018-2019 were for faculty to: 1) consider increasing the percentage the Critical Thinking exam counts toward the total course grade, 2) inform students of the importance of the information, and 3) inform students how faculty utilize this information for program evaluation and improvement and to help future students.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, students were encouraged to do their best on the Critical Thinking Exit Exam and were informed that the results would identify strong and weak areas of critical thinking. Though the Shreveport campus students results increased from 59% to 63%, meeting the national program mean, the percentage of Alexandria campus students meeting the national program mean decreased from 53% to 44%. Overall, 57% of students scored at or above the national program mean, which did not meet the expected outcome. Faculty discussed these results at the February (2019) BSN Assessment meeting. Though NSU faculty research recently found that critical thinking increased significantly from clinical entrance to end, NSU students aggregate scores did not meet the national mean. The data from this exam is not utilized in any way by the faculty. Consequently, faculty decided to delete this measure.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to delete this measure.

SLO 3. Integrate research findings to promote evidence-based nursing practice

Measure 3.1.

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: NSU mean score will be equal to or greater than the Carnegie mean score

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met

NSU Mean – 5.99; Carnegie Mean – 5.92

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met

NSU Mean – 5.72; Carnegie Mean - 5.97

AY 2018-2019: Target Met

NSU Mean – 5.94; Carnegie Mean - 5.93

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q69	Q68	Q68
	N=212	N=170	N=164
NSU	5.99	5.72	5.94
Carnegie	5.92	5.97	5.93

Analysis. Students are taught to apply research-based knowledge as a basis for practice throughout the BSN curriculum. In NURB 3141 Adult Health Nursing Practicum, students complete a care plan in which they must utilize three evidence-

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

based sources to support the plan of care. One source must be a journal article. In NURB 3160 Research in Nursing, students develop a presentation and poster based on evidence-based nursing practice.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was not met. The plan for 2018-2019 was to implement the Healthy Campus 2020 project in which the faculty would survey nursing students regarding health behaviors. Results would be analyzed and faculty would receive a report documenting how NSU student scores compared to national targets for health promotion behaviors. In areas that the students scored below the national target, students would develop interventions and implement plans to promote healthy behaviors.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented, with the Healthy Campus for the Shreveport students Healthy People for the Natchitoches students, and the windshield survey for the Alexandria students. Student projects demonstrated the ability to use evidence-based research and information to promote healthy behaviors in their community. Student reported satisfaction with the projects. On the Shreveport campus, some students embraced the Healthy Campus assignments, resulting in the development of a relaxation room with aroma therapy for students, STD education on posters on bathroom doors, availability of condoms in the bathrooms, and distribution of ear plugs to students during testing to decrease distractions. First and fourth level clinical students completed an Interpersonal Recording (IPR) which required the use of an article on effective communication from a peer reviewed nursing journal. Additionally, students in clinical developed care plans or concept maps based on current research and evidence.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score for Measure 3.1 was 5.94 which met the Carnegie mean score of 5.93. Therefore, the expected outcome was met. Though the plan for 2019-2020 initially was to expand the Healthy Campus research and projects to the other campuses, there was no funding to continue the survey portion of the activity. Consequently, the activities in the 2018-2019 assessment year will be replaced with another activity in the 2019-2020 assessment year.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is for faculty to: 1) meet to determine a new project/assignment to replace the Healthy Campus assignment, and 2) encourage students to utilize the tutorials available on research databases.

Measure 3.2.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – “To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: “Make effective presentations.”

Expected Outcome: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification

Finding. Target was not met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met

NSU Mean – 5.78; Carnegie Mean – 5.66

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met

NSU Mean – 5.49; Carnegie Mean – 5.7

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

AY 2018-2019: Target Not Met

NSU Mean – 5.57; Carnegie Mean – 5.67

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q71	Q70	Q70
	N=209	N=167	N=162
NSU	5.78	5.49	5.57
Carnegie	5.66	5.7	5.67

Analysis. Student presentation assignments in the BSN program include: 1) NURB 2160 - students create and present an Ethical Dilemma assignment, 2) NURB 3160 - students create and present an evidence-based research poster presentation, 3) NURB 3260 Culture of Safety assignment, and 4) 5th level students participate in political debates. Students performed very well on these assignments.

The Skyfactor™ NSU mean score for 2017-2018 did not meet the expected outcome. Plans for 2018-2019 were to encourage students to enhance presentation skills by using props in NURB 3160, and to continue to support and encourage students wanting to further their research from NURB 3160, and to continue other presentation assignments in the nursing courses.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, above plan was implemented. In NURB 3160, faculty added information regarding how to make effective presentation. In addition, in 4th level, students presented in clinical post conferences. In 5th level students were required to present a teaching plan supported by evidence-based practice to staff on the floor. Students in NURB 3160 created and presented an evidence-based research poster presentation, and students in NURB 3260 presented a Culture of Safety assignment. Though students make presentations multiple times throughout the nursing program, historically, this outcome is not met every year. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the expected outcome was not met for the second year in a row. However, the score of 5.57 on a scale of 1-7 is seen as a positive score, though it did not meet the Carnegie mean score of 5.67.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to delete this measure as measure 3.3 is an objective measure that gives data at the time the students are in the course and will be a better measure for this SLO.

Measure 3.3.

Data for this measure was first collected in the 2016-2017 assessment year.

Assessment Method: Evidence Based Poster Presentation in NURB 3160 (Research)

Expected Outcome: 90% of students in NURB 3160 will score 80% or higher

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; 98.6% of students achieved a score of 80% or higher
AY 2017-2018: Target Met; 99.4% of students achieved a score of 80% or higher
AY 2018-2019: Target Met; 99.4% of students achieved a score of 80% or higher

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Evidence Based Presentation	Shreveport n = 106/108	98.1%	Shreveport n = 118/119	99%	Shreveport n = 135/136	99.26%
	Alexandria n = 31/31	100%	Alexandria n = 47/47	100%	Alexandria n = 32/32	100%
			Natchitoches N=7/7	100%	N/A	
Total	137/139	98.6%	172/173	99.4%	167/168	99.4%

Analysis. For this assignment, students selected a research article and developed a poster presentation. The audience is allowed to view the digital posters and talk with students about their topic. Each presentation period is limited to one hour, which allows all students to present their research.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. The plan for 2018-2019 was to encourage students to enhance their presentation by allowing the use of props (i.e. aroma therapy, colored eyeglasses, food, wound care products). The plan also included maintaining the requirement for the poster presentation and ensuring the use of faculty prepared at the doctorate level.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Students brought diffusers for scents, a gerbil for pet therapy, and a video game console to enhance hand and eye coordination. Students enjoyed getting to touch and manipulate the added sensory simulators. Students also reported that being able to use props enhanced learning. However, what students found most helpful and exciting was interacting with undergraduate and graduate faculty during the presentations.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) work with students who want to further their research projects or present their project at a larger venue.

Measure 3.4.

This measure is composed of 3 Skyfactor™ questions.

Expected Outcome for all 3 questions: NSU mean score will be equal to or greater than the Carnegie mean score.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Questions – “To what degree did your nursing program teach you to:

1. “Understand the effects of health policies on diverse populations.”

Finding: Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; NSU Mean – 5.79; Carnegie Mean – 5.68

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met NSU Mean – 5.58; Carnegie Mean – 5.77

AY 2018-2019: Target Met; NSU Mean – 5.80; Carnegie Mean – 5.71

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Understand the effects of health policies on diverse populations		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q73	Q72	Q72
	N=211	N=166	N=164
NSU	5.79	5.58	5.80

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Carnegie	5.68	5.77	5.71
----------	------	------	------

2. “Apply an ethical decision-making framework to clinical situations.”

Finding. Target was not met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; NSU Mean – 6.19; Carnegie Mean – 6.05

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met NSU Mean – 5.99; Carnegie Mean – 6.09

AY 2018-2019: Target Not Met; NSU Mean – 6.06; Carnegie Mean – 6.07

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Apply ethical decision making		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q86	Q 85	Q85
	N=213	N=169	N=166
NSU	6.19	5.99	6.06
Carnegie	6.05	6.09	6.07

3. Act as an advocate for vulnerable populations.”

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; NSU Mean – 6.19; Carnegie Mean – 6.09

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met NSU Mean – 6.04; Carnegie Mean – 6.15

AY 2018-2019: Target Met; NSU Mean – 6.14; Carnegie Mean – 5.97

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Act as an advocate for vulnerable patients		
	2016	2017	2018-2019
	Q82	Q81	Q81
	N=211	N=169	M=160
NSU	6.19	6.04	6.14
Select 6	6.09	6.15	5.97

Analysis. Students learn about diversity, vulnerable populations, and ethical dilemmas beginning with pre-clinical nursing courses and continue until the end of the nursing program. In the clinical area, students deal with diverse and vulnerable populations each semester. In the 5th semester, students research healthcare related bills before the legislature, selected a bill, write a letter for or against the bill, and mail it to their congress person.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was not met. The plan for 2018-2019 was to implement the Healthy Campus 2020 project in which the faculty would survey nursing students regarding health behaviors. Results would be analyzed, and faculty would receive a report documenting how NSU student scores compared to national targets for health promotion behaviors. In areas that the students scored below the national target, students would develop interventions and implement plans to promote healthy behaviors. Another plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to participate in the university’s Quality Enhancement Plan capstone project “Learning for Life” starting in the summer of 2018. This project required students to engage in and then reflect on experiential learning during their last semester of preceptorship/ internship clinical experiences. During the experiential capstone courses (NURB 4221

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

and NURB 4231), students provided healthcare to vulnerable populations within the guidelines of health policies and gained experience in making ethical decisions.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the capstone reflections were initiated. Students reflections of their experiential learning improved greatly from midterm to the end of the semester. In addition, students in all other levels participated in some form of reflection. Consequently, the fall graduating cohort was better able to document their reflections on their learning experiences, as they had started reflective writing in 4th level during the summer semester.

Also, in the 2018-2019 assessment year, the Healthy Campus project was implemented for the Shreveport students, Healthy People for the Natchitoches students, and the windshield survey for the Alexandria students. Student responses to the activities were positive. On the Shreveport campus, some students embraced the Healthy Campus assignments, resulting in the development of a relaxation room with aroma therapy for students, STD education on posters on bathroom doors, availability of condoms in the bathrooms, and distribution of ear plugs to students during testing to decrease distractions.

The measure for 3.4 involves 3 questions on the Skyfactor survey. The expected outcomes were met for the 1st and 3rd question. The 2nd question did not meet the expected outcome by 0.01 point. Though the expected outcome (mean Carnegie score) was not met, the NSU mean score was 6.06. Since the highest score is a 7, the mean score is seen as a good score.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) delete 3.41, 2) move 3.4.2 to SLO 4, 3) move 3.4.3 to SLO 4, and 4) determine an assignment to replace the Healthy Campus/Healthy People project.

Measure 3.5.

Assessment Method: Health Assessment Final Practicum in NURB 3061 (Health Assessment & Skills Lab)

Expected Outcome: 90% of students in NURB 3061 will achieve a minimum score of 80% on the Final Practicum.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; 99.4% of students achieved a score of 80% or better

AY 2017-2018: Target Met; 97.6% of students achieved a score of 80% or better

AY 2018-2019: Target Met; 96.5% of students achieved a score of 80% or better

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Final Practicum	Shreveport n = 116/117	99%	Shreveport n =153/155	99%	Shreveport n =97/100	97%
	Alexandria n = 45/45	100%	Alexandria n =34/35	97%	Alexandria n =36/36	100%
			Natchitoches n=23/25	92%	Natchitoches n=36/39	92%
Total	161/162	99.4%	N=210/215	97.6%	N=169/175	96.5%

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Analysis. Lab skills are taught throughout the first level semester via ATI videos, faculty demonstrations, student return demonstrations, and evaluations. Students who are weak in skills or fail a practicum have remediation before retaking a practicum. Students must successfully pass all practicums before the Final Practicum as these skills are essential to providing safe, competent, care in the clinical setting. The Final Practicum incorporates all skills learned in first level. Students are only allowed one attempt on the Final Practicum.

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) have students learn skills with assigned faculty prior to practicums, 2) develop a process whereby faculty evaluate students without regard to who taught the student, and 3) incorporate Lippincott virtual simulations in NURB 3061.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Students in first level learned skills and assessments through ATI demonstrations, faculty demonstrations, and student return demonstrations. Instead of each faculty checking off their own students (as done in past years), students signed up and did their practicum with the next available faculty. Also, students who were unsuccessful on the first attempt of any practicum before the Final Practicum were required to complete remediation prior to retaking a practicum. This requirement was instrumental in student success on repeat practicums. The results of this process change include the following: 1) a more streamlined process, 2) a more time efficient process, and 3) better prepared students. Students also reported that they enjoyed the Virtual Simulations. Faculty reported similar benefits as well, including a more efficient process and better preparation by the students. The only complaint from the students was perceived inconsistencies with grading practicums and teaching the content. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 96.5% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on the Final Practicum in NURB 3061. This met the expected outcome for measure 3.5.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) have more course faculty meetings to address the inconsistencies in grading and teaching; 2) ensure faculty are consistent with teaching content by utilizing Lippincott as the primary resource for standard guidelines (however, students will still have access to ATI videos as a secondary resource); 3) revise practicum grading rubrics to ensure all faculty are consistent with practicum evaluations and grading; 4) incorporate use of the Anatomatage table as a teaching tool; and 5) revise the process for practicum check offs to eliminate all students having to sit out in the hallway (waiting their turn to test) by offering group time slots and having students will wait in the atrium until they are called.

SLO 4. Incorporate knowledge of economic, legal, ethical, and political factors influencing health care systems and policy to advocate for recipients of nursing care.

Measure 4.1.

Assessment Method: Political Assignment Project in NURB 4220 (Community Health)

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

This assignment in NURB 4220 requires students to write a letter to an elected representative of the community regarding a healthcare or education issue that is currently before the legislature. The letter must state their support for or against the issue.

Expected Outcome: 90% of students in NURB achieve a minimum score of 80% on the political assignment project.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; 100% achieved a score of 80% or better

AY 2017-2018: Target Met; 100% achieved a score of 80% or better

AY 2018-2019: Target Met; 99% achieved a score of 80% or better

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Political Assign.	Shreveport n = 127/127	100%	Shreveport n = 111/111	100%	Shreveport n = 91/92	98.9%
	Alexandria n = 27/27	100%	Alexandria n = 17/17	100%	Alexandria n = 32/32	100%
					Natchitoches Data not available	
Total	164/164	100%	128/128	100%	123/124	99%

Analysis. Students are required to identify a healthcare bill and address the author of the bill in support or non-support. This assignment requires students to critically think about the legislative process, analyze the specific piece of legislation, and evaluate the nurse's role in policy making.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 was to develop written instructions that gave examples of how items (like the state or national budget) can affect healthcare and nursing education. In addition, faculty were to post links to websites that educate students about the legislative process and provide information regarding current legislation.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Faculty developed written instructions that gave examples of how items (like the state or national budget) affect healthcare and nursing education. Students were provided a rubric for the project and links to the legislature were posted. In addition, faculty posted links to websites that educated students on the legislative process and provided information regarding current legislation. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 99% (123/124) of students achieved a score of 80% or better on the Political Assignment Project. This met the expected outcome of 90% achieving a score of 80% or better on the assignment.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to update information on the legislative process and current legislation.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

SLO 5. Collaborate with clients and other members of the interdisciplinary health care team for health promotion, risk reduction, disease prevention, disease management, and health restoration.

The first two measures for this SLO are from the Skyfactor™ survey and are similar. As such, the questions and findings will be presented first and the analysis for both will be combined as measures to accomplish these outcomes are similar.

Measure 5.1.

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: NSU mean score equal to or greater than the Carnegie mean score

Finding. Target Met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met	NSU Mean – 5.93; Carnegie Mean – 5.77
AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met	NSU Mean – 5.63; Carnegie Mean – 5.85
AY 2018-2019: Target Met	NSU Mean – 5.88; Carnegie Mean – 5.82

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Communicate with healthcare professionals		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q76	Q75	Q75
	N=213	N=171	N=167
NSU	5.93	5.63	5.88
Carnegie	5.77	5.85	5.82

Measure 5.2.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – “To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Work with interprofessional teams.”

Expected Outcome: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification

Finding. Target Met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met	NSU Mean – 6.02; Carnegie Mean score – 5.8
AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met	NSU Mean – 5.55; Carnegie Mean score – 5.81
AY 2017-2018: Target Met	NSU Mean – 5.83; Carnegie Mean score – 5.80

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Work with interprofessional teams		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q78	Q76	Q76

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

	N=212	N=167	N=165
NSU	6.02	5.55	5.83
Carnegie	5.8	5.81	5.80

Analysis for measures 5.1 and 5.2. Each semester clinical students work with healthcare personnel in numerous clinical facilities to gain a rich clinical experience. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcomes for measures 5.1 and 5.2 were not met. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to schedule all students for interprofessional simulation during the 4th level clinical semester.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the BSN program attempted to schedule all students for interprofessional simulation. However, due to many barriers, all students were not able to participate in interprofessional simulation. Barriers included: course schedules, accessibility to the simulation center, coordination with other professional schools, and in general, scheduling conflicts. Though all students did not participate in a formal interprofessional simulation, all students did interact and coordinate care with other healthcare team members during their clinical experience. These experiences occurred onsite in a variety of clinical settings, during case conferences, simulation activities, and rounds. Interprofessional interactions occurred with physicians, speech therapists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, dietary workers, housekeeping, nursing, and discharge planning.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score for measure 5.1 was 5.88 which exceeded the Carnegie mean score of 5.82. Therefore, the expected outcome was met. The NSU mean score for measure 5.2 was 5.83, which exceeded the Carnegie mean score of 5.80. Therefore, the expected outcome was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to 1) schedule as many students as possible for interprofessional simulation, and 2) delete measure 5.2 because measure 5.1 includes interprofessional teams and therefore is redundant.

Measure 5.3.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – “To what degree did your nursing program teach you to: Assess predictive factors that influence the health of patients.”

Expected Outcome: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification

Finding. Target Met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met

NSU Mean – 6.02; Carnegie Mean – 5.8

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met

NSU Mean – 5.55; Carnegie Mean – 5.81

AY 2018-2019: Target Met

NSU Mean – 5.83; Carnegie Mean – 5.83

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Assess predictive factors		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q78	Q77	Q77
	N=212	N=170	N=167
NSU	6.02	5.76	5.83
Carnegie	5.8	5.87	5.83

Analysis. Assessing factors that predict a patient's health status is integrated throughout the BSN nursing courses. Pre-nursing courses that contribute to student learning of this concept include NURB 3050 Concepts of Altered Health States and BIOL 2240 Introductory Human Genetics. In 1st level, students learn predictive factors in health assessment and fundamentals courses as each topic is covered; Predictive factors are covered in each level's didactic course and in the clinical course of each level.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the data, the plan for 2018-2019 was to implement the Healthy Campus 2020 project in which the nursing students responded to a survey about their health behaviors. Results were analyzed, and faculty received a report on which health promotion behaviors the students were below the national target, identifying risky behaviors specific to these students. Students would then develop interventions and implementation plans to improve the health behaviors in the identified areas.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented through either Healthy Campus, Healthy People 2020, or a windshield survey, depending on the campus. Student response to the assignments were positive. The Shreveport campus implemented Healthy Campus. Students completed the survey of health behaviors. From that survey, a list of health indicators was generated that showed where the students scored below the national target. Students then developed and implemented projects to address those deficient areas. Some students embraced the Healthy Campus assignments, resulting in the development of a relaxation room with aroma therapy for students, STD education on posters on bathroom doors, availability of condoms in the bathrooms, and distribution of ear plugs to students during testing to decrease distractions. On the Natchitoches campus, students selected a Health Indicator from Healthy People 2020 and developed a method to educate the public on that topic. On the Alexandria campus, students completed a Windshield Survey assignment in which they assessed a community and developed three interventions that could help the community. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 5.83, which met the Carnegie mean score of 5.83.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is for 5th level faculty to discuss and decide on one assignment which all campuses will complete that helps to identify risk factors that affect the health of patients.

SLO 6. Apply the principles of leadership to design, manage, coordinate, and evaluate health care delivery.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Measure 6.1.

Assessment Method: Leadership ATI Exam: The Leadership ATI exam is given during the final semester of course work.

Expected Outcome: 80% of students will score a Level 2 or higher on the ATI Leadership exam. Note: This year, the ATI Leadership exam was only given once

Finding. Target not met

AY 2016-2017: Target Not Met; 75% achieved a Level 2 on the ATI Leadership exam.

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met; 64% achieved a Level 2 on the ATI Leadership exam

AY 2018-2019: Target Not Met; 40% achieved a Level 2 on the ATI Leadership exam

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
1 st Attempt	Shreveport n = 71/129	55%	Shreveport n =56/108	52%	Shreveport n =43/101	42.6%
	Alexandria n = 24/27	88.9%	Alexandria n =12/17	71%	Alexandria n =13/32	40.6%
					Natchitoches N=3/13	23%
2 nd Attempt	Shreveport N= 19/29*	*65%	N/A		N/A	
	Alexandria N=3/3*	*100%	N/A		N/A	
Total	117/156	*75%	68/125	54%	59/146	40.4%

*As of the Fall of 2016, students only have one attempt. Second attempt results are from the Summer 2016 class only.

Analysis. In the 2017-2018 AY, the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the following plan was developed for the 2018-2019 assessment year: 1) review texts for possible adoption and make a recommendation for a more appropriate textbook to adopt, 2) add five delegation/prioritization questions to each exam/quiz, 3) review and analyze the ATI Leadership results to determine areas of weakness to be addressed, 4) investigate ATI resources that can be utilized in teaching the content, and 5) discuss with students the value in giving this exam their best effort.

In 2018-2019, other texts were reviewed. No changes in texts were made. The layout of the course was analyzed and topics were rearranged to fit the core topics of the ATI Leadership textbook. Discussion Board questions were deleted as faculty did not see that they contributed to learning needed leadership concepts. Assignments were made in the place of discussion boards. In addition, students were required to do assignments to prepare them for the ATI Leadership Exam. The assignments had to be completed before students were allowed to take the ATI Leadership Exam. Reminders of the assignments were posted in the Moodle course shell and sent by email repeatedly throughout the semesters. However, despite this, many students did not complete the assignments required and were delayed in taking the exam. Students

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

reported not studying for the ATI Leadership exam due to their priority of studying for another course which they were not passing at the time.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 40% of students achieved a Level 2 or higher on the ATI Leadership Exam. Therefore, the expected outcome of 75% of students achieving a Level 2 or higher was not met. This result continues to trend downward. The major contributing factor to the lower percent of students achieving at least a Level 2 or higher was the ATI Leadership exam was not a priority for all students and students were not required to pass the ATI Leadership exam to progress to pass NURB 4230.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to 1) analyze student results from the ATI Leadership exam for the last two years, 2) identify concepts in which students were most frequently deficient in knowledge, 3) identify ATI resources which will benefit student learning these concepts, and 4) develop assignments/ learning modalities in NURB 4230 to enhance the student learning utilizing ATI resources.

SLO 7. Demonstrate professional nursing standards, values, and accountability.

The three measures for this SLO (7.1-7.3) are from the student satisfaction survey – Skyfactor™. As such, the questions and findings will be presented first and the analysis for all will be combined as measures to accomplish these outcomes are similar.

Measure 7.1. - 7.3.

Expected Outcomes: NSU mean score equal to or greater than the Carnegie mean scores

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Questions – “To what degree did your nursing program teach you to:

7.1 “Incorporate nursing standards into practice.”

Finding. Target Met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met NSU Mean – 6.27; Carnegie Mean – 6.13

AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met NSU Mean – 6.01; Carnegie Mean – 6.16

AY 2018-2019: Target Met NSU Mean – 6.18; Carnegie Mean – 6.15

Trending

Skyfactor™	Incorporate standards into practice				
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q 86 N=179	Q 85 N=214	Q85 N=211	Q84 N=172	Q84 N=167
NSU	6.43	6.25	6.27	6.01	6.18
Carnegie	6.11	6.10	6.13	6.16	6.15

7.2 “Support fairness in the delivery of care.”

Finding. Target Met

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

AY 2016-2017: Target Met NSU Mean – 6.12; Carnegie Mean – 5.96
AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met NSU Mean – 5.90; Carnegie Mean – 6.02
AY 2018-2019: Target Met NSU Mean – 6.02; Carnegie Mean – 6.00

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Support fairness in delivery of care				
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q 81	Q 80	Q80	Q79	Q79
	N=179	N=215	N=210	N=172	N=165
NSU	6.27	5.96	6.12	5.9	6.02
Carnegie	5.99	5.93	5.96	6.02	6.00

7.3 “Demonstrate accountability for your own actions.”

Finding. Target Met

AY 2016-2017: Target Met NSU Mean – 6.32; Carnegie Mean – 6.12
AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met NSU Mean – 5.99; Carnegie Mean – 6.16
AY 2017-2018: Target Met NSU Mean – 6.15; Carnegie Mean – 6.15

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Demonstrate accountability for your own actions		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q83	Q82	Q82
	N=211	N=170	N=164
NSU	6.32	5.99	6.15
Carnegie	6.12	6.16	6.15

Analysis. In the 2017-2018 assessment year the target was met. Based on the analysis of the 2017-2018 assessment year results, the plan for the 2018-2019, was to participate in the Learning for Life Quality Enhancement Plan. This capstone initiative would be implemented in the student’s final semester starting in Summer 2018, with students reflecting in-depth on their learning experiences, how they have developed, and how the learning will affect their future self. All clinical levels were to initiate reflection measures, beginning in the 1st level and building reflection practices incrementally to prepare students for the capstone experience in 5th level.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Learning for Life was initiated in the summer semester and students participated in an in-depth reflection assignment throughout all clinical levels which culminated in the 5th level capstone experience of the BSN program. The results for the 2018-2019 assessment year for the Skyfactor questions in Measures 7.1-7.3 all met the expected outcomes, which is a mean score at or above the Carnegie mean score. However, not all students taking the Skyfactor survey during this reporting cycle participated in the capstone project. The Fall 2017 graduating students were included in the data received in Fall 2018 from Skyfactor. Data from 2019 forward be a more accurate reflection of the capstone project’s impact of this measure.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plans for 2019-2020 assessment year is to 1) have all clinical students reflect on their own learning throughout each of the BSN clinical levels, where learning refers to the student’s ability to demonstrate nursing knowledge, skills, and attitudes over the course of their nursing education. Students were asked to reflect on their past learning and share how that learning might impact their future self and future practice. Additionally, plans for 2019-2020 include: 2) a requirement that all students achieve a score of 2 or better on their final reflective journaling in 5th level – this will be a critical behavior for clinical, 3) the addition of journaling to the clinical evaluation for all clinical levels, and 4) deletion of measure 7.2 as Measure 7.1 and 7.3 cover this SLO. The present 7.3 will become 7.2

SLO 8. Assume responsibility for professional development and lifelong learning.

Measure 8.1.

Assessment Method: Graduating Senior’s Biographical Data Form “Do you plan to continue your education at some time in the future?”

Expected Outcome: 80% of graduating seniors will indicate a goal to continue their education.

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met 80% indicated a plan to continue their education

AY 2017-2018: Target Met 83% indicated a plan to continue their education

AY 2018-2019: Target Met 81% indicated plans to continue their education

Trending:

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
Continue Education	Shreveport n = 99/126	77%	Shreveport n = 83/104	80%	Shreveport n = 85/100	85%
	Alexandria n = 23/27	85%	Alexandria n = 22/23	96%	Alexandria n = 21/31	68%
					Natchitoches 14/17	82%
Total	122/153	80%	105/127	83%	120/148	81%

Analysis. As students’ progress through clinical courses, faculty reinforce the concept of healthcare evolution and emphasize the importance of nurses needing to continuously learn to remain knowledgeable. Students are taught in NURB 3030 (a pre-clinical course) of the many educational opportunities that are available to nurses to advance their practice and careers. The measurement for this SLO is obtained from student’s answers to the question “Do you plan to continue your education at some time in the future?”

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met - 83% of students reported the plan to continue their education. The plan for 2018-2019 was to have

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

students complete the form a little earlier in the semester when they are not as fatigued with their educational path and to reinforce the fact that, as nurses, they are lifelong learners. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, data were gathered from the Graduating Student Data forms and from the Recognition Bio information read at the Recognition Ceremony. Eighty-one percent of students reported plans to continue their education. The 68% from the Alexandria campus was due in part to a lack of data. Students at this campus did were not asked to complete the Graduating Student Data form until after the final and once asked to complete the form, not all students responded.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan is to get the distance sites to complete the Graduating Student Data form earlier in the semester and to obtain the Recognition Bio forms from the distance campuses. In addition, faculty will continue to reinforce the concept of life-long learning.

SLO 9. Utilize information and healthcare technologies in nursing practice.

Measure 9.1.

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question: “To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: Use appropriate technologies to assess patients.”

Expected Outcome: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met	NSU Mean – 5.93;	Carnegie Mean – 5.68
AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met	NSU Mean – 5.75;	Carnegie Mean – 5.76
AY 2018-2019: Target Met	NSU Mean – 5.88;	Carnegie Mean – 5.74

Trending:

Skyfactor™	Use appropriate technologies to assess pts		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
	Q72	Q71	Q71
	N=213	N=171	N=167
NSU	5.93	5.75	5.88
Carnegie	5.68	5.76	5.74

Analysis. Students in clinical are taught to use a variety of technologies, including but not limited to, vital sign machines, Point of Care testing for blood sugar measurements, cardiac monitoring, and electronic health records. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the 2017-2018 results, the plans for the 2018-2019 assessment year were to: 1) expand the use of virtual simulation in didactic and clinical courses, and 2) explore options for the adoption of teaching-learning materials that offer a variety of multi-media experiences to enhance learning (in all levels).

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, first level BSN faculty adopted the use of a new Lippincott textbook, which gave access to a multitude of technological resources, including online books, virtual simulation, quizzes, videos, and case scenarios. These resources remain available to students for one year as they progress through the program. Another technology strategy initiated included the use of iPads for all first level students. The iPads are used to access Lippincott and ATI resources, testing, taking notes, and accessing e-books. NSU also obtained a new Anatomage table which faculty and students use to teach and learn human anatomy and physiology. In addition, students now have access to an electronic health records. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean score of 5.88 on measure 9.1 exceeded the Carnegie mean score of 5.74, which means that the expected outcome/target was met.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plans for 2019-2020 are to 1) expand the iPad usage to progressing clinical levels, 2) use the Anatomage for in teaching first level clinical students physical assessment, 3) expand health record training at multiple healthcare facilities in Shreveport and distance sites, 4) expand the use of clinical simulations to 5th level, and 5) send as many students as possible for interprofessional simulation; however historically, access to interprofessional simulation is limited due to accessibility and scheduling.

Measure 9.2.

Assessment Method: Informatics Assignment in NURB 3260

Expected Outcome: 80% of students will achieve a grade of 80% or higher on the midterm assignment - Culture of safety (using PowerPoint to present)

Finding. Target was met.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; 100% scored 80% or higher

AY 2017-2018: Target Met; 100% scored 80% or higher

AY 2018-2019: Target Met; 100% scored 80% or higher

Trending:

	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Informatics Assignment (Culture of Safety)	100% 146/146	100% 144/145	100% 135/135

Analysis. The Culture of Safety assignment is a midterm assignment in which the students are given a safety topic. The rubric provides specific requirements for developing a PowerPoint document aimed at educating nursing staff in a healthcare facility. This assignment counts 25% of the course grade.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome/target was met. With 100% achieving the expected outcome and positive student feedback, there was evidence of student learning on this important topic. To enhance this assignment and encourage further learning, the plan for 2018-2019 was to expand the potential topics by researching the Joint Commission websites and adding the topic of safety related to the Electronic Health Record.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented with the assignment utilizing the information on the Culture of Safety for topics. Positive feedback was received from graduates now using this information in their work setting. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on the mid-term assignment, Culture of Safety.

Decision. Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is for faculty to utilize current Joint Commission's Culture of Safety initiatives for the assignment. Additionally, with the curriculum revisions that will take place in the fall of 2019, the Informatics course, (NURB 3260) in which the Culture of Safety assignment is taught, will be deleted. Therefore, this assignment will be transitioned into the NURB3160 – Research course.

Comprehensive Summary of Key evidence of improvement based on the analysis of results.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the BSN program implemented many plans to enhance student learning with the overall goals of students graduating, passing the NCLEX-RN, and finding employment. Statistics related to these goals are:

- 99.3% of 2018 graduates passed the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt
- 100% of graduates who sought employment were able to find employment
- 85% of students in cohorts have graduated within 150% of the time – which exceeded the benchmark of 70% graduating within 150% of the time.
- 82% of graduating students expressed plans to continue their education

In 2018 the pass rate for the BSN program was 99% which was an increase from 2016 & 2017 (96%) and from 2015 (88%). In the last assessment year, all Skyfactor™ survey mean scores were below the expected outcome by 0.01 -0.3 points. This year, all Skyfactor survey measures met the expected outcomes by 0-0.17 points except for three measures. Those expected outcomes were not met by mean scores that were slightly (0.01-0.1 points) below the Carnegie mean scores. The 2018-2019 mean scores for each of these three measures showed an increase over last year's mean scores.

Students take the ATI Comprehensive Predictor in 4th level to assess their readiness to take the NCLEX-RN. The individual student report of strengths and deficits in knowledge generated was utilized to facilitate student remediation on those concepts during their 5th Level semester, thereby helping prepare them for the NCLEX-RN exam. In addition, a live NCLEX-RN review course was scheduled for students in the 4th level. Students have been taught content based on evidence-based practice (EBP), developed presentations on EBP, and practiced nursing care based on EBP. As these measures increase the knowledge base of the students, they directly contributed to

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

preparation of students and the graduates being successful on the NCLEX-RN licensing exam.

Additional actions that have contributed to student learning success in the 2018-2019 assessment year include:

- Advised preclinical students to take University 1000 designed for nursing majors and the English 2110 section designed for healthcare majors.
- Implemented new on-line advanced teaching-learning products with the first clinical level, including: online resources, quizzes, case scenarios, virtual simulations, remediation, and testing.
- Added Virtual Simulations for teaching assessment skills.
- Gave a live ATI NCLEX review in the 4th level
- Gave the ATI Comprehensive Predictor given in the 4th Level
- Allowed students who made below a 94% on the ATI Comprehensive Predictor Exam in 4th level to review weak areas of learning content and retake the ATI Comprehensive Predictor exam in 5th level.
- Utilized ATI standardized exams each clinical level to assess, inform, and remediate students on content areas which were found deficient.
- Used supplemental ATI Resources for teaching, remediation, and testing.
- Added numerous presentation experiences throughout the program to increase student confidence in professional presentations.
- Enhanced student presentations skills by encouraging use of props and visual aids.
- Had students participate in Interprofessional Simulation with pharmacy and physician's assistant students.
- Revised teaching related to the legislative process, how legislation impacts healthcare, and current bills before the legislature.
- Implemented tutoring of course content in each level by both tutors and faculty.
- Utilized learning contracts to remediate students not meeting passing criteria throughout the semester.
- Faculty meeting individually with at-risk students to review tests and counsel on study habits.
- Utilized case studies in didactic and clinical courses.
- Students participated in mock interviews (for job employment) in their junior and senior year.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

- Utilized Healthy Campus and Health People 2020 projects in Community Health clinicals.
- Participated in QEP *Learning for Life* with capstone courses which utilize experiential learning and reflection of learning to enrich learning experiences in clinical.
- Supported BSN students who desire to participate in research and present research findings.
- Provided access to high fidelity simulation through healthcare partners of NSU – Willis-Knighton Health Systems and Christus St. Frances Cabrini Hospital.
- Faculty advised students pre-clinical and each semester that students were in clinical.
- Admitted BSN nursing cohorts on the Natchitoches campus.
- Worked with athletics department on main campus to facilitate students being able to fulfill the nursing major requirements while also participating in athletics.
- Provided a Student Success Coordinator through healthcare partnerships.
- 82% of graduating students expressed the intent to continue their education in the future.
- NSU sent two students to AACN Student Policy Summit in Washington, D.C.
- Resources provided to increase the availability of technology-based teaching resources.
- Piloted iPads to enhance student learning. Worked with ATI, Exam Soft, and NSU technology specialists to resolve problems. iPads were used for student books, resources, and testing in Fall 2018 in 1st level. Use of iPads decreased time required for students to take tests due to moving to different rooms, rotating through a computer lab, and working with older technology.
- Reviewed and revised SLO Measures to more accurately and concisely measure Student Learning Outcomes.
- Revised curriculum to meet the 15/30 success initiative set forth by the university and the ULS system. Revisions included deleting NURB 2160 Culture and Ethics, NURB 3240 Care of the Older Adult and NURG 3260 Nursing Informatics. Content from these courses was found to be in other didactic courses and beneficial assignments will be continues in other courses.
- Supported eleven faculty actively working on obtaining doctorate degrees.
- Five faculty completed their doctorate degree in 2018.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Plan of action moving forward.

In the 2019-2020 assessment year, the BSN program will be moving forward with the implementation of all clinical levels utilizing iPads for accessing online resources and testing. This will increase student comfort and confidence with online test. Additionally, the NCLEX-RN is a computerized exam, and students will have much more experience with online testing by the time they take the NCLEX-RN. The use of iPads will decrease the need for costly expansions of the computer labs and the need for updates of computer equipment. The “Learning for Life” capstone initiative will be in its second year, with graduating students having had more experience at reflective journaling in their lower level clinical courses. The BSN Curriculum will begin its new curriculum (15-credit hour semester/30 credit hour year) in the Fall of 2019. In addition, faculty will be planning implementation of the new BS to BSN program to begin Summer 2020. Additional plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year include:

- Move the Comprehensive Predictor to 5th level and give in NURB 4230 Leadership course.
- Provide a live ATI NCLEX review in 5th level prior to the Comprehensive Predictor
- Expand use iPads for student books, resources, and testing to 2nd level in the spring 2019, adding a level each semester.
- Provide a workshop on LGBT+ advocacy for students and faculty in Spring 2019
- Development of a project that involves use of research- based knowledge to replace the previous project of Healthy Campus.
- Teach research students more content on features of MS Word program and APA formatting. Students wishing to continue their research or present their research will be mentored by faculty.
- Increase faculty meetings in 1st level to address more consistency in teaching and grading practices in NURB 3061. Revise 1st level grading rubrics.
- Initiate new process for grading 1st level practicums.
- Incorporate the new Anatomatage table in teaching
- Update teaching related to the legislative process and links associated with the legislature and bills
- Identify concepts on the ATI Leadership exam, analyze student results from the ATI Leadership exam for the last two years, identify concepts in which students were most frequently deficient in knowledge, identify ATI resources which will benefit student learning for these concepts, and develop assignments/ learning modalities in NURB 4230 to enhance the student learning utilizing ATI resources.
- Require students to achieve a score of 2 or better on the final reflective journaling in 5th level clinical courses

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

- Add journaling to the evaluation in all clinical courses
- Organize all students to access the electronic health records in healthcare facilities as allowed by the healthcare facilities and as needed in the clinical rotations.
- Encourage BSN students working with faculty to present nationally at the 2019 STTI Conference in Washington DC.

Summary of planned changes to SLO Measures:

- Move measure 2.3 to SLO 4 as this measure is more appropriate to SLO 4
- Delete Measure 2.4 (ATI Critical Thinking Exam). Though student scores increase from beginning of the program to the end, the students are not meeting the expected outcome of 80% of students achieving the national mean. However, 99% of students who graduated in 2018 passed the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt. Faculty believe that this is not a best measure for SLO 2, therefore it should be deleted.
- Delete measure 3.2. Measure 3.3 is an objective measure for students making presentations and is evaluated in the semester in which they make a presentation on research. Measure 3.2 is a subjective measure from the Skyfactor survey and students evaluate this at the end of the program. Faculty think that measure 3.3 is a more accurate and effective measure for SLO 3. Therefore, Measure 3.2 will be deleted.
- Measure 3.4.1 measures learning regarding effects of health policies on diverse populations. Measure 3.1 and 3.3 more directly measure SLO 3. Therefore, measure 3.41 will be deleted.
- Measures 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 measure the students perceived ability to apply ethical decision-making frameworks to clinical situations and acting as an advocate for vulnerable populations. These measures more accurately measure SLO4. Therefore, they will be moved to measure SLO 4
- Measures 5.1 and 5.2 are very similar on Skyfactor questions. Faculty felt that we did not need to have both as measures and that 5.1 was the better measure. Therefore, measure 5.2 will be deleted.
- Measure 7.2 will be deleted. Measures 7.1 and 7.3 address the incorporation of nursing standards into practice and demonstrating accountability for own actions, which adequately cover this SLO.