NSU College of Nursing and School of Allied Health
Assessment Year 2017-2018

Program – Bachelor of Science in Nursing

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

Prepared by: Dr. Debra Clark/Mrs. Pamela Holcombe   Date: 6-20-2018

Approved by: Dr. Dana Clawson, Dean   Date: 6-21-2018

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.
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 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 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 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 score.
Note[2]: students in one of the two groups taking this survey during the 2017-2018 assessment year were very disgruntled at having to attend multiple review sessions due to the high failure rate on the Comprehensive Predictor. This survey was given during this time of much dissention.

Note[3]: 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 2016 year as 2016-2017 and 2017 year as 2017-2018.
Note[4]: The BSN program has 5 clinical levels. The entry clinical level is referred to as 1st level. The last level before graduation is the 5th level.

SLO 1. Integrate theory from nursing, the arts, humanities, and sciences to provide culturally sensitive care in the global community.
The two measures for this SLO will be presented with findings reported for each. The analysis for these two measures will be presented as one section as the Comprehensive Predictor is a practice NCLEX-RN test and interventions to address the Comprehensive Predictor measure also address the NCLEX-RN measure.

Measure 1.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

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% or better by the 2nd attempt.

Findings
AY 2016-2017: Target Met; 100% of students achieved a 94%
AY 2017-2018: Target Met; 95% of students achieved a 94% attempt
Trending:

Comp Predictor	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
1st Attempt	Shreveport n = 86/121	71%	Shreveport n = 85/127	66.9%	Shreveport n = 85/128	66%
	Alexandria n = 30/33	90.9%	Alexandria n = 25/27	92.5%	Alexandria n = 10/17	59%
	Total 116/154	75.3%	Total 110/154	71.4%	Total 68/103	66%
2nd Attempt			Shreveport 33/42	78.6%	Shreveport N=29/36	81%
			Alexandria 2/2	100%	Alexandria N-6/6	100%
					Total 130/137	95%

Measure 1.2. (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: NCLEX-RN   The NCLEX-RN is the licensing exam for Registered Nurses.
Expected outcome: 90% of first time NCLEX-RN takers will be successful (pass NCLEX-RN)

Findings

AY 2016-2017: Target Met – 96.3 % of graduates passed NCLEX-RN on the first attempt

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

Trending:

	2015-2016	2016-2017		2017-2018	
NLCEX-RN Pass Rate on First Attempt	91.36% 148/162	Shreveport N=104/109	95.5%	Shreveport N = 109/115	95%
		Alexandria N = 27/27	100%	Alexandria N = 23/23	100%
Total		N=131/136	96.3%	N=132/138	96%

Analysis. The ATI Comprehensive Predictor is a standardized examination that is a mock NCLEX-RN. The score is based on the percent probability of passing the NCLEX-RN. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, students had to score a 94% probability or better to pass the examination and to complete the program. The expected outcome for 2016-2017 stated that 80% of students would score at or above the 94% probability level after 2 attempts. At that time students could take the Comprehensive Predictor repeatedly and students informed faculty that they took it the first time to see what it was like, then were more serious about trying to pass the test on the second attempt. However, this negated the purpose of the test and was not an accurate assessment of the student's knowledge.

Based on the analysis of the results from 2016-2017, the plan for 2017-2018 included moving this exam from a 5th level course to a 4th level course, counting the Comprehensive Predictor as part of the course grade (5%) so it would be taken seriously on the first attempt, and remediating students not reaching the 94% mark in NURB 4950 in 5th level. Students not reaching the expected outcome on the first attempt would also retake the exam in NURB 4950 after remediation. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, all these measures were implemented. As seen in the data/evidence, the percentage of students passing the ATI comprehensive Predictor exam on the first attempt decreased significantly (from 71.4% to 66% on the first attempt). With evidence that students did not have needed knowledge at this point, a remediation plan was developed, and students were required to attend multiple review sessions that focused on the specific area of weakness indicated on the ATI Comprehensive Predictor report.

The percent of successful students taking the Comprehensive Predictor for the 2nd time was much higher than on the first attempt. Overall 95% of the class was able to successfully reach a probability of 94% in two attempts. This data demonstrates that the remediation provided in the extra review sessions and in NURB 4950 (in 5th level) assisted students in being successful on this exam and in gaining knowledge needed to be successful on the NCLEX-RN. Inconsistencies in the total number of students taking the exam on the first and second attempt is due to students failing 4th level, and therefore not taking the ATI Comprehensive Predictor a second time in 5th level. In talking with students, faculty learned that many students again reported a lack of preparation for the exam because 5% of their grade was not seen as significant and was not going to hurt their overall score in the course enough to put them in danger of failing.

After researching practices by other schools, the following plan was developed for 2018-2019 assessment year: Faculty would 1) give the ATI Comprehensive Predictor at the end of 4th level, 2) make the ATI Comprehensive Predictor count an equal percent as all other exams in the course, and 3) guide remediation indicated on the ATI Comprehensive Predictor in NURB 4950.

NCLEX-RN results are based on the first-time test takers who took the test in 2017. The goal of 90% pass rate was met in the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 assessment years (96.3% and 96% respectively). In talking with students who did not pass the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt, faculty discovered that these students did not take a NCLEX-RN review course. In addition, data analysis showed that all the graduates failing the NCLEX-RN had previously failed at least one clinical level except one. That student had passed each level right at the minimum score (79.5%). The plan for measure 2.2 for the 2018-2019 assessment year follows: Faculty will 1) give the Comprehensive Predictor at the end of 4th level, 2) make the Comp Predictor count an equal percent as all other exams in the course, and 3) guide remediation indicated on the Comprehensive Predictor in NURB 4950. In addition, for 2018-2019 assessment year, faculty will arrange for students to have a live NCLEX review in the 4th level of the program. Though NCLEX-RN reviews are traditionally taken after graduation or in the final semester, faculty learned that if the NCLEX-RN review is taken before graduation, the students would be allowed to repeat the review multiple times before taking the NCLEX-RN exam without additional charges. This would provide multiple opportunities for students to prepare before and after graduation. The review was paid for by the students during the semester the review was provided. For the 2018-2019 assessment year, faculty will also investigate to see if the professional fees that students have already paid during the program will be enough to pay for an NCLEX-RN review. If so, the review will be provided at no extra cost to the students; however, students will be required to take the review as part of course requirements.

Decision: Based on the analysis of the results, students met the expected outcome of 80% of students passing the ATI Comprehensive Predictor for the 2017-2018 assessment year (130/137 or 95% passed) and the expected outcome of 90% of students passing the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt (132/138 or 96% passed). Although the 2016-2017 plan (that was implemented in 2017-2018) did not have the desired results of increasing the success rate on the initial attempt by students taking

the ATI Comprehensive Predictor, students were able to be successful by the second attempt after remediation (95% passed the ATI Comprehensive Predictor by the 2nd attempt). Moving the ATI Comprehensive Predictor to 4th level has been a positive action. Students utilize the report generated to focus on their weak areas in NURB 4950 in 5th level. Moving the ATI Comprehensive Predictor provided a semester to bring student's knowledge to a higher level before graduation and thereby increasing their preparation for the NCLEX-RN. Having the student's ATI Comprehensive Predictor initial attempt count 5% of the course grade did not have the desired effect of making students take the test seriously on the first attempt. Faculty did learn that other nursing programs utilize this test as a regular exam grade in the course. As the ATI Comprehensive Predictor tests on all material covered in the program, increasing the weighted percentage of the exam in the course seemed appropriate and fair. Based on the analysis, it is evident that students did learn, as evidenced by 96% of students passing the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt. The plan for 2018-2019 is for the ATI Comprehensive Predictor to be given at the end of 4th level with remediation for students provided in NURB 4950. In addition, students will have a NCLEX-RN review in 4th level and the ATI Comprehensive Predictor will count as much as a regular exam in the 4th level course.

SLO 2. Apply the nursing process using critical thinking, communication, assessment, and technical skills.
The first three measures for this SLO are from the student satisfaction survey – Skyfactor. As such, the question and findings will be presented first and the analysis for all will be combined as measures to accomplish these outcomes are similar. Note: students in one of the two groups taking this survey were very disgruntled at having to attend multiple review sessions due to the high failure rate on the ATI Comprehensive Predictor. Thus this survey was given during a time of much dissention.

Measure 2.1 (Indirect-Knowledge)

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

Findings

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

Trending:

Skyfactor	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 67	Q66	Q66	Q 65
	N=179	N=212	N=212	N=165
NSU	4.6	4.68	4.85	4.64
Carnegie	4.85	4.89	4.88	4.91

Measure 2.2. (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor Survey "To what degree did the nursing program teach you to: Integrate theory to develop a foundation for practice."
Expected outcome: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification

Findings
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

Trending:

Skyfactor	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q67	Q70	Q70	Q69
		N=215	N=213	N=172
NSU	4.6	5.88	5.94	5.75
Carnegie	4.85	5.75	5.76	5.78

Measure 2.3 (Indirect-Knowledge)

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

Findings
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

Trending:

Skyfactor	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q80	Q79	Q79	Q78
		N=213	N=210	N=168
NSU	6.17	5.82	5.99	5.76
Carnegie	5.96	5.91	5.92	5.96

Analysis for measures 2.1- 2.3: For the 2016-2017 Assessment year, NSU met the expected outcomes of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score for Measure 2.2 and 2.3 (see chart above). For Measure 2.1, the expected outcome (4.88) was not met, as NSU's mean score was 4.85. During pre-nursing course and in the last nursing

course, faculty discuss how courses from the pre-clinical courses contribute to their nursing education. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, faculty started teaching UNIV1000 for nursing students and presented this information. The plan for 2017-2018 was to revise an English 2110 section that would be focused toward nursing majors. During the 2017-2018 assessment year, a faculty member teaching in the English department worked toward revising an English 2110 section to be specifically for healthcare majors. This course would use nursing related literature for assignments and readings. In addition, this course would teach and require the use of APA formatting, which NSU nursing programs use. (English courses usually require MLA formatting). Although the English 2110 section was not available for enrollment during the 2017-2018 assessment year, it was open for student enrollment for Spring 2018. Faculty advisors started promoting the section of English 2110 during pre-registration for the spring 2018 semester.

The data/evidence for 2017-2018 shows the NSU mean score decreased slightly for all three of the measures above. The differences ranged from 0.03 to 0.2 points below the expected outcome of the Carnegie mean score. In evaluation of the efforts, students enrolled in English 2110 will be in their first semester of their sophomore year and will not have an impact on this SLO measure until they are graduating seniors (that is when the Skyfactor survey is given). Consequently, this measure will not have an impact on the data for several years, but the faculty feel it will have an impact on how students perceive the general education courses in the BSN curriculum. Based on the analysis of last year's evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to promote the English 2110 section that is for healthcare majors and to talk to faculty teaching math to see if a section of Math 1020 could be revised to reflect math specific to nursing.

Measure 2.3 relates to providing culturally competent care. Students presently take NURB 2160 Culture and Ethics as a second semester freshman. This is their first nursing course. Students get their first experience of nursing in 1st level clinicals, which is in the second semester of the sophomore year. In the 1st level clinical courses students are provided with cultural considerations in all aspects of basic care and assessments. Throughout most of the curriculum, culture is integrated into each concept in each course. Faculty teaching NURB 2160 believe that students at the pre-clinical level do not have enough life experience or healthcare knowledge to grasp culture and ethics as it applies to nursing and providing healthcare. Plans for 2018-2019 are to ensure integration of culture in all courses and continue discussion of the need for the NURB 2160 course and/or its placement in the curriculum.

Decision: The expected outcomes for Measures 2.1-2.3 were not met. Though the scores did not meet the Carnegie mean scores for these three Skyfactor questions, each NSU mean score did come close (difference ranged from 0.03 – 0.2) to the Carnegie mean score. The information for each question is taught repeatedly throughout the program. The Skyfactor survey was given at a time of student dissention. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 is to encourage student enrollment in the English and University courses that are designed specifically for nursing students, and to ask math 1020 faculty to develop a section specifically for nursing majors. In addition, faculty will continue to point out how liberal education

courses contribute the ability of student in the nursing program and the curriculum will be reviewed for revisions. In addition, faculty will look for ways to ensure integration of culture in all courses.

Measure 2.4. (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: ATI Critical Thinking Exit Examination. This exam is a standardized exam that is given in the last semester of the curriculum in NURB 4950. *Expected Outcome:* 80% of students achieve the ATI National Program Mean on the ATI Critical Thinking Exit exam.

Findings.

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

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

Trending

	2014-2015	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
Critical Thinking Exit	60% 84/141	Shreveport n = 138/212	65.2%	Shreveport n = 92/127	72%	Shreveport N=66/111	59%
		Alexandria n = 20/33	60.6%	Alexandria n = 20/27	74%	Alexandria N=9/17	53%
Total		158/245	64%	112/154	73%	75/128	59%

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, the ATI Critical Thinking results did not meet the expected outcomes of 80% of students achieving the national program mean for this exam. In 2016-2017, 73% of students achieved the expected outcome. Students take a Critical Thinking Exit exam in their last clinical semester. Though students are taught the nursing process, problem solving, and critical thinking in didactic and clinical courses throughout the program, faculty report that students do not take this exam seriously because it does not impact their grade. In 2016-2017, the Critical Thinking Exit Exam counted 5% of the course grade. While the percent of students achieving the national average increased from 64% in 2015-2016 to 73% in 2016-2017, the upward trend did not continue into 2017-2018. One other factor that could have affected the scores are the changes in faculty teaching this course each year. In 2017-2018 there has been consistent faculty teaching the course. However, the percentage of students achieving the program national mean has decreased significantly (14 percentage points). Though this exam did count 5% of the grade, many students expressed the opinion that 5% was not going to hurt their grade. This was evident in looking at course grades in which all students earned a grade of "A" or "B" in the course. Additionally, it was noted that many students completed the 40-item test in 15 minutes or less. Based on the evidence, the plans for 2018-2019 are that faculty will consider increasing the

percentage that this exam counts toward the total course grade. In addition, the faculty will inform students of the importance of the information and how faculty utilize this information for program evaluation and improvement and to help future students.

Decision: The expected outcome of 80% of students achieving the ATI National Program Mean for this exam was not met. The percent of students passing the exam at this level decreased significantly. Evidence for this decrease included student's attitudes, inconsistent faculty assignments, and the exam counting only 5% of the course grade. Based on the evidence, the plans for 2018-2019 are that faculty will increase the percentage that this exam counts toward the total course grade. In addition, the faculty will inform students of the importance of the information and how this information is used for program evaluation and improvement.

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

Measure 3.1. (Indirect-Knowledge)

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

Findings.

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

Trending:

Skyfactor	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 70	Q 69	Q69	Q68
	N=179	N=215	N=212	N=170
NSU	6.10	5.78	5.99	5.72
Carnegie	5.97	5.95	5.92	5.97

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score was met as NSU had a mean score of 5.99 and the Carnegie mean score was 5.92. Results on this Skyfactor item has fluctuated over the past several years ranging from 0.15 points above or below the Carnegie mean score. Students complete a care plan in clinical rotations. In the 1st clinical level, students must utilize three sources to support the plan of care. One of those sources must be a journal article. In NURB 3160 students develop a voice-over PowerPoint (PPT) presentation based on evidence-based nursing practice. The plan for 2017-2018 was to find a project in which the students actively participated in research. In searching for an engaging and appropriate project, faculty surveyed students to see if they thought doing a project that was directly related to health outcomes of students at

this university would be interesting. The students supported the idea. As the idea was to participate in Healthy Campus 2020 which would involve the collection of health data, the faculty submitted an IRB proposal and received approval. The plan for 2018-2019 is to implement the Health Campus 2020 project in which the faculty survey nursing students regarding health behaviors. Results will be analyzed, and faculty will choose areas of health promotion behaviors which the students score below the national targets. The students will develop interventions and implement plans to improve those selected areas. Future plans for this project including majors other than nursing.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, NSU did not meet the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score. While the idea for the project that would have students actively applying research-based knowledge on a personal level was conceived and initiated in 2017-2018 assessment year, the process was extended with seeking IRB approval, resulting in plans for data collection and implementation in the 2018-2019 assessment year. Based on student feedback and analysis of the data, the plan for 2018-2019 is to implement the Health Campus 2020 project in which the faculty survey nursing students regarding health behaviors. Results will be analyzed, and faculty will choose health promotion behaviors in areas in which the students score below the national targets. The students will develop interventions and implement plans to improve those selected areas. Future plans for this project include expanding the project to majors other than nursing

Measure 3.2. (Indirect-Knowledge/Skills)

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

Findings.

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

Trending:

Skyfactor	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 72	Q 71	Q71	Q70
		N=212	N=209	N=167
NSU	5.88	5.61	5.78	5.49
Carnegie	5.70	5.64	5.66	5.7

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, NSU met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of this question related to making effective presentations. Trending for this outcome shows three years of meeting the

outcome with slight fluctuations in the NSU mean score. Assignments that required presentation 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 participated in political debates. Students performed very well on these assignments. In the Spring of 2016, the students presented the NURB 3160 project by developing a voice-over PowerPoint and submitted it for a grade. In the Fall 2016 semester, the faculty decided to enhance the presentation experience in NURB 3160 by utilizing TVs as monitors which would display the student's PPT presentation and have the students present the material at an "Evidence Based Practice" (EBP) event. Students rotated giving their evidence-based practice presentation as interested students, faculty, and guests perused their work. The event was met with success and positive reviews. During this year, two 2nd level students decided that they would like to continue the proposed research they submitted in their NURB 3160 research PPT presentation. They developed a research proposal with guidance from the faculty teaching the undergraduate research course and submitted the proposal to the NSU IRB. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to obtain more TVs to use as display monitors to enable more students to present at the same time during the event and to support the students who express an interest in continuing research. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, five more TVs were obtained bringing the total to nine monitors. During this year, the EBP event was promoted to the school and faculty with students rotating after an hour to allow all students to participate.

In addition, the two students who elected to continue their research received IRB approval, initiated the research, analyzed the data (with faculty assistance), and presented the preliminary results to the NSU faculty in the Fall of 2017 and again at the Sigma Theta Tau Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana in November 2017. The two students presenting this research have now graduated from the BSN program. However, in 2018 the students have plans to present their research regionally and internationally (in Australia).

The Skyfactor NSU mean score for 2017-2018 did not meet the expected outcome. The NSU mean score was 0.21 points below the Carnegie mean score which was a decrease of 0.29 points. Plans for 2018-2019 are to encourage students to enhance their presentation skills by using props in NURB 3160, and to continue to support and encourage students in the research process in NURB 3160, and to continue other presentation assignments in the nursing courses.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, NSU did not meet the expected outcome of meeting the Carnegie mean score for this item. Students did participate in several presentations throughout their BSN program. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 is to encourage students to enhance their presentation by using props in NURB 3160, continue to support and encourage students in the research process in NURB 3160, and to continue other presentation assignments in the nursing courses.

Measure 3.3 (Indirect-Knowledge)
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 a grade of 80% or better

Findings.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met;   98.6% of students achieved a score of 80% or better

AY 2017-2018: Target Met;   99.4% of students achieved a score of 80% or better

Trending:

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

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, 98.6% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on the Evidence Based Presentation in NURB 3160. The expected outcome for this measure was met. The student who did not achieve this score chose not to complete the project due to the need to study for another course. For this project, students selected a research article and developed a voice-over PowerPoint presentation. In the spring semester, the students submitted this project to the faculty with no other presentation. In the Fall semester, faculty obtained four TVs to use as monitors for presentation purposes. Multiple students were then able to present their research in one room with the audience perusing the posters on the TV monitors and talking with the group of students that had research that was of interest. After one hour, the students rotated to allow all student to present their research. The project and feedback from students was positive and the plan for 2017-2018 was to expand the number of students able to present at one time. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the faculty obtained five additional TVs for a total of nine. Students were spaced around the room with many students and faculty attending each rotation. Students from the previous semester attended as did the students in the 1st level clinicals who would be presenting the next semester. Student feedback and course evaluations were positive. In addition, this course was taught by distance learning (compressed video) starting in the Fall 2017 semester. Use of distance learning technology allowed all students to be taught by a faculty with a doctorate degree and research background. The plan for 2018-2019 is to encourage students to enhance their presentation by allowing the use of props (i.e. aroma therapy, colored eye glasses, food, wound care products), to continue the requirement for voice-over PPT, and continue the use of doctorly prepared faculty.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome of 90% of students in NURB 3160 scoring a grade of 80% or better was met with 99.4 % of students scoring an 80% or better. The approach from 2016-2017 was expanded resulting in the ability to more efficiently use the time for the presentations. Based on the analysis of the results, the assignment allows students to demonstrate the ability to effectively present their research project to an audience of their peers and faculty. Therefore, based on these findings, the plan for 2018-2019 is to encourage students to enhance their presentation by allowing the use of props, to continue the requirement for voice-over PPT, and continue the use of doctorate prepared faculty.

Measure 3.4 (Indirect-Knowledge/Attitude)
This measure is composed of 3 Skyfactor questions.

Expected Outcome for all 3 questions: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification
Assessment Method: Skyfactor Questions – "To what degre did your nursing program teach you to:
   1. "Understand the effects of health policies on diverse populations."
      Findings:
      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
      Trending:

Skyfactor	Health policies on diverse populations			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 74	Q 73	Q73	Q72
	N=179	N=214	N=211	N=166
NSU	5.98	5.69	5.79	5.58
Carnegie	5.72	5.69	5.68	5.77

   2. "Apply an ethical decision-making framework to clinical situations."
      Findings:
      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
      Trending:

Skyfactor	Apply ethical decision making			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 87	Q 86	Q86	Q 85
		N=213	N=213	N=169
NSU	6.35	6.10	6.19	5.99
Carnegie	6.06	6.03	6.05	6.09

   3. Act as an advocate for vulnerable populations."
      Findings:
      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
      Trending:

Skyfactor	Act as an advocate for vulnerable patients

	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Q 83	Q 82	Q82	Q81
			N=211	N=169
NSU	6.31	6.15	6.19	6.04
Select 6	6.13	6.08	6.09	6.15

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, NSU met and exceeded the expected outcome for all three of the questions in Measure 3.4. NSU also met the expected outcomes for the previous two years with our mean scores increasing and decreasing slightly by 0.3 points. Students learn about diversity, vulnerable populations, and ethical dilemmas beginning with pre-clinical nursing courses through the end of the nursing program. In the clinical area, students deal with diverse and vulnerable populations each semester. In the 5th semester, students wrote a Political letter in which they researched bills related to healthcare before the legislature, selected a bill, wrote a letter for or against the bill, and emailed the letter. In 5th level, students also completed the "windshield survey" in which they assessed a community and developed three interventions that could help the community. To bring more depth to the 5th level assignment, the plan for 2017-2018 was to change the "windshield" assignment to a Healthy People 2020 assignment. Students in 5th level would be assigned certain health topics and would compare the state of Louisiana's health outcomes with a similar state (but not our neighboring states). The assignment was to write a paper on the health outcomes and why they were different, addressing policies, funding, etc. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the Healthy People 2020 assignment was implemented. Though the assignment was a success, the students did not like the assignment and complained that it was boring. Faculty actively searched for an activity to better engage the students. Faculty surveyed students to see if they thought doing a project that was directly related to health outcomes of students at this university would be more appealing. The students liked the idea. As the idea was to participate in Healthy Campus 2020 which would involve the collection of health data, the faculty submitted an IRB proposal and received approval. Data has not been collected at this point. The plan for 2018-2019 is to implement the Healthy Campus 2020 project in which the faculty survey nursing students regarding health behaviors. Results will be analyzed, and faculty will determine areas in need of improved health promotion behaviors based on the student score and the national average. The students will develop interventions and implementation plans to improve those areas.

During the 2017-2018 assessment year, the BSN faculty also made plans to participate in the university's Quality Enhancement Plan capstone project "Learning for Life" starting in the summer of 2018. This project will initiate a process in which students reflect more in-depth on their experiential learning during their last semester of preceptorship/ internship clinical experiences. During the experiential capstone courses (NURB 4221 and NURB 4231), students will provide healthcare to vulnerable populations within the guidelines of health policies and gain experience in making ethical decisions.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, NSU did not meet the expected outcomes for the three questions related to diverse populations, ethical decision

making, and being an advocate for vulnerable populations despite students experiencing these concepts in clinical each semester and assignments required to guide student learning in these areas. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year will be to implement the capstone project in the last clinical semester – Learning for Life and implement Healthy Campus 2020. These learning experiences will provide students the opportunity to reflect more in-depth on their learning experiences and health practices during their last semester of clinical. During the experiential capstone courses, students will provide healthcare to vulnerable populations within the guidelines of health policies and gain experience in making ethical decisions.

Measure 3.5 (Direct-Knowledge/Skill)

Assessment Method: Health Assessment Final Practicum in NURB 3061 (Health Assessment & Skills Lab)
For this practicum, students are expected to demonstrate skills learned in the lab course throughout the semester. There is one attempt only.
Expected Outcome: 90% of student in NURB 3061 will achieve a minimum score of 80% on the Final Practicum.

Findings.

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

Trending:

	2015-2016	2016-2017		2017-2018	
Final Practicum	100%	Shreveport n = 116/117	99%	Shreveport n =153/155	99%
		Alexandria n = 45/45	100%	Alexandria n =34/35	97%
				Natchitoches n=23/25	92%
Total		161/162	99.4%	N=210/215	97.6%

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, 99.4% of students achieved a score of 80% or above on the final practicum in NURB 3061. Lab skills are taught throughout the semester utilizing ATI videos, faculty demonstrations, student return demonstrations, and practicums. Students who are weak in skills or fail a practicum have remediation before retaking a practicum. Students must successfully pass the practicums as these skills are essential to providing safe, competent, care in the clinical setting. There was a change in the 1st level coordinator from Spring 2016 to the Fall 2016. Faculty reported issues of students not preparing for lab and students not putting forth a good effort to learn all skills. In assessing the course during that first semester, the faculty determined that if the course was graded with A-F instead of pass/fail, students would give the class more effort. The plan for 2017-2018 was to change the NURB 3061 course to a graded course, institute a one-hour mandatory self-practice before each practicum before a

student would be allowed to take the practicum and schedule a class period of practice/mock practicum before each practicum. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, these measures were implemented. NURB 3061 was changed to a graded course and the practice periods were implemented. In addition, students who failed a practicum signed a learning contract specifying what was needed for the student to pass the practicum and the course. Faculty reported that students were more prepared for the practicums. Also, during the 2017-2018 assessment year, the coordinator noticed inconsistencies in faculty grading of practicums, prompting the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year. During the 2018-2019 assessment year, students will learn skills during lab with their assigned lab faculty. However, students will sign up for evaluation with no regard for lab faculty. Students are evaluated by the next faculty available during the testing period. It is felt that this will also facilitate student preparation for practicums. An additional plan to promote student success and utilize technology, includes incorporating virtual simulation as a component in the NURB 3061 lab course.

Decision: The plan from 2016-2017 was implemented and included 1) changing the NURB 3061 to a graded course, 2) instituting a one-hour mandatory self-practice before each practicum before a student would be allowed to take the practicum, and 3) scheduling a class period to include a practice/mock practicum before each graded practicum. In the 2017-2018, 97.6% of students met the expected outcome of 90% of students achieving a score of 80% or better on the final practicum in NURB 3061 Health Assessment & Skills Lab. During the 2017-2018 assessment year, the coordinator noticed inconsistencies in faculty grading of practicum, prompting the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the next year is for students to learn skills during lab with their assigned lab faculty. However, students will sign up for evaluation with no regard for lab faculty, ensuring that students are preparing to demonstrate the knowledge and skills required. Students are evaluated by the next faculty available during the testing period. An additional plan to promote student success and utilize technology, is to incorporate Virtual simulation in to the lab course.

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 (Direct-Knowledge)

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

Findings:

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

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

Trending:

	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
Political Assign.	Shreveport n = 121/121	100%	Shreveport n = 127/127	100%	Shreveport n = 111/111	100%
	Alexandria n = 30/33	90.9%	Alexandria n = 27/27	100%	Alexandria n = 17/17	100%
Total	151/154	98%	164/164	100%	128/128	100%

Analysis. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, the expected outcome was met with 100% of students achieving a score of 80% or above on the political assignment project. The Political Assignment Project in NURB 4221 required students to write a letter to an elected representative of the community regarding a healthcare or education issue that was currently before the legislature. The student had to state their support for or against the issue. Details were specified on a rubric provided to students. Students submit the assignment, receive feedback, and made changes until it was satisfactorily completed. The student then emailed the letter to the official. Faculty reported that the quality of the submissions was poor since the course was a Pass/Fail with no letter grade assignment for the course. To put emphasis on this assignment, the plan for 2017-2018 plan involved moving the assignment from NURB 4221 (a clinical course) to NURB 4220 (a didactic course) and to make the assignment count as part of the course grade. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the Political Assignment Project was moved to NURB 4220 and counted 10% of the course grade. Faculty report that students have given more effort to this assignment in the past year. Though 100% of students achieved a grade of 80% or better, students did have difficulty in determining how the current items before the legislature related to healthcare when they were just budget items. Faculty subsequently educated the students on how the budget affects healthcare and education. With 100% achievement, there is evidence that students learned how to write a political letter and send it to the appropriate official. Based on the analysis of the results, faculty plan to develop written instructions that give examples of how items like the budget can affect healthcare and education. In addition, faculty will post links to websites that educate on the legislative process and provide information regarding bills before the legislature.

Decision: One hundred percent of students met the expected outcome of achieving a score of 80% or better on the Political Assignment Project for the 2017-2018 assessment year, providing evidence of student learning. However, students did have difficulty in determining how the current items before the legislature related to healthcare when they were just budget items. Based on the analysis of the results,

faculty plan to develop written instructions that give examples of how items like the budget can affect healthcare and education. In addition, faculty will post links to websites that educate on the legislative process and provide information regarding bills before the legislature.

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. Note: students in one of the two groups taking this survey were very disgruntled at having to attend multiple review sessions due to the high failure rate on the Comprehensive Predictor. This survey was given during the time of much dissention.

Measure 5.1, (Indirect-Knowledge)

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

Findings.

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

Trending:

Skyfactor	Communicate with healthcare professionals			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 77	Q 76	Q76	Q75
	N=179	N=216	N=213	N=171
NSU	6.07	5.88	5.93	5.63
Carnegie	5.8	5.76	5.77	5.85

Measure 5.2, (Indirect-Knowledge)

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

Findings.

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

Trending:

Skyfactor	Work with interprofessional teams			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 79	Q 78	Q78	Q76
	N=179	N=214	N=212	N=167
NSU	6.14	5.89	6.02	5.55
Carnegie	5.85	5.78	5.8	5.81

Analysis for measures 5.1 and 5.2: For the 2016-2017 assessment year, the BSN program met the expected outcome of meeting the Carnegie mean score for the questions related to communicating with healthcare professionals and working with interprofessional teams. The NSU mean score for the 5.1 measure increased slightly from the 2015-2016 assessment year. The NSU mean score for the 5.2 measure also increased slightly and both exceeded the Carnegie mean score for the past three years. Each clinical semester students work with healthcare personnel in many departments in a variety of clinical facilities. However, there was not an organized effort to ensure that all students have the same opportunity to learn the same things from those encounters. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, plans were made to initiate interprofessional collaboration in the simulation environment to offer a more organized effort and controlled learning environment. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the BSN program collaborated with our simulation provider to initiate interprofessional simulations with students from nursing, physician's assistant, and pharmacy programs. Since this was the first interprofessional simulation for this group, it took time to develop and organize. Consequently, not all students were able to participate. Faculty received positive feedback from students who participated in interprofessional simulation. Students who were unable to participate the interprofessional simulation had the opportunity to participate in in other interprofessional activities including a community wide disaster training and a collaborative care activity at an area teaching hospital. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to schedule all students for interprofessional simulation during the 4th level clinical semester.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the BSN program initiated interprofessional simulation training with pharmacy and physician's assistant students. In addition, students participated in collaborative activities in an area hospital and in a community wide disaster drill. Despite these efforts, the BSN program did not meet the expected outcome of meeting the Carnegie mean score of 5.81. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to schedule *all* students for interprofessional simulation during the 4th level clinical semester.

Measure 5.3 (Indirect-Knowledge)

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

Findings.

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

Trending:

Skyfactor	Assess predictive factors			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 79	Q 78	Q78	Q77
	N=179	N=214	N=212	N=170
NSU	6.14	5.89	6.02	5.76
Carnegie	5.85	5.78	5.8	5.87

Analysis. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.02, which exceeded the expected outcome of the Carnegie mean score of 5.8. Current teaching for this measure is integrated throughout the BSN nursing courses. Pre-nursing courses that contribute to student learning 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 didactic course and in each clinical course of each level. Fifth level students also participated in a "windshield survey" in which they assessed a community and developed three interventions which could help the community. Students did well on this assignment, however, faculty felt the students could benefit from a different assignment – one that would help the students learn more. The plan for 2017-2018 was to change the "windshield" assignment to a Healthy People 2020 assignment. Students in 5th level would be assigned certain health topics and would compare the state of Louisiana's health outcomes with a similar state. The assignment was to write a paper on the health outcomes and why they were different, addressing policies, funding, etc. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the Healthy People 2020 assignment was implemented. Though the assignment was a success, the students did not like the assignment and complained that it was boring. All other assignments mentioned above continued. Though students were demonstrating the ability to assess predictive factors in nursing courses and scored this measure high (5.76 on 7-point scale), the mean score did not meet the Carnegie mean score. As stated before, students completed this survey during a period of dissatisfaction during one of the semesters.

In searching for an activity to engage the students in 5th level, faculty surveyed students to see if they thought doing a project that was directly related to health outcomes of students at this university would be more interesting and applicable to their

practice. The students liked the idea. As the idea was to participate in Healthy Campus 2020 which would involve the collection of health data, the faculty submitted an IRB proposal and received approval. Based on the analysis of the data, the plan for 2018-2019 is to implement the Health Campus 2020 project in which the faculty survey nursing students regarding health behaviors (IRB approval will be obtained). Results will be analyzed, and faculty will choose areas of health promotion behaviors which the students scored below the national targets. The students will develop interventions and implementation plans to improve those areas.

Decision. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, NSU did not meet the Carnegie mean score of 5.87 for this measure. The NSU mean score was 5.76 which is 0.11 points below the expected outcome. Content for this concept is integrated throughout the nursing courses. In addition, new projects have been explored and implemented in the last clinical level. While students have done well on these, they were not projects that students enjoyed. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 will be to implement the Healthy Campus 2020 project in which the faculty survey nursing students regarding health behaviors (IRB approval will be obtained). Results will be analyzed, and faculty will choose areas of health promotion behaviors which the students scored below the national targets. The students will be responsible for developing interventions and implementation plans to improve those areas.

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

Measure 6.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

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 on the ATI Leadership exam. Note: This year, the ATI exams were only given once - with the exam counting the same percent as the other exams in the course.

Finding.

AY 2016-2017: Target Not Met; 75% of students achieved a Level 2 on the ATI Leadership exam by the 2nd attempt

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

Trending:

	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
1st Attempt	Shreveport N=79/117	76%	Shreveport n = 71/129	55%	Shreveport n =56/108	52%
	Alexandria N=28/32	87.5%	Alexandria n = 24/27	88.9%	Alexandria n =12/17	71%
2nd Attempt	Shreveport N=17/20	85%	Shreveport N= 19/29*	*65%		
	Alexandria N=3/4	75%	Alexandria N=3/3*	*100%		
Total	127/149	85%	117/156	*75%	69/125	64%

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

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, 75% of students achieved a Level 2 on the ATI Leadership Exam. This did not meet the expected outcome of 80% of students scoring a Level 2 on this exam. The Level 2 on this exam reflects that students have learned the material sufficiently. During the 2016-2017 assessment year, faculty teaching this course changed. Material utilized by the original faculty was used for the course when the new faculty started. During this online course, students have readings from their text, discussion boards, quizzes, and a resumé to complete. Faculty teaching in Fall 2016 were new to the course and followed the previous syllabus and content delivery. Also, during this year, the Alexandria campus had a face-to-face course and the Shreveport campus had an online course. Though the face to face course had a higher percentage of students achieving a level 2 on this exam, the online course provided students more flexibility for completing course work during times convenient to them. Also, the Alexandria campus faculty had taught the course previously. The plan for 2017-2018 was to provide more online resources for students, offer all courses online, and to review the ATI results to determine areas of knowledge deficits. In the 2017-2018 assessment year all sections of NURB 4230 Healthcare Management were moved online and more web resources were provided for each module to enhance student learning. During this time the faculty remained stable and they were able to learn more about the class and evaluate the students and class more in-depth. Faculty found that the required text was more appropriate for a graduate course than an undergraduate course, that students were missing ATI Leadership Exam questions that dealt with delegation and prioritization, and that students often prioritized other courses over this course due to the need to study more depending on their grades in other courses. Most students passed this course with grades of As and Bs; there were no failures. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the following plan was developed for 2018-2019: 1) review other texts and make a recommendation for a more appropriate text and adopt that text, 2) add five delegation/prioritization questions to each exam/quiz, 3) review and analyze the ATI Leadership results to determine other changes needed, and investigate ATI resources that could be utilized in teaching the class, and 4) discuss with students the value in giving this exam their best effort.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, 64% of students achieved a level 2 on the Leadership ATI exam. This result did not meet the expected outcome. Contributing factors to the decrease in the outcome were changes in faculty, a text book more advanced that was appropriate, and student prioritizing preparing for other courses over this exam. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the following plan was developed for 2018-2019: 1) review other texts and make a recommendation for a more appropriate text and adopt that text, 2) add five delegation/prioritization questions to each exam, and 3) review and analyze the ATI Leadership results to determine other changes needed, and investigate ATI resources that could be utilized in teaching the class, and 4) discuss with students the value in giving this exam their best effort.

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 question and findings will be presented first and the analysis for all will be combined as measures to accomplish these outcomes are similar. Note: students in one of the two groups taking this survey were very disgruntled at having to attend multiple review sessions due to the high failure rate on the Comprehensive Predictor. This survey was given during the time of much dissention.

Measure 7.1 - 7.3, (Indirect-Knowledge/Attitudes)

Expected Outcome: Mean score equal to or greater than the mean score of the schools in the Carnegie Classification *Assessment Method:* Skyfactor Questions –"To what degree did your nursing program teach you to:
1. "Incorporate nursing standards into practice."
Findings.
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

Trending

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

2. "Support fairness in the delivery of care."
Findings.
AY 2016-2017: Target Met   NSU Mean – 6.12; Carnegie Mean – 5.96
AY 2017-2018: Target Not Met   NSU Mean – 5.9 ; Carnegie Mean – 6.02
Trending:

Skyfactor	Support fairness in delivery of care			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 81	Q 80	Q80	Q79

	N=179	N=215	N=210	N=172
NSU	6.27	5.96	6.12	5.9
Carnegie	5.99	5.93	5.96	6.02

3. "Demonstrate accountability for your own actions."
   Findings.
   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
   Trending:

Skyfactor	Demonstrate accountability for your own actions			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 84	Q 83	Q83	Q82
	N=179	N=216	N=211	N=170
NSU	6.41	6.22	6.32	5.99
Carnegie	6.20	6.11	6.12	6.16

Analysis. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, NSU met the expected outcomes on all of the above questions by exceeding the Carnegie mean score by 0.08 to 0.2 points. There have been consistent results for the past three (3) years of meeting the expected outcomes with slight increases and decreases in the mean scores. The content covered with these questions is based on nursing standards and nursing professional behaviors which are introduced in pre-nursing courses and integrated throughout the curriculum. Adhering to legal and ethical standards, demonstrating accountability and respect in all aspects of nursing care, and maintaining patient confidentiality are student behaviors that are evaluated each clinical rotation throughout the program. Each student demonstrated these behaviors in each clinical rotation, as evidenced by their progression through the program. In 2016-2017 faculty planned to revise the clinical evaluation to have students complete a self-evaluation at Mid-term and at the end of the semester and to make these behaviors a "critical behavior." Student must be successful in meeting critical behaviors to pass the course. In addition, students were to reflect on these behaviors in their portfolio. These actions were implemented in 2017-2018. However, the NSU mean score for these items all decreased to slightly below the Carnegie mean score. (As stated above, this survey was initiated during a time of much student dissatisfaction during one semester.) Though the mean scores decreased, the average of 6 on a 7-point scale does indicate that students rated the program high on these measures; the NSU means did not, however, meet the expected outcomes. In the 2017-2018 assessment year the BSN program prepared to participate in the university's Quality Enhancement Plan "Learning for Life" to be initiated in the summer of 2018. This capstone initiative will be implemented in the last clinical semester, with students reflecting on learning experiences, how they have developed professionally, and how their education will affect their future self and future practice. All clinical levels will initiate reflection measures, beginning in the 1st level and building reflection practices incrementally to prepare students for the capstone experience in 5th level.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the BSN program did not meet the Carnegie mean scores of the presented Skyfactor questions, despite the evidence of students demonstrating the behaviors stated in the questions. Though the outcomes

were not met, the NSU mean score was still high with the mean scores ranging from 5.9 to 6.01 on a 7-point scale. Based on the analysis of the results, in the 2018-2019 assessment year, the BSN program will participate in the Learning for Life Quality Enhancement Plan. This capstone initiative will be implemented in the student's final semester starting in Summer 2018, with students reflecting in-depth on learning experiences, how they have developed, and how the learning will affect their future self. All clinical levels will initiate reflection measures, beginning in the 1st level and building reflection practices incrementally to prepare students for the capstone experience in 5th level.

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

Measure 8.1 (Direct-Attitude)

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.

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

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

Trending:

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		2017-2018	
Continue Education	71% 110/156	71% 86/121	Shreveport n = 99/126	77%	Shreveport n = 83/104	80%
			Alexandria n = 23/27	85%	Alexandria n = 22/23	96%
Total			122/153	80%	105/127	83%

Analysis: In the 2016-2017 assessment year, 80% of graduating students expressed that they planned to continue their education. This met the expected outcome measure of 80%. As students' progress through clinical courses, faculty reinforce that the healthcare world is ever changing, which means that they will continuously have to learn to keep abreast of current practice. 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. In addition, nurses must have five continuing education hours per year to renew their license. For advance practiced or certified nurses, the number of continuing education hours increases significantly. In 2016-2017 the form used to gather this information asked, "Do you plan to pursue further education following graduation?" The implication from this could be that they plan to return to school immediately after graduation. The measurement for this SLO is obtained from

self-report of the student who is in their last semester of a very difficult curriculum. Many students report that they are "tired" and just want to be a nurse. Others do not have the financial means. The plan for 2017-2018 was to revise the question to ask "Do you plan to continue your education at some time in the future?" This would clarify the intent of the question. In the 2017-2018 assessment year 83% of students reported the plan to continue their education. This supports an upward trend in students valuing continued education. The plan for 2018-2019 is to have 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 addition, the question on the form could imply that we are asking about formal education. The question will be reviewed further.

Decision: In 2017-20108 assessment year, 83% of graduating students indicated a plan to continue their education at some point in the future. This continues the four year upward trend in this measure. Based on the analysis of the results, students have plans to further their education. The plan for 2018-2019 is to have 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 addition, the question on the form could imply that we are asking about formal education. The question will be reviewed further.

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

Measure 9.1 (Indirect-Knowledge)

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

Findings.

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

Trending:

Skyfactor	Use appropriate technologies to assess pts.			
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
	Q 73	Q 72	Q72	Q71
	N=179	N=214	N=213	N=171
NSU	5.92	5.80	5.93	5.75
Carnegie	5.76	5.69	5.68	5.76

Analysis: For the 2016-2017 assessment year, the expected outcome measure was met with the NSU mean score of 5.93 and the Carnegie mean score of 5.68. Students in the clinical setting use a variety of technologies, including vital sign machines, Point of Care testing for blood sugar measurements, cardiac monitoring, and electronic health

records, to name a few. Over the past assessment years, the NSU mean scores for this item remained above the Carnegie mean score with slight fluctuations. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for 2017-2018 was for every student to experience simulation in clinical and to initiate utilization of virtual experiences to enhance classroom learning. In 2017-2018 this plan was implemented with each student experiencing simulation related to the specific course content. In addition, faculty utilized virtual experiences with case scenarios to enhance learning in the didactic courses in 5th level. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the NSU mean score (5.75) was a slight decrease from the previous year (5.93). While the NSU mean score of 5.75 did not meet the Carnegie level (5.76), the NSU mean score was only 0.01 below the expected outcome. Life in general requires an increasing use of technologies, especially in healthcare facilities. Based on the analysis of the evidence, for the 2018-2019 assessment year, the program plans to expand the use of virtual simulation in the didactic and clinical courses. All clinical levels are exploring options for the adoption of new materials that offer multi-media experiences to enhance learning.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the NSU mean score (5.75) was a slight decrease from the previous year (5.93). While NSUs mean score of 5.75 did not meet the Carnegie level of 5.76, it was only 0.01 below the expected outcome. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the program plans to expand the use of virtual simulation in the didactic and clinical courses. All clinical levels are exploring options for the adoption of new materials that offer multi-media experiences to enhance learning.

Measure 9.2 (Direct-Knowledge)

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)

Findings.

AY 2016-2017: Target Met; 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or higher on the Culture of Safety Assignment

AY 2017-2018: Target Met; 100% of students achieved a score or 80% or higher on the Culture of Safety Assignment

Trending:

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Informatics Assignment (Culture of Safety)	100% 92/92	Data not available	100% (146/146) Course Online	100% 144/145

Analysis: During the 2016-2017 assessment year NURB 3260 Nursing Informatics was transitioned to an online course. 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. Since 100% of students were able to achieve an 80% or higher on this assignment, faculty decided to shift the focus of the topics to those which had a high risk for errors. This would enhance awareness and facilitate learning on those critical topics. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the faculty initiated this plan by assigning topics from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality website. Students prepared a PPT document, then reviewed and gave feedback on two other student's projects. References were required for the document and in the responses to classmate's projects. Students reported that they felt better prepared to prevent these errors in the clinical setting. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome measure was met with 100% of students achieving a score of 80% or better on the Culture of Safety assignments. With 100% achieving the expected outcome and positive student feedback, there is evidence of student learning on this important topic. To enhance this assignment and encourage further learning, the plan for 2018-2019 will be to expand the potential topics by researching the Joint Commission websites and to add the topic of safety related to the Electronic Health Record.

Decision: In 2017-2018, 100% of the students in NURB 3260 achieved a score of 80% or better on the Culture of Safety Assignment. The plan from 2016-2017 had been successfully implemented with positive results and students voicing that they felt better prepared to prevent these errors in the clinical setting. Based on the analysis of the results and a desire to enhance learning for students, the plan for 2018-2019 is to utilize topics from the Joint Commission websites and to add the topic of safety related to the Electronic Health Record.

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

In the 2017-2018 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:

- 73% of students who started in cohorts to graduate in 2017 did graduate on schedule. Another 11% of those cohorts are still enrolled.

- 96% of graduates passed the NCLEX-RN on the first attempt

- 100% of graduates who sought employment are employed

The Comprehensive Predictor (predictive test for the NCLEX-RN) was moved from the 5th Level (last semester) to the 4th Level (next to last semester) clinical courses and the exam counted 5% of the course grade. The individual student report of strengths and deficits in knowledge 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 NCLEX-RN review course was scheduled for students in their last year. 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 preparation of students and the graduates being successful on the NCLEX-RN licensing exam. In addition, nursing students are participating in research and using that research in Health Campus 2020; two students presented their research twice in 2017 (locally and nationally) and plan to present it twice in 2018, regionally and internationally; students wrote and sent political letters to their elected legislators; and students participated in interprofessional simulation.

Some interventions taken will not result in immediate improvements on SLO measures, like the Skyfactor survey. Some measures initiated affected the freshmen or sophomore level students and those students will not take the Skyfactor survey until they are graduating seniors. These measures include developing English, Math, and University 1000 courses specifically for nursing students. As these courses will be designed specifically for nursing, we expect students to see how it helps with the nursing courses.

All Skyfactor survey mean scores were below the expected outcome by 0.01 -0.3 points. As all scores were lower than previous trending, it is reasonable to suspect that the student experience at the time of the survey impacted the results. The Skyfactor survey was given during a time of student dissatisfaction due to students experiencing consequences related to their actions. Most measures that were not related to Skyfactor showed that students were meeting and exceeding expected outcomes. These actions facilitated the success of graduates in passing the NLCEX-RN on the first attempt. In 2017 the pass rate for the BSN program was 96% which was an increase from 2015 (88%) and the same as 2016 (96%). The employment rate of graduates who sought employment is 100%. Below are other measures that have contributed to student learning and success in the 2017-2018 assessment year.

- ATI standardized exams were utilized each clinical level to assess and inform students of content areas of competency and deficiency.

- Use of ATI Resources for teaching, remediation, and testing.

- Increased the weighted percentage for ATI exams in courses.

- Texts utilized contain evidence-based practice in each chapter.

- Senior students worked on areas of knowledge deficits identified by the Comprehensive Predictor.

- Student participation in Interprofessional Simulation.

- Tutoring on course content in each level by tutors and faculty.

- Learning contracts implemented for students not meeting passing criteria throughout the semester.

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

- Utilizing case studies in didactic and clinical courses.

- NURB 3050 Altered Health States utilizing adaptive testing.

- Student mock interviews (for job employment) in the final clinical semester.

- ATI prep with Jeopardy game in 2nd level.

- Faculty initiated Healthy Campus 2020 project after students expressed interest.

- Preparing to participate in QEP Learning for Life – capstone courses utilizing experiential learning and reflection on learning throughout the clinical nursing courses including a pilot in Summer 2018.

- Faculty support of BSN students desiring to participate in research and present findings.

- Students have access to high fidelity simulation through a healthcare partner of NSU – Willis-Knighton Health Systems.

- Faculty advise students pre-clinical and each semester that students are in clinical.

- NURB 3061 Health Assessment and Basic Life Skills across the Lifespan was changed to a graded course.

- Admitting BSN nursing cohorts on the Natchitoches campus.

- Working with athletics department on main campus to facilitate students being able to fulfill the requirements for majoring in nursing and being athlete.

- Six (6) BSN faculty and one Student Success Coordinator are supported/provided through healthcare partnerships.

- 83% of graduating students express the intent to continue their education in the future.

- Employment Rates: 100% of graduates from 2017 who want to work are employed. One graduate has returned to school (unable to work at present due to injury).

- Nine faculty are working on their doctorate.

- NSU sent two students to AACN Student Policy Summit in Washington, D.C.

- Resources are being reviewed for increase in type and amount of technology-based teaching resources.

- Surveyed students on technology and apps utilized for nursing courses.

- Initial steps taken to obtain iPads for student testing and resources.

Plan of action moving forward.

As is evident in the measures of the student learning outcomes, students must be able to utilize technology comfortably as it continues to expand and become a part of

each course that we teach. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the BSN program will be moving toward utilization of technology to facilitate student learning, increase student comfort with testing online, and increase the amount and variety of resources available. Books with a variety of learning resources will be adopted starting in the first clinical courses in the spring semester. The NCLEX-RN is a computerized exam, so all testing will be given via computer. The use of iPads will support these endeavors and decrease the cost of expanding computer labs. In addition, the 5th Level students will be participating in the capstone courses as part of the Learning for Life initiative.

The 2018-2019 assessment year will also be a time of in-depth review of the Student Learning Outcomes and measures to ensure a more concise and effective use of measures. The BSN Curriculum will be under review as the program attempts to design a 15-credit hour semester/30 credit hour year to promote student success. The program will also use this time to review the content of the curriculum, making changes to facilitate the preparation of students for their future career in the nursing profession.