



**2014-2015 CSCI EETF Assessment Year End Report, June, 2015**

Program Name(s)	EETF Faculty Rep	Department Chair
Nursing	Lindsay McCrea	Lynn Van Hofwegen

**A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

Students graduating with a B.S. in nursing from Cal State East Bay will

1. Synthesize knowledge from the natural, behavioral sciences, and the humanities with current nursing knowledge and theory to deliver nursing care.
2. Provide safe, compassionate nursing care to diverse client populations.
3. Use critical thinking and communication skills to collaborate with clients and other health care professionals.
4. Demonstrate responsibility and accountability for design, delivery, and evaluation of client care.
5. Demonstrate professional behaviors in interactions with clients, families, colleagues, and the public.

**B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

While we continue to assess all SLOs for our program this year we have focused on

SLO2 Provide safe, compassionate nursing care to diverse populations.

SLO3 Use critical thinking and communication skills to collaborate with clients and other health care professionals.

SLO4 Demonstrate responsibility and accountability for design, delivery, and evaluation of client care.

**C. Summary of Assessment Process**

Our primary mission is to educate nurse generalists prepared with a Bachelor of Science degree. Assessment of student progression and achievement of learning outcomes is in place throughout the nursing curriculum. Assessment approaches include direct observation and evaluation in clinical settings, assignments, tests, performance evaluations in skills lab settings and standardized examinations (e.g., NCLEX- RN exam, Kaplan predictor exam). We are utilizing the comprehensive test data along with recommendations from the Institute of Medicine (IOM) to restructure our curriculum and to enhance learning outcomes of our students. To improve the assessment of SLOs for the Nursing Program, we are in the process of gathering artifacts from all levels in the form of rubrics used to evaluate papers and capstone projects, as well as clinical outcomes using a new Clinical Performance Evaluation Tool and a revised Nursing Care Plan.

In AY 2014-2015, the Nursing Program received approval for the interim report to the Commission of Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) submitted in May 2014 in which

evaluation and assessment of program outcomes were addressed in detail. The Nursing Program is in the progress of preparing a comprehensive self-study for the CCNE accreditation renewal. The self-study will be submitted in January 2016 with a site visit in February 2016. CCNE evaluates programs on passing rates for the nursing licensure exam (NCLEX – RN), graduation completion rates, employment rates, and evidence of student satisfaction with the program. Student Learning Outcomes are also addressed as program outcomes. NCLEX-RN pass rates are assessed annually through information provided by the California Board of Registered Nurses and trends are carefully tracked by the nursing program. Graduation/attrition rates are tracked by the department for both the pre-licensure cohort and the ADN/RN-BSN cohort. Student satisfaction is assessed through a biannual Student Exit Survey from EBI, an external assessment agency and by a biannual internal survey for all enrolled students. Graduate employment rates are assessed through online surveys distributed annually.

Student learning outcomes and institutional outcomes have been identified and are mapped through the curriculum (see curriculum map). Data is collected for evaluation of the achievement of the SLO and program learning outcomes. In order to evaluate student performance in clinical, the faculty developed a new Clinical Performance Evaluation Tool (CPE) and updated the Nursing Care Plan (NCP). The CPE is a document that specifically evaluates student performance in the following areas: professionalism, patient-centered care, teamwork and collaboration, informatics, evidence based practice, safety, quality improvement and clinical judgment. These content areas are based upon QSEN competencies and AACN BSN competencies. Students are evaluated with a “Satisfactory, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory” scores on each of the items within the areas aforementioned.

SLO 3 assessment was continued with the Level 1 and Level 3 students. Rubrics were used to evaluate the Evidence Based Paper and capstone Ethics paper.

#### **D. Summary of Assessment Results**

The Nursing Program uses information provided by the California Board of Registered Nurses (BRN) to assess our graduates' pass rates on the licensure exam (NCLEX-RN) While program pass rates in the last 5 years have consistently been above 88% which is our program bench mark; in 2013 the NCLEX-RN was revised with a subsequent drop in the program pass rate. In 2013, we had an 82.79. This year in 2014, the program pass rate has increased to 88.3 NCLEX-RN pass rate for all graduates who have taken the NCLEX-RN for the first time. This information is posted by the BRN on its website at <http://www.rn.ca.gov/schools/passrates.shtml>

The nursing program remains concerned about the pass rates below 90% but recognizes the trend toward increasing pass rates this year. The Nursing Program continues to take action to address this matter. An NCLEX task force and an action plan are remain in place to address the rates. Our graduation/ attrition rates have remained steady at 91.5%, 87.6%, 88.6% and 87.3% for the past 4 years. Employment rates of graduates have increased as the economy has improved. Student satisfaction remains strong.

Evaluation of our SLOs has continued in our clinical evaluations, assignments, tests and laboratory assessments and findings have remained consistent with previous years. This year we implemented new clinical evaluation tools and nursing care plans. Preliminary evaluation of the effectiveness in measuring SLO2 and SLO4 via these documents has been completed by our Level 1 and 2 Coordinators. SLO #2 provide safe, compassionate nursing care to diverse populations and SLO #4 demonstrate responsibility and accountability for design, delivery, and evaluation of client care revealed that the clinical sites for Level 1 students provide a diverse

patient population with socio-economic variation. This strongly supports opportunities for students to achieve SLO #2 and students are consistently achieving this outcome in Level 1. The evaluation of client care is introduced in Level 1. Design and delivery of patient care is also introduced in Level I. The short hospital stays of most patients create a challenge for our beginning students to be able to implement nursing interventions designed with their nursing care plans (NCP). Modification of the NCP is a possible solution to assist the beginning students in this process. Students could be guided to develop possible Nursing Diagnosis and Interventions for their patients before the first day of two clinical days. Level II and III students demonstrate increasing competency SLO # 4 and Level 3 students have consistently demonstrated mastery. Modification of the Clinical Performance evaluation tool continues with implementation of the revised form anticipated in Level III this year and faculty evaluation of the tool is planned in June 2015 and June 2016.

Finally, SLO #3 was evaluated (critical thinking and communication) in the form of a capstone APA paper focused on Ethical Decision Making and Advocacy in Level 3. Using a new rubric, the Hayward and Concord cohorts (n=107) were evaluated. Specific criteria aimed at this outcome included: Description of the issue and its relevance to the clinical placement and patient population; Discussion of applicable ethical principles and their relevance to the ethical issue; Analysis of the advocacy role of the student and/or Nurse in the identified problem ending with a discussion of the intervention outcomes. Breakdown of points possible were 3, 3, 3, and 3. Student average scores for these specific sections were 2.88, 2.76, 2.34, and 2.48. The student average for the whole paper was 83.9% (range 40-100%). Low scores were outliers and can be attributed to lack of depth in discussion areas and language issues.

Students appear to be able to clearly identify problems and assess contributing factors, however, improvement is indicated in the area of analysis of interventions and outcomes. Currently students are engaged in classroom discussion regarding identification and assessment of ethical issues. However discussion has not always included problem solving regarding implementation possibilities and evaluation of actual outcomes. We plan to incorporate more robust classroom discussion. In addition engagement of active critical thinking activities in the preceding levels of the program may be required. This will require faculty collaboration.

In Level 1, evaluation of SLO #3 communication and critical thinking was revisited in the form of the clinical evidence based practice paper. In the Hayward cohort of 57 students, the average score was 93.05 (range 75-99/100). Students who had lower than the average scores showed strength in the area of identifying find issues or problems in the clinical site, but they were weak in the area of identifying and applying reliable and appropriate guidelines specific to their clinical site and patients. In addition, writing skills were neither scientific nor scholastic, and application of the APA format needs improvement.

### **E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CSCI EETF in the Future**

Nothing to suggest at this time!