Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20   *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

Unit/Program Name: Doctor of Nursing Practice   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Erik Southard, erik.southard@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? *Can expand on this in Part 2.*
1. Integrate scientific knowledge to influence health policy and decision-making through leadership, collaboration, and interprofessional action at the organizational, local, regional, national, and global levels. **DNP Essential I: Scientific Underpinning for Practice**	Community Health Planning Proposal APN810 Plan Includes: 1) Analysis of health needs at patient, population, community level 2) Identified stakeholders from community 3) Theoretical framework used to guide community project	90% of students will achieve a grade of B or better (83%) on the final community health assessment report in APN 810 per the grading rubrics, chapter one in APN 891, and the final PICO(T) question assignment in APN 891. Successful completion of APN 891 chapter one of project paper as assessed per the grading rubric: Paper includes: 1) Background 2) Significance Population of interest	There were 12 students in the APN 810 course for the fall of 2018. Ten of the 12 students were able to successfully complete the APN 810 final paper with a grade of B or better. The scores ranged from 157/225 to 225/225 with a mean of 92%. The lowest scoring student failed APN 810 and APN 891 and is no longer in the program. The other low performer is on track to graduate on time. There were 12 students in the APN 891 course in the fall of 2018; eleven of the 12 students scored an 83% or better on the chapter one assignment. Scores ranges from 58/100 to 100/100 with an average score of 93%. All 12 students in APN 891 were able to successfully articulate their PICO(T) statement. Scores on this assignment ranged from	Will continue to use this metric. Consider change to application process to further evaluate scholarly writing and possible addition of graduate writing seminar in the future.

			27/30 to 30/30 with a mean score of 29.	
2. Develop and evaluate care delivery approaches that meet current and future needs of patient populations based on scientific findings in nursing and other clinical sciences, as well as organizational, political, and economic sciences. **DNP Essential II: Organizational and Systems Leadership for Quality Improvement and Systems Thinking**	1) DNP Scholarly Project paper reflects plan that includes evaluation if IRB applicable. a. Community Planning Course Project completion and Scholarly II Course activities Webcast collaboration in N810 faculty, student, and stakeholders b. Development of socio-economic stratification for the community/population of interest in final assessment report for APN 810 and successful link of this information to scholarly project. c. Describe patient/ population/community of interest in APN892 post and scholarly paper 2) APN892 include ethical considerations and how student will develop evidence based approach in scholarly paper development	Successful identification of patient population, communication with stakeholders and establishment of project planning and budget as needed as evidenced in Community Planning and DNP Scholarly Project paper. *Use of standardized rubric and DNP Scholarly Project Guidebook utilized for student guidance.	1. All students 100% n=12 included approval of ISU IRB a) Fall 2018 Community planning project scores ranged from 157-225 out of 225 points, 2/12 students did not meet the benchmark of 83% on the paper. 83% (n=10) met the 83% benchmark on the paper b. Students (n = 12) Fall 2018 Acknowledged budgetary costs for scholarly project in APN810/891 presentation c. Students in 892 (n=11) Spring 2019 finalized their PICO and population of interest. 2. All students (n=12) Spring 2019 composed Chapter 2 literature review encompassing patient population and special considerations (i.e., protected population, dual role conflict, conflict of interest)	Action: Continue to use these metrics and level of achievement. (Consider adjusting the number of total points for this assignment in APN 810 (fewer points). Continue to move IRB Form A development into the spring semester (APN 892) to facilitate timely progression through IRB in summer session (APN 893).
3. Use analytic methods to critically appraise existing literature and other evidence to determine and implement the best evidence for clinical practice. **DNP Essential III: Clinical Scholarship & Analytical Methods for Evidence-Based Practice**	Successful completion of systematic review based upon identified search terms, through RCT, and application of the best EBP for phenomenon of interest	Scores at or above 83% on standardized grading rubric for literature review activity in APN892	Spring 2019 APN 892 course had 11 students. Range of scores from 173-188 out of 200 possible. The mean score for the group was 182.9.	Action: Continue to use this measure and level of achievement

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table
   a.   Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
   b.   Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
   c.   Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
   d.   Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities
Use Blue Reports to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

   1)   Cohort Size: 22 Current Students (13 in Spring 2021 Graduating Cohort, 6 in Spring 2022 Graduating Cohort, 3 in Spring 2023 Graduating Cohort). Three additional students are currently in progression as non-degree to join the spring 2023 cohort.

   2)   2) Year-to-Year Retention:

Retention % (Next Fall)			
2016	2017	2018	2019
86.36%	100.00%	85.00%	86.67%

   3)   Average time to graduation: 2.6 years.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?
   Additional focus and attention have been placed on improving writing skills for our DNP students. All students have been moved to APA 7.0 format. Faculty have collaborated with internal and external stakeholders to ensure students have access to targeted support materials to guide the transition to the new format. Encouragement, guidance, and grace have resulted in successful shift to APA 7.0. We have increased the amount of one-on-one attention that students receive from faculty and made incorporated group and individual synchronous Zoom meeting requirements to ensure students feel supported.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?
   1.   Providing students with increased support to facilitate growth in writing.
   2.   New course offering.
   3.   Program revisions to facilitate student success and student progression.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)
2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
3) **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
4) **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

Students in the DNP program draw from their vast experiences in healthcare and their emotional intelligence to fuel their resilience throughout the program. Faculty provide reassuring reminders to students that they are practice experts and that they can be founded in their learned/lived experiences. They carry with them their varying perspectives and share openly with their colleagues to create a rich and diverse learning experience for faculty and co-learners.

As a whole, our DNP students are less proficient in formulating targeted research questions and search strategies. They have a general lack of familiarity with the databases and various resources available to nurses engaging in quality improvement and translation science. Their evidence appraisal skills and data analytics are also areas of deficiency. All of these challenges form the basis for new and exciting opportunities to engage students and to provide them with a new set of skills that will accelerate their potential to serve as change agents within their existing organizations and communities.

Our student retention and graduation rates support the overarching premise of the DNP Program. Students quickly grow in skill and knowledge and engage in formative and summative learning activities throughout the program to demonstrate their achievement of the competencies set forth by the DNP Essentials from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Employer and alumni feedback, assessed six to 12 months post-graduation are evidence of programmatic success. Students hold our program in high regard and recommend it to their colleagues. Employer satisfaction provides reassurance that our graduates are prepared to meet the demands of an increasingly complex healthcare environment. This overlap of student success, career readiness, and employer satisfaction provides reassurance that we are providing a good learning environment. Good is not good enough. As we celebrate a decade of DNP education at Indiana State, we are looking for targeted opportunities to go from good to great.

All DNP projects are required to go through the institutional review board (IRB) at ISU. As a member of the IRB, I can attest to the increasing complexity of projects that are being advanced to and through this process. Historically all projects were exempt as students and faculty came up with ways to avoid the more intimidating expedited and full-board reviews. Over the past couple of years, I have witnessed exponential knowledge growth in faculty and students in the realm of human subject protections. Our instruction in this area is improving

and our students and projects are reaping the benefits. While we record and assess the overall success of student projects and track all dissemination efforts, I am eternally in search of ways to quantify the overall impact our graduates are having on the communities they serve. The impact of the DNP on healthcare quality is an evolving issue that is being assessed at a professional level. As this knowledge base evolves, new metrics for student success will be integrated into our program.

Our previous application process included a required written statement about what the applicant wanted to do for their DNP project. This statement was too specific and facilitated anchor thinking around the project once the applicant was enrolled in the program. The statement did not provide enough guidance regarding length, writing structure (APA), and the importance of integrating student learning outcomes into the writing sample. This awkward writing prompt resulted in submissions that were problematic and resulted in submissions that did not contribute to the admission committee's ability to make educated assumptions about the applicant's writing skills. This process, referenced in the first box of item 1a box e, has been revised to address these issues.

Writing quality is improving with much effort from faculty and students; our student body, mostly comprised of practice focused graduate nurses, continues to be challenged by the writing expectations of the program. Students are also challenged with the current scaffolding structure utilized to advance DNP scholarly projects from conceptualization to completion. In lieu of these two challenges, graduate faculty in the SON have come up with a plan to address these issues.

Input has been obtained from education experts, professional organizations, partner institutions, students and alumni. As a result, a new course proposal was voted on 9/29/2020. This proposal will create an APN 600 Graduate Writing for Healthcare Professionals course. This one-hour, eight week course will help to level up students' writing abilities and provide them with foundational writing knowledge to improve writing skills prior to entry into writing intensive courses.

In addition, a DNP Program Revision was also voted on and approved by the Graduate Faculty Curriculum Committee on 9/29/2020. The new proposal includes a modified course progression to help students move their projects from conceptualization to dissemination with increased efficiency. These modifications are being entered into Curriculog for advancement this fall with a target implementation date of fall 2021.

Our assessment plan for 2020-2021 will remain unchanged. Program metrics are shared with internal stakeholders routinely. An annual meeting is held with external stakeholders that serve on our community advisory board annually in the spring.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: Doctor of Nursing Practice	Overall Rating: Mature (2.94/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
- Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable. - Multiple direct measures are used to assess student learning, and students are given professional-relevant opportunities to demonstrate their learning. High-impact practices such as problem-based learning are included. - Tools for evaluating student learning are described in detail (e.g. rubrics), and expected and actual performance are reported clearly with regards to these measures. - Thoughtful notes are provided on the findings, including suggestions for improving and supporting student learning despite already strong performance, as well as expanding the understanding of the influence of the program on external stakeholders. Great use of data to inform the creation of a graduate writing course. - It is clear that faculty integrate assessment into teaching and learning in the program. Assessment findings and related plans are shared with and generated by faculty and stakeholders.	- Include notation of the alignment of learning outcomes to the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes to evidence alignment with CGPS expectations for graduate-level learning (find them here: https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/learning-outcomes-library). - Considering the learning achievement of your students consistently meets or exceed expectations, think about disaggregating student performance data by level on the rubric. This might provide insight into where students are greatly exceeding expectations or just meeting them – insights that may be useful to faculty as they evaluate any changes they are considering to their courses.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.	Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.	Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.	No *(program)* learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected. Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings. Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).	Performance goals are clear and appropriate. Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.	Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity. Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.

Analysis & Results	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.	Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality. Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description. Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.	No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected. No results are provided
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area. Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans. Reflection if offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.	A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted. Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans. Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content. Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results. Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No evidence of reflection on results in provided.
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	□ **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**

Please see reviewer notes for more details.