

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: __ Baccalaureate Nursing Completion – LPN to BS_ **Contact Name and Email:** Jessica Nelson Jessica.Nelson@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One Fall 2014 - Spring 2015

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1. Critical Thinker</p>	<p>(1) Mean score of student self-perception as a critical thinker on the Adequacy of Preparation exit survey will be 3.75 or higher on 5 point Likert scale</p> <p>(2) Nursing 486-Nursing Synthesis</p>	<p>Student mean group score will be 3.75 or higher on the Adequacy of Preparation exit survey as defined by the operational definition</p>	<p>Fa 14 = no data available Sp15 = no data available</p> <p>No results were recorded on exit survey. Exit survey administration moved to college level. Incentivize exit survey by NURS486 faculty to ensure results available</p>	<p>Assessment committee representative in conjunction with department chairperson and individuals responsible for collecting exit survey information. Presented via monthly assessment meetings.</p>
<p>2. Communicator</p>	<p>(1) Student in Leadership course (N470) will complete a project scoring at or above a 75%</p> <p>(2) Nursing 470-Nursing Leadership</p>	<p>90% of students will score at or above 75% on the project as defined in the operational definition</p>	<p>Fa14 150/150 – 24 stud. 148/150 – 6 stud. 145/150 – 10 stud. 140/150 – 6 stud.</p> <p>Sp 15 148/150 – 6 stud. 145/150 – 13 stud. 142/150 – 6 stud. 140/150 – 17 stud. 135/150 – 6 stud. 0/150 – 2 stud. LPN and RN data mixed – separate out tracks</p>	<p>Assessment committee representative in conjunction with senior level leadership (N470) faculty member. Presented via monthly assessment meetings.</p>

3. Provider of Care	(1) ATI RN Comprehensive Predictor score at or above 94% predictability of passing NCLEX-RN on either the ATI RN Comprehensive Predictor Readiness exit examination. (2) Nursing 486 – Nursing Synthesis	90% of students will score 94% predictability on the first or second attempt on ATI RN Comprehensive Predictor exam	Fall 14 = 26/31 = 83.9% Sp 15 = 26/30 = 86.7%	Assessment committee representative in conjunction with ATI coordinator. Presented via monthly assessment meetings.
4. Leader	(1) Student shall score at or above individual mean program or higher on the second attempt on the ATI RN Leadership exam (2) Nursing 470- Nursing Leadership	90% of students will achieve at or above the operational definition	Fa 14 = 22/35 = 62.9% on first take – retake data unavailable Individual mean program: 71.9% Sp 15 = 41/55 = 74.5% Individual mean program: 71.9%	Assessment committee representative in conjunction with ATI coordinator. Presented via monthly assessment meetings.
5. Professional	(1) Evaluation shall reflect a passing score or better score in the senior reflective nursing course (N484) (2) Nursing 484	90% students shall reflect a passing score as defined by the operational definition.	Fa 14 = 100% N=31 Sp 15 = 100% N=30	Assessment committee representative in conjunction with senior level clinical synthesis course (N484) faculty member. Presented via monthly assessment meetings.
6. Life Long Learner	(1) Students shall successfully complete a culture presentation in final semester nursing capstone course (N486) (2) Nursing 486	90% of students will achieve 75% or greater as defined by the operational definition.	Fa 14 = 31/31 = 100% Sp15 = 30/30 = 100%	Assessment committee representative in conjunction with senior level capstone course (N486) faculty member. Presented via monthly assessment meetings.
7. Advocate	(1) Students should analyze the role of the nurse policy developer in a variety of health care settings. As evidenced by a score of 75% or better on assignment in senior level community health course (N450) (2) Nursing 450	90% of students will successfully complete assignment of Community Health project as defined by the operational definition	Fa 14: 91.3% 100% -90%: 15 89% – 80%: 5 79%-70%: 2 69% – 60%: 1 N=23 Sp/Su 15: 93.9% 100% – 90%: 35 89% – 80%: 9 79% – 70%: 4	Assessment committee representative in conjunction with senior level community health course (N450) faculty member. Presented via monthly assessment meetings.

			69% – 60%: 1 N=49	
8. Coordinator of Community Resources	(1) Student shall score at or above level 2 proficiency or higher on the second attempt on the ATI RN Community Health exam (2) Nursing 450 – Community Health Nursing	90% of students will achieve operational definition	Fa 14 = 11/23 = 47.8% on first attempt – no data available for retake. Sp/Su 15= 34/49 = 69.4%	Assessment committee representative in conjunction with ATI coordinator. Presented via assessment meetings.
9. National Licensure Exam (NCLEX-RN) Pass rates	(1) Results provided by National Council of State Board of Nursing (NCSBN) (2) Post-graduation licensure exam.	Above national average. Results reflect 2015 calendar year.	59/69 (85.5%)	Assessment committee representative. Presented via assessment meetings.

Part One Fall 2015 * *please note that the department switched to new curriculum during this calendar year.*

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

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.

Notes

- Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- Each outcome must 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 must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- 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.”
- 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).
- This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

1. Assessment at the course and department level is conducted on a routine basis throughout monthly assessment meetings that is attended by our entire department faculty. Each faculty member within each course is provided with a yearly schedule of course review each monthly meeting. Lead faculty members are required to present course specific assessment data and facilitate discussion amongst their peers regarding methods, expectations, tools etc. Discoveries of assessment are always ongoing and typically driven by faculty teaching the courses or data collected in each course.
2. One large change this year was the discussion and analytics regarding our standardized testing system ATI. The determination to change vendors was driven from outcomes from both assessment and curriculum data including cost of students. Assessment of information technology and lack of informatics curriculum/assessment was discovered throughout the past year as well. Improvements were discussed and the creation of NURS 317 was proposed as a new course to implement and assess.
3. The upcoming year will bring very little substantial changes as prior changes are still being implemented and data collected.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: Baccalaureate Nursing Completion – LPN to BS Date: 7.29.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p>assessed in this cycle.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

				<input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not clear and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important

	plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

No learning outcomes are included in the report, only the general category of the over-arching objective (e.g., critical thinker, communicator). Please be sure to identify the specific outcomes that were assessed.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

Multiple measures are identified, including projects, a presentation, and the licensure exam. But without knowing what the specific outcomes are, it is difficult to gauge their appropriateness. It is safe to say that more detail would be useful. For example, what does the project that assesses communication skills entail? What's in the evaluation that assesses professionalism? Thanks for including an indirect measure (exit survey).

3. Results

Students appear to be achieving standards set for most outcomes, but in some cases it is difficult to tell. The standards for outcomes 4 and 5, for example, are geared to an undefined "operational definition" and 9 to an unspecified national exam pass rate. Did students meet these standards?

4. Engagement & Improvement

It is clear that everyone is involved in assessing student learning, and that conversations occur on a very regular basis. But there is little detail here about what you've learned about student learning from all of your efforts and how it specifically is related to the outcomes you assessed. Was the new course proposed in response to assessment results? Have previous changes (including the new curriculum you reference) improved student performance? Is there evidence that overall, they are achieving learning outcomes and that continuous improvement is occurring? I look forward to learning more from next year's plan!