

Program Assessment: Annual Report

Program(s): Family Psychiatric Mental Health NP (Master's and Post-Master's)

Department: Nursing

College/School: School of Nursing

Date: May, 2019

Primary Assessment Contact: Dr. Joanne Thanavaro

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Outcome #2: Use scholarly inquiry including evidence-based practice and research application to improve decision-making and health outcomes

Outcome #5: Facilitate the improvement of health care through leadership within health care systems and communities

Outcome #6: Demonstrate competence in a specialized area of advanced practice nursing that builds on foundational nursing knowledge.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

There are no Madrid students included in the student artifacts as there are no Madrid students in the AGPCNP program.

Outcome #2:

In NURS 5140 (Health Promotion) 80% of all students will achieve a grade of B or better on a written evidenced based/research assignment

In NURS 5200 (General Research Methods) students were required to complete a written assignment involving the synthesis of the known clinimetric or psychometric qualities of a tool used in patient care (see Appendix 5200). Eighty percent of students achieving a grade of B or better over a prescribed interval was viewed as evidence that outcome #2 was being satisfactorily addressed within the educational programming.

Outcome #5

In NURS 5160 (Principles of Practice Management) students will receive a score of 90% or better (on an established grading rubric) focusing on their ability to analyze and discuss a healthcare policy of their choosing during interactions with student colleagues and faculty.

Outcome #6

DATA: Saint Louis University School of Nursing Student Clinical Evaluation [tool] completed by 26 Family Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner students' preceptors [N = 55] Fall 2018 NURS 5810; Madrid students were not included as there is no MSN NP program on that campus. Preceptors' ratings were based on their direct observations while in the clinical setting working together.

GOAL: 95% of all students achieve a satisfactory clinical evaluation on their final practicum (NURS 5810) based on direct preceptor or faculty observation

For each of the 25 items on the clinical evaluation form, the rating scale has a range of 4 (Above Average); 3 (Average/Satisfactory); 2 (Needs Improvement); 1 (Unsatisfactory); N/A (No Opportunity or Non-Applicable). Also, there is a final question at the end of the form that states: "Did the student appropriately apply knowledge and skills during this clinical experience" with a yes-no option.

There was a total of 55 preceptor evaluations reviewed and summarized by the Family PMHNP Program Coordinator. Results pertain to 22 items. No data was sought for 3 items that pertain to physical examinations or use of exam equipment in that this is not customarily directly done on a regular basis during medical-medication management encounters by psychiatric mental health prescriptive providers but rather is done by ancillary staff unless client/patient circumstances dictate otherwise. These 3 items were N/A.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

Outcome #2:

In NURS5140, Students are required to write a scholarly health promotion research paper that is due around week 7. The students receive a lecture & power point on how to properly write a research paper, research topic examples, detailed written directions, rubric with scoring, APA tips sheet, and example paper as a guide. Additionally, students are encouraged to use the SLU writing services, meet with the medical librarian, and reach out to their faculty leader with any questions or concerns. Papers are graded using the rubric that is posted for students and this is made clear in the lecture, power point, and detailed directions. Plus, reminder emails are sent at weeks 3 and 6. Dr. Hill and I grade all the research papers using the same criteria as mentioned above. We do not utilize teaching assistants, graduate assistants, or any plagiarism check system. Grading and reference checking is all done by the two of us.

Data for Spring 2018 and Fall 2018 semesters were analyzed. There were a total of 85 students enrolled in health promotion for those 2 semesters. Spring 2018 there were 46 students and Fall 2018 there were 39 students. A total of 59 students (69%) earned a B or above (spring 2018 =34 students, fall 2018 =25 students).

In NURS5200 Students were scored on their ability to leverage what they have

learned within the classroom context about clinimetric and psychometric evaluation to interpret the qualities and limitations of a measurement tool used in patient care. Students were required to describe what they learned about the reliability and validity of their selected tools from the research literature and clarify whether the instrument is appropriate for patient care. Items on the assignment are graded as pass or fail. Scores on the measurement assignment range from zero to 10 with higher scores indicative of better use of scholar inquiry to improve decision-making and health outcomes. The assessment data was analyzed by aggregating total scores on the graded assignments using summary statistics, including median, range, and percent of students receiving a B or higher. One of the faculty members of the course completed analysis of the assessment data.

Sky factor Scores:

Factor 8: Learning Outcomes from Core Masters: Research 85%

Factor 13: Learning Outcomes from Core Masters: Evidence Based Knowledge 88.5%

Outcome #5

In NURS 5160, a six-section grading rubric was used to evaluate each of the papers. The course director, to avoid disproportionate grading between multiple faculty members, graded each paper. Dr. Chris Hemmer, DNP, ANP who is the course chair graded this assignment in its entirety.

We had 86 students in the course. Maximal score was 100% on the paper and the minimal score was 87%. We only had 1 student who scored below our desired threshold of 90%. 85 of 86 students received the required 90% or better. No student scored below 87% on the assignment.

N=86

Maximum score: 100%

Minimum score: 87%

Median score: 96%

Average score: 95.5%

85 students: 90-100%

1 student: 80-89%

No student scored below 87%

Sky Factor Score

Factor 6: Learning Outcomes from Core Masters: Leadership 89.3%

Outcome #6:

Twenty-six students completed the course and clinical evaluations were received from all preceptors. Given 26 students and 55 preceptor evaluations, the average number of preceptors each student had was 2 with a range noted of students having 1-5 preceptors.

The FPMHNP program coordinator reviewed and analyzed the evaluation form

data from 55 preceptor-completed student evaluations that pertained to 26 students. The clinical preceptors completed the Student Evaluation form for each student and rated the student on each item according to a four-point scale that ranged from 4 (above average) to 1 (unsatisfactory). The evaluation form contains 4 sections: Professionalism (6 items), Skills (10 items), Therapeutic Planning (6 items) and Outcomes (3 items). The final question at the end of the form that states: "Did the student appropriately apply knowledge and skills during this clinical experience" with a yes-no option was tabulated. All preceptor comments were also reviewed.

#2

Students take the Comprehensive Exit examination at a specific date during their last semester. After the exam the FPMHNP Program Coordinator evaluates each student's exam – those who were successful and unsuccessful on their 1st attempt. Areas of strength and weakness along with knowledge areas and testing domains are created for each of the respective students who require remediation. The teacher-made examination is also reviewed using statistical analysis options available to Program Coordinator to enhance teaching quality and management.

Sky Factor Scores:

Overall learning: 86.7 %

Overall Program Effectiveness 80.8 %

Board Certification Pass Rates: > 94%

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

Outcome #2

In NURS 5140 the scholarly papers did not lack evidence-based practice or research application. The students who scored below the "B" threshold in Spring 2018 and Fall 2018 simply did not put forth the effort to earn a "B" or higher. Most of the scores resulted from lack of following the directions and sample paper that were provided.

Students scored high in the areas of introduction, background, health behavior theory, conclusion, writing style, & references.

Students scored average to low in areas of case finding/screening, interventions, APA format, and resources.

In NURS 5200 the evidence reviewed here suggests that the educational programming implemented in NURS 5200 effectively imparted skills related to the use of scholarly inquiry to improve decision-making and health outcomes. In the 2018 academic year, approximately 94.87% ($n = 37$) of the students who completed the measurement assignment described under item 2 achieve a B or higher, which exceeds the 80% of B or higher standard. Scores ranged from 6.25 to 10 with a typical score of 9.78, which indicates that there was a relatively

consistent demonstration of outcome #2 across the 39 submitted assignments. An example is given next to highlight the consistency between the assignment, scoring scheme, and the domains composing outcome #2. One student reported on a swallow evaluation questionnaire used within their clinic as part of their stroke victim care. The student shared that while the tool exhibits some evidence of validity and reliability, she learned that the measure is unable to identify key diagnostic symptoms and so the questionnaire was best used as a screening tool in her clinic as opposed to a diagnostic tool. The student received a score of 10/10.

Outcome #5:

We learned that the students had to do a lot of research on policy and legislation to understand the process of how bills are introduced and move through the process of becoming or not becoming a law. Many students reflected in section five of the assignment how much they learned and how much they did not understand about the legislative process for healthcare policy. Many recognized the need to be more active on the local, state, and national levels with various NP organizations. Several students reached out to their representatives and senators to ask questions about various pieces of legislation that would have a direct impact on each student's future practice.

Outcome #6:

#1

100% of students' (N=26) preceptor evaluations (N= 55) were rated 3 (Average/Satisfactory) or 4 (Average Average). Specific breakdowns are as follows:

Twenty-five preceptor evaluations [45%], representative of 19 students, showed all entries being 4 (Above Average) rating.

Two preceptor evaluations [4%], representative of 2 students, showed all entries being 3 (Average/Satisfactory) rating.

Twenty-eight preceptor evaluations [51%], representative of 18 students, showed entries being of combination of 4 (Above Average) and 3 (Average/Satisfactory) ratings. There were no ratings of 2 (Needs improvement) or 1 (Unsatisfactory).

The final question at the end of the form that states: "Did the student appropriately apply knowledge and skills during this clinical experience" with a yes-no option was tabulated to be 55 preceptor-indications of 'yes' response [100%].

Forty-five of 55 preceptor evaluations [82%] included positive remarks/comments regarding student performance. The remaining 10 preceptor evaluations 18%] included no remarks/comments. No negative comments were recorded.

#2

Teacher-made test: Item difficulty is emphasized by this Program Coordinator in terms of seeking effectively worded, specialty area and role items that most students should answer correctly, and these items were evident in the test statistical analysis. Areas of strength and weakness were noted. It is noted that resources given to the students throughout the semester preceding the examination to facilitate content mastery and test taking strategies to enhance

focus are assistive. The advised textbooks remain pertinent, which especially includes the current ANCC review and resource manual for this specialty.

Five students were able to take and passed the requisite ANCC certification examination before program completion and graduation which was a first-time action of a graduating class and this attests to readiness provided by this program. As of 05/01/2019 a total of 25 of the 26 students who completed program 12/22/2018 reported passing the FPMHNP ANCC certification examination on their first attempt.

All Sky factor scores are the good-excellent range and will be tracked annually.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Outcome #2:

In NURS 5140 changes were made Fall 2016 that included an updated rubric (see Appendix A) with assigned points per category, added a lecture and power point on how to successfully write a scholarly research paper, started sending out reminder emails on weeks 3 and 6, and changed the due date from week 11 to week 7 to allow for feedback and grades to be sent to the students earlier in the semester.

In NURS 5200 while the evidence presented under item 4 was consistent with outcome #2, the results implicate one assessment deficiency. Namely, the scope of the assessment is limited to the student's experience with scholarly inquiry up to clarifying the implications of the clinimetric or psychometric qualities they discover about their tools. It is unclear whether the skills imparted to the students continue to have a meaningful impact on their decision-making or on health outcomes after the assignment is completed. To begin amelioration of the gap in assessment knowledge, the Spring of 2019 measurement assignment now requests that students convey their insights into how their measurement tool can impact patient care.

Outcome #5:

The assignment and analysis helped us realize we need to increase the emphasis on the legislation and healthcare policy aspect of this course. Though students are exposed to this material it seems that many were "afraid" or unsure how to use the information they are being taught. The students were able to identify stakeholders as well as barrier to healthcare policy through the assignment. We intend to keep this paper as it is a useful assignment for educating future NP on healthcare policy and ways to affect change. We also challenged them to think about the long-term implications of change such as the economic implications as well as the reality of such changes becoming law. How will this affect the provider and the healthcare system as a whole?

Outcome #6:

#1

The goal of 95% of student having a satisfactory clinical evaluation was achieved. Overall, the data show that the PMHNP specialty curriculum is strong and current pedagogy is skillful and effective.

There is a great deal of variability in amount of clock time individual students spent with their various preceptors given range of 1-5 preceptors that any single student had during the semester. Therefore, evaluating for a trend of responses in any of the 4 sections: Professionalism (6 items), Skills (10 items), Therapeutic Planning (6 items) and Outcomes (3 items) may well have been influenced by, and not necessarily limited to, clinical time with a preceptor, style of preceptor oversight, varied settings, client/patients seen, and varied clinical nursing process events that took place with particular psychiatric-mental health clients/patients. Based on eyeball analysis of preceptors' rating sheets where 3 or 4 were selected, therapeutic planning may well warrant enhanced attention based on numbers of 3 ratings overall. Given students' every 2-week Skype supervision sessions with adjunct faculty during clinical semesters, program coordinator will advise enhanced focus in this area during those supervision meetings.

#2

Test statistics will continue to be used with this teacher-made comprehensive exit examination to evaluate parameters such as item difficulty, discrimination, and reliability in order to improve test items. Analysis of results are also used to get to know how much knowledge students have obtained in program. Continued utilization of current ANCC Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner Board Certification Examination test content outline for devising pertinent test items remains relevant strategy, along with provided textbooks and guidance concerning study resources available online.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

Outcome #2:

In NURS 5140 after making the changes Fall 2016, it was noted the 69 and below grades dropped from four to one or less Fall 2016-Spring 2018. There was two F's Fall 2018. The two F's were a result of papers being turned in past the due date that lacked depth, APA format, and did not meet the requirements of the rubric.

In NURS 5200 we will continue to monitor student learning data in this course to assessment outcomes. No changes are recommended at this time.

Outcome #5:

We recently changed the paper assignment in this course to help educate our students on healthcare policy and leadership. We found that many of our students had difficulty recognizing how to affect change with healthcare policy after discussing curriculum with course coordinators. Therefore we developed this assignment to better prepare them to address professional issues and leadership. A portion of the paper asked the student to reflect on what they learned. Several students commented on how much they learned about leadership and how to

affect change within healthcare policy and legislation.

Outcome #6:

The tool utilized for this program outcome had not been a measurement instrument in the past so continued evaluation using the same tool will become standardly applied now as program continues. Results of encouraging enhancement, given ratings were already 3 [Average/Satisfactory], in Therapeutic Planning has already been communicated to both current students in Spring 2019 and all 4 adjunct faculty. Coordinator will continue to monitor current and emerging knowledge and skill trends and issues in the PMH and PMHNP fields via professional contacts, professional literature perusal, and conference attendance in order to continue specialty enhancement and relevance.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.