School of Nursing and Health Professions Program
Evaluation Committee (approved January 2017)
Score Card 2016-2017

Program: MSHI

Presenter(s): Patricia Francis-Lyon

Date: March 23, 2017

PEC Scorecard	Yes	No	Feedback
1. Program's assessment/evaluation plan (must include one direct measure)			
a. Is there a program goal? (summary statement of PLOs)	Y		Program goal is solid-was consideration given to having it reflect USF values e.g. social justice?
b. Is there an assessment plan? Is it sufficiently comprehensive?	Y		Evaluation plan is available-see suggested revisions (e.g. clarify program outcome benchmarks, etc). Very useful MSHI data was presented.
c. Is there a current sufficiently comprehensive curriculum map(s) in place? For undergraduate programs, are ILOs included?	Y		Curriculum map is clear and tightly aligned to program learning outcomes
d. Is there a direct measure used to assess if students' learn what is being taught?		N	The capstone appears to be the focal point but there is not one consistent rubric used among faculty that provided individual student feedback but then is also used to aggregate the data to assess how effective the courses are.
2. Outcomes data (must minimally include: time to graduation, attrition, 1st time pass rate (NCLEX/NP certification), employment, and results from using one direct measure).			

a. Were the Program Evaluation Plan (PEP) and other program specific benchmarks reached?	P		Again, some metrics are being used, please fully clarify them in the written evaluation plan. If for example the time to degree is not reasonable, use existing date to recommend to PEC what would be better. Allow the data to justify MSHI's recommendation.
b. Were there faculty developed action plans?	Y		Despite the newness of the program it has made significant adjustments. The online program was phased out and a hybrid model is now in place in response to program assessment and evaluation processes.
c. Based on findings, were faculty develop action plans captured in department committee minutes?	P		Faculty action plans were developed to shift the program from an online to a hybrid program. It is less clear if there is ongoing discussion about program outcomes in faculty meetings currently.
3. Closing the loop			
a. What was shared and with who? (evidence)	P		Dean and Associate Dean as well as faculty. It is unclear how students are involved in closing the loop.
b. How was it shared?	Y		During meetings with the Dean and Associate Dean.
c. What impact did this have and what was learned/revised-captured in department committee minutes?	?	?	Unclear if MSHI routinely meets and if minutes capture program assessment/evaluation outcomes.

P* Partial

Y Yes

N No

? Unclear

PEC Feedback/Priorities:

1. See specific revisions noted on the submitted MSHI Evaluation Plan.

2. Develop a direct measure that operationalizes the curriculum map. It appears the capstone course may be the ideal place to accomplish this. An agreed upon rubric will be needed that is universally used by all faculty, this will ensure consistency among faculty. Students will then also have a shared understanding about expectations. By aggregating the data this will provide data about which courses

in the curriculum are effective and which courses may need improvement.

3. For benchmarks that do not fit to program outcomes, use data to formulate new benchmarks. Present those proposed benchmarks to PEC for formal approval.

4. Given there is no accreditation body at present for informatics, anticipate a formal program review will occur at USF within the next year.

5. Clarify if students and prospective applicants are informed about MSHI program assessment/evaluation/outcomes discussions and if they are able to share their perspective.

6. PEC is aware of the end of the program evaluation-this will be a helpful addition to what MSHI uses as part of its program assessment. Surveys are indirect measures and offer lower level data in comparison to direct measures but can be a valuable tool for students to provide crucial feedback.