

**SONHP Program Evaluation Committee**  
**Spring 2020 Brief Report on Assessment of Student Learning**  
(Guideline: 1 to 2 pages in length, not including optional charts/graphs etc. of results)

**SONHP Program:** Master of Science in Nursing  
**Assessment Champion(s):** Mary Donnelly, DNP, MPH, ANP-BC, CNL  
Susan Mortell, DNP, RN, CNL  
Robert Patterson, DNP, MSN, RN  
**Date for PEC Discussion:** April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020

**1. For 2018-2019**

**a. What aspect of student learning in your program did you assess?**

Faculty assessed student learning using the clinical nurse leadership rubric for the final Evidence Based Project completed in *NURS 653 Internship* from fall of 2019. There were 33 students from ME-MSN Cohort 25 at the Hilltop across 7 sections and 24 students from ME-MSN Cohort 5 the Orange County campus across 3 sections. Nine ME-MSN section faculty reported results.

Additionally, work products from 23 students from 2 sections of RN-MSN Online *N653 Internship* classes from fall of 2019 were reviewed.

**b. How did you measure it?**

Faculty aggregated data using the Evidence Based Project Rubric (attached). Three or more points indicated that the student met or exceeded the requirements of each section.

**c. What were the results?**

For ME-MSN students:

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in all sections: 82%

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 1: 93%

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 2: 86%

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 3: 91%

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 4: 88%

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 5: 100%

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 6: 96%

For RN-MSN Online students:

Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in all sections: 70%  
Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 1: 91%  
Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 2: 100%  
Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 3: 91%  
Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 4: 91%  
Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 5: 100%  
Percentage of students who received 3 or greater in section 6: 96%

Although the overall results of this survey were positive, there were problems with analyzing the data. For one thing, it was not clear whether the prospectuses analyzed were first or subsequent drafts. Only one draft was required and it was not clear whether the professors asked some students to rewrite their drafts before issuing final grades. We also note that more clarity is needed to define criteria to be evaluated by the rubric. Also we want to assess which courses have primary responsibility for instructing the material. The MSN faculty have reviewed the clinical nurse leader courses and found that many did not instruct or assign key elements measured by the rubric.

**d. What changes to curriculum or programming did you make (or are you planning to make) in light of these results?**

It is recommended that a specific draft of the prospectus (probably the first draft) be analyzed. Weaknesses in the results occurred in the abstract, the introduction, the methods, financial analysis, results and references. It was also found that there was not an agreed upon analysis of the literature. Students analyzed are on a previous curriculum with many competencies not fully developed, so it's clear that this content needs to be strengthened in the new curriculum. Teachers also need to work collaboratively to reinforce content that was covered in previous classes. A more systematic way of retrieving this evaluation would increase the accuracy of this report and allow confidence in the assessment.

Courses where abstract potentially appears (the crosswalk has not been completed for the revised curriculum).

Abstract: 613, 614, 628, 634 for ME-MSN; 633, 643, 660 and 670 for RN-MSN Online

Introduction: 613, 615, 634, 602, 664, 629 for ME-MSN; 633, 643, 603, 664, 677, 629, 641, 674, 509, 505 for RN-MSN Online

Methods, 640, 644, 628, 629, 615, 629 for ME-MSN; 609, 603, 664, 641, 629, 674, 660, 505 for RN-MSN Online

Results: 602, 664, 622, 648, 651, 629, 653, 614, 628, 634 for ME-MSN; 641, 660, 670, 677 for RN-MSN Online

References: 613, 602, 634 for ME-MSN; 633, 509, 660, 670 for RN-MSN  
Online

Through meetings with instructor leads, these areas for development have been identified and discussed with an agreed plan to review the current research course. All of these areas need to be strengthened in the current courses and teachers need to reinforce content taught in previous classes.

## **2. For Spring 2020**

### **a. Which Program Learning Outcome (PLO) will you assess?**

1. Clinical leadership for patient-care practices and delivery, including the design, coordination, and evaluation of care for individuals, families, groups, and populations.

#### **Why are you focusing on this PLO this spring?**

This PLO gives a broad view of program outcomes. It was also the PLO decided on by the PEC

### **b. How do you plan to assess this PLO?**

In categories that apply to the above program objectives, students need to identify a problem that pertains to patient care practices and delivery at their practicum site. Such a problem impacted the care of individuals, families, groups and/or populations. Students need to design a solution to an identified problem, and this solution will be based on gathered evidence. Utilizing a theoretical framework and considering any ethical and budgetary implications, students need to implement their intervention. Students will also design an evaluation instrument in which to assess the effectiveness of their intervention.

**University of San Francisco  
Clinical Nurse Leadership: Final Evidence Based Project Rubric**

**Student Name:**

**Project Title:**

Characteristic	Reviewer Rating	Comments
<b>Section I: Title and Abstract</b>		PLO 1, 8
Abstract includes the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem</li> <li>• Context</li> <li>• Interventions</li> <li>• Measures</li> <li>• Results</li> <li>• Conclusions</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	Address each heading in the abstract  In conclusion, what are the implications for practice based on this project
<b>Section II: Introduction (Why did you start?)</b>		PLO1,2,4,8,9,10
Introduction (Why this improvement topic; impact for patients, system; link to organizational priorities)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	Overview of the topic
Problem description (Describe the setting; summarize current knowledge about the problem as it relates to the setting: metrics that matter, benchmark data, baseline data and current performance)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	What is the quality gap?

Available knowledge (PICO question; synthesis of exiting literature and evaluation table)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	This section has 5 parts 1. PICO question 2.Search Strategy 3.Synthesis of your evidence. 4.Level and quality of your evidence- strong or weak? 5.How will it guide project See addendum for more detail
Rationale (conceptual framework or theory used to guide the project)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	1.Describe theory 2.Describe how it will guide your project
Specific project aim	<input type="checkbox"/> 5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	Specific Project aim
<b>Section III: Methods (What did you do?)</b>		PLO 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11
Context Microsystem assessment, IHI culture assessment, SWOT analysis, ROI plan, communication plan	<input type="checkbox"/> 5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	1.Summary of key findings from microsystem assessment- population, staff, procedures, IHI culture assessment 2.Brief description of SWOT analysis. 4.Summarize the ROI for the project
Intervention Description of changes to test	<input type="checkbox"/> 5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0Does not meet expectation	1.Describe intervention. 2.If multiple interventions, list them
Study of the intervention Measurement strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> 5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3Meets expectation	1.Describe the measurement strategy 2.Briefly list PDSA cycles and how they were used to refine the intervention

	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	
Measures Family of measures	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	List the family of measures: Outcome measure Process measure Balancing measure
Ethical considerations	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	1. Provide a reflection of the project as it relates to the Jesuit values and the American Nurses Association Ethical Standards.  2. Include QI wording: This project has been approved as a quality improvement project by faculty using QI review guidelines and does not require IRB approval.
<b>Section IV: Results</b>		PLO 1,2,3,8,11
Outcome measure results	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	1. Describe outcome results-analysis. 2. Were the results expected? 3. If not, why not?
<b>Section V: Discussion</b>		PLO 1,2,3,7,8,9,10,11
Summary Key findings, lessons learned, what contributed to the successful change	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does not meet expectation	1. Current performance 2. Did the intervention work? 3. If not, what are the next steps?

<p>Conclusions Usefulness of the work, sustainability, potential for spread, implications for practice</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/>3Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/>0Does not meet expectation</p>	<p>1.How will the project impact practice? 2.What are the sustainability plans? 3.If the intervention did not work what are some of your thoughts about why and next steps? 4.What are the implications for others who face the same issues?</p>
<p><b>Section VI: References</b></p>		<p>1,2,8,12</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/>5Exceeds expectation <input type="checkbox"/>3Meets expectation <input type="checkbox"/>0Does not meet expectation</p>	
<p><b>Section VII: Appendices</b></p>		<p>1,2,8,12</p>

<p>Appendices include all</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IRB Non-research determination form</li> <li>• Evaluation Table</li> <li>• Charter (Aim, Background, Measures, Driver Diagram, Sponsors, Team, Measurement Strategy., Timeline)</li> <li>• PI Tools: Process map; SWOT analysis, Run chart</li> <li>• Cost benefit Analysis</li> <li>• Budget</li> <li>• All materials for implementation and evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/>5Exceeds expectation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/>3Meets expectation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/>0Does not meet expectation</li> </ul>	<p>Project charter and measurement strategy</p> <p>Include any tools developed</p>
--	--	--

**Summary of Recommendations:**

- Accept**
- Accept with minor revisions**
- Accept with Major Revisions**
- Do not accept**

**Reviewer's name**

**Reviewer's signature:**