

Program: Clinical Nurse Leader Department: Nursing

Degree or Certificate Level: MSN College/School: Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing

Date (Month/Year): May 2022 Primary Assessment Contact: Joanne Thanavaro/Bobbi

Shatto

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2021

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2020

Which of the program's 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: Synthesize systems data, information and evidence based and theoretical knowledge to reduce risk, improve safety, and achieve optimal client adaptation and outcomes.

Outcome #8: Manage human and fiscal nursing team resources.

Outcome #9: Advocate for policies that improve the health of the public and the profession of nursing.

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Use scholarly inquiry including evidence-based practice and research application to improve decision-making and health outcomes.

N5200 (General Research Methods): Online; Weekly discussion board postings (Rubric E)

N5605 (Practicum in Clinical Leadership): Clinical; Capstone Quality Improvement Paper (Appendix F)

N5604 (Advanced Clinical Studies) and N5605 (Practicum in Clinical Leadership); Clinical; MSN CNL Preceptor Feedback form (Appendix D)

Skyfactor 8 (Research): >5.5 on a 7-point scale

Skyfactor 13 (Evidence Based Knowledge): >5.5 on a 7-point scale

: Facilitate the improvement of health care through leadership within health care systems and communities.

N5020 (Healthcare Systems and Policy): Online; Healthcare System Paper (appendix I)

Students do a presentation on a health care system case study which show improvement of health care through leadership within systems and communities (N5020; appendix I). Students were observed in their clinical areas by their preceptors. Each preceptor possessed either an MSN, DNP or a PhD and provided feedback and scored the students abilities to implement collaborative strategies improve health care outcome within the healthcare systems and communities. Personal face to face feedback was given to each student by the preceptor after the evaluation was completed. Faculty reviewed and discussed results with each student via student meetings (via Zoom) and assignment rubrics (appendix D). Faculty were in contact with preceptors via phone and email. Feedback for N 5605 final capstone paper and quality improvement project was given by faculty via student meetings and assignment rubric (appendix F). Reviewed Skyfactor MSN Exit survey report results (Leadership Skills).

Students were observed in their clinical areas by their preceptors. Each preceptor possessed either an MSN, DNP or a PhD and provided feedback and scored the students abilities to synthesize systems data and evidenced based practice to reduce risk, improve safety and achieve optimal health care outcomes. Personal face to face feedback was given to each student by the preceptor after the evaluation was completed. Faculty reviewed and discussed results with each student via student meetings (via Zoom) and assignment rubrics (appendix D). Faculty were in contact with preceptors via phone and email. Feedback for N 5605 final capstone paper and quality improvement project was given by faculty via student meetings and assignment rubric (appendix F). Reviewed Skyfactor MSN Exit survey report results (Overall learning effectiveness). CNL exam results were reviewed.

Students were observed in their clinical areas by their preceptors. Each preceptor possessed either an MSN, DNP or a PhD and provided feedback and scored the students abilities to implement collaborative strategies for managing human and fiscal resources. Personal face to face feedback was given to each student by the preceptor after the evaluation was completed. Faculty reviewed and discussed results with each student via student meetings (via Zoom) and assignment rubrics (appendix D). Faculty were in contact with preceptors via phone and email. Feedback for N 5605 final capstone paper and quality improvement project was given by faculty via student meetings and assignment rubric (appendix F). Reviewed Skyfactor MSN Exit survey report results (Leadership Skills).

Students do a presentation on a health care system case study where they advocate for policies that improve the health of the public and profession of nursing (N5020; appendix I). Reviewed Skyfactor MSN Exit survey report results (Policy and advocacy rating).

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Outcome #2: N5200 (appendix E); N5604 & N5605 (appendix D); 5605 (appendix F)

100% of students achieved a satisfactory clinical evaluation in their clinical courses (N5604, N5605). Greater than 80% of students received a grade of B or better on their evidence based/research methods discussion postings (N5200). Greater than 90% of students received a grade of B or better on their capstone quality improvement papers. Skyfactor8 (research): Rating 5.8 on a 7-point scale (benchmark >5.5) and Skyfactor 13 (evidence based) Rating 6 on a 7-point scale (benchmark >5.5).

Outcome #5: N5020 (appendix I); N 5604 and 5605 (appendix D) & N5605 (appendix F) 100% of students achieved a satisfactory clinical evaluation in their clinical courses (N5604 & 5605). Greater than 90% of students received a grade of B or better on their final capstone projects (N5605) and greater than 90% of students

received a grade of B or better on their healthcare systems case study

Outcome #2

Results were reviewed by the MSN CNL coordinator and course coordinators and were reviewed at the MSN CNL program meeting and at the ANPPC meeting in May 2022. Strength and weaknesses of assessment tools were discussed.

Outcome #5: Results were reviewed by the MSN CNL coordinator and course coordinators and were reviewed at the MSN CNL program meeting and at the ANPPC meeting in May 2021. Strength and weaknesses of assessment tools were discussed.

Outcome #6: Results were reviewed by the MSN CNL coordinator and course coordinators and were reviewed at the MSN CNL program meeting and at the ANPPC meeting in May 2021. Strength and weaknesses of assessment tools were discussed.

Outcome #8: Results were reviewed by the MSN CNL coordinator and course coordinators and were reviewed at the MSN CNL program meeting and at the ANPPC meeting in May 2021. Strength and weaknesses of assessment tools were discussed.

Outcome #9: Results we

Changes will be implemented following the MSN CNL faculty meeting to discuss the capstone project, paper and poster presentations.

What were the findings of the assessment?

Changes will be implemented following the MSN CNL faculty meeting to discuss the capstone project, paper and poster presentations.

How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

Changes will be implemented following the MSN CNL faculty meeting to discuss the capstone project, paper and poster presentations. The changes will be reviewed post-course by the MSN CNL faculty and student evaluations.

Appendix D

	NURS 5604 Advanced Clinical Studies NURS 5605 Practicum in Clinical Leader	ship Semester:	
Stude Name	nt Precep :Name:	otor /Mentor	
Clinica	al Agency:		
	e Rate MSN CNL Clinical Student Behavio	ors which relate to Student Learning	
	E = Excellen t S = Satisfactory I = Improvement Needed U = Unsatisfactory NA = Not Applicable	If an I (Improvement needed) or U (Unsatisfactory) are given, please give an explanation as to	
RESP	ONSIBILITY/PROFESSIONALISM		
b.	Clinical Preparedness Ownership &.67 0Tj 3 0 Td ()Tj 3 dTj 3n- Punctuality	- Tw 2m6 (p m)peeYYne61 (ppl)-6 <u>b.ps 8</u> .34	s 8.34]TJN
_	Sociocultural awareness Identifies and analyzes ethical issues Takes ownership of duties as assigned Considers human and fiscal resources where	hen making decisions (SLO 8)	
Comn	nent:		
CLINI	CAL COMPETENCE – THEORY		
a.	Synt212 90(J 0)1 (y)4 (nt212 90(J 0 2r	-00. (nt212 90(J.68 Tm ()] kJ 0 2 -0. ow90)(JI90(Jed
d. e. f. g.	Utilizes Information technology (SLO 7) Synthesizes relevant data to make decisi Proposes a process improvement plan in	n microsystem (SLO 5, 6)	

Appendix F

NURS 5605 Practicum in Clinical Leadership

Student Name: Date:

Criterion: See syllabus for detailed progress report assignment description		Points Earned
1. Clinical Performance and Goals		
x Summarize clinical experience thus far (hours spent in direct care)	15	
x Evaluate your performance for the pas64weeks.		
x What went well and what would you do differently?		
x Reflect on the progress you have made toward meeting you goals.		
x Describe how you will revise your goals for future clinical hours.		
Clinical experiences from nursing perspective:		
x Nursing process: Summarize assessment data and list 3 priority nursing	10	
diagnoses		
3. State priority nursingliagnosis		
x Correctly stated in NANDA format	10	
x Validated and prioritized from written assessment data		

- 4. List the goal and projected outcome criteria
- kl Measureable and specific to patient
- x Appropriate to diagnosis

Appendix L

	NURS 5605Evaluation of Final Capstone Thesis Paper	
Project Title:		
StudentName		
Criterion	Points Possible Points Earned	

Abstract

x Pertinent infblï

Appendix K

Letter to Legislator Grading Rubric

Letter to your Legislator	Points Possible/ Earned	Feedback
Addressed Properly	10	
Introduction Introduce yourself and the organization you are supporting	10	
Statement of the issue or concern Brief reason why you support the position. Includes well-thought-out arguments that include/reflect evidence of investigation, facts, statistics.	20	
Relevance Does the author successfully attempt to relate the issue to the legislator's constituents.	20	
Follow up Include contact information	10	
Overall Quality Formal, professional language is used. Proper punctuation present. Correct state representative chosen for the district of residence.	15	
Literature Include 2 sources of evidence that was used to support the arguments on a separate page.	15	
Total	100	

Appendix E

General Research Methods Discussion Rubric

Discussion Thread Tool and Expectations Grading Rubric

Graded Domains & Scoring	Domain Criteria	
(1) Content	Meets expectations	Does not meet standard(s)
0 to 3	Contains all elements require and discussion of elements in-depth, clear, based upon professional standards, empirical evidence or logical synthesis, and displays adequate attending to course content.	isunderdeveloped, missing, unclear or displays minimal application to course content.
(2) Response to Peers	Meets expectations	Does not meet standard(s)
0 to 2	Contains all elements require and responses are depth, clear, based upon profession standards, empirical evidence or logical synthesis, and displays adequate attending course content.	inconsistent with the original ripost, islacking depth, is seunclear, lacking thoughtful reflection or discourse, or is necessity to the original