

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [MS in Nursing

B2. Report author(s): [Denise M. Wall Parilo

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [48

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
X	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

Currently, none of the ten MS in Nursing graduate student learning outcomes are explicitly linked with the written communication WASC outcome. However, students must earn a passing score on the written Comprehensive Exam (NURS 500) to graduate with the MS in Nursing. This year, we formed a Faculty Learning Community (FLC) with the purpose of assessing the WASC written communication outcome for the graduate nursing program.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Written Communication standards of performance and expectations: MS Nursing comprehensive exam first attempt success rate of 90% as scored by the existing scoring rubric. (The scoring rubric may be found in Appendix 1 as a pdf attachment.)

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

X	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
X	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
X	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
X	10. In other places, specify: The SacCT site dedicated to advising for the NURS 500 comprehensive examination.

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including tables and graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

A total of 85% students passed the written comprehensive examination on the first attempt. Just over half of the submissions (54%) required a third reader due to disagreement between the first and second reader regarding whether the exemplar met the standard. This evaluation demonstrates that students are not meeting the comprehensive exam goal of 90% pass rate on first attempt. We are also concerned that a third reader was necessary for over half of the submissions.

The MS in Nursing student performance needs improvement in the written comprehensive examination. Faculty graders identified Area II of the comprehensive examination as yielding the lowest scores; students have difficulty applying a theoretical/conceptual framework and performing a critical appraisal of the literature. The graduate curriculum committee will perform a more direct assessment of each area of the examination in future, incorporating the VALUE rubric for written communication. It is hoped this analysis will help to better direct curricular efforts at improving student writing across the curriculum.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [Written Communication]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
X	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [1]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

X	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] that you used to collect the data. [**WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS**]

Please see Appendix I (pdf attachment) for the scoring rubric for the NURS 500 comprehensive examination.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [**Select one only**]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
X	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [**Select one only**]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We reviewed all scores for the NURS 500 comprehensive examinations submitted during the 2013-14 academic year.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

X	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

The students who graduated in 2013-14 were invited to participate in a national benchmarking exit survey conducted by Education Benchmarking, Inc. The response rate was 68.2% (15/22). One survey item is an indirect measure related to skills in communication. The survey invites respondents to report their perception regarding how well the MS in Nursing program prepared them in this area; students rated the MS in Nursing program highly. (Survey results are proprietary and not available to the public.)

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The NURS 500 comprehensive examination data were analyzed to assess graduate student performance in written communication. NURS 500 is the capstone course for the MS in Nursing program and successful passage is required for the degree. The examination is scored separately by two graduate faculty who are blind to the student author's identity. Each student must earn a minimum score of 350 out of 500 points in order to receive a "pass." If there is disagreement between the graders, the examination is scored by a third faculty to determine the pass/fail outcome. The scoring rubric was developed by the graduate curriculum committee specifically for the comprehensive examination and was modeled after similar examinations in use at prominent schools of nursing. Numerous faculty meetings were conducted to establish consistency with faculty grading prior to the implementation of the comprehensive examination.

The VALUE critical thinking rubric was not used to review the comprehensive examinations this assessment cycle. The rubric will be applied in future to ascertain alignment with the faculty-made scoring rubric and student outcomes. The rubric will also be used to assess student writing in the core courses that precede NURS 500 as a way to directly assess progress in student writing.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total did you use to assess this PLO? [__1__]**

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum		X			
3. Improving advising and mentoring	X				
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			X		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			X		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan				X	
7. Annual assessment reports			X		
8. Program review		X			
9. Prospective student and family information			X		
10. Alumni communication				X	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning			X		
16. Institutional benchmarking	X				
17. Academic policy development or modification			X		
18. Institutional Improvement			X		
19. Resource allocation and budgeting				X	
20. New faculty hiring					X
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					X
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

Last year's assessment focus was competence in the discipline. These data were used to improve the orientation and advising sessions for the comprehensive examination (NURS 500) so that expectations were clearer (an issue identified from focus group participants at program exit). A NURS 500 handbook has been created and the NURS 500 advising website has been significantly improved. Now that faculty feel confident advising is adequate, more time may be directed toward writing workshops (both within courses and during special sessions) and to improve student writing.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The graduate curriculum committee has identified several changes to improve written communication outcomes for the MS in Nursing students. These changes are presented below:

- Revising the course plan for NURS 209 and NURS 210 (core courses) to add more writing workshop time during class sessions
- Modifying the NURS 213 course plan to provide more feedback on student writing assignments with the comprehensive examination in mind.
- Updating the graduate student learning outcomes (GSLOs) to:
 - Improve clarity in the written communication GSLO
 - Possibly incorporate aspects of the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)* related to writing in the GSLO
- Defining measurable writing expectations (e.g., VALUE rubric scores) for each written assignment in the curriculum

It is hoped that the sustained writing development activity will yield improved writing outcomes across all courses and a 90% or higher first-time pass rate on the comprehensive examination (NURS 500). These changes will be implemented and evaluated during 2014-15 by the graduate curriculum committee.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

N/A

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above:

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop the current assessment plan?**

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
X	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update your assessment plan?**

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of **student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [__NURS 500__]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [__ School of Nursing__]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [__School of Nursing __]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [__Dr.Carolynn Goetze__]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [__3__]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
X	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [__2__]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [__BS in Nursing; BS in Nursing with RN License__]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__0__]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master’s degree programs the academic unit has: [2]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [MS in Nursing; School Nursing Credential Program with MS in Nursing (in CCE)]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? []

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [1]

A14.1. List all the names: [School Nursing Credential Program (in CCE)]

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [0]

A15.1. List the name(s): []

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

x	1. Yes
	2. No

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: School Nursing Credential Program with MS in Nursing (in CCE)

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____