



2016-2017



Allen College
UnityPoint Health

ALLEN COLLEGE ASSESSMENT PLAN

Report of College Goals Achievement

Table of Contents

College Goal 1	1
College Goal 2	113
College Goal 3	160
College Goal 4	192
College Goal 5	225

Allen College Goals 2015-2019

1. Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.
2. Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.
3. Recruit and retain highly qualified and engaged students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.
4. Promote a commitment by all members of the Allen College community to lives of service.
5. Adopt management practices that demonstrate outstanding stewardship of all resources to our constituents.

College Goals Achievement Report

2016-2017 Reporting Year

College Goals 2015-2019

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Admin - Teaching & Learning Committee

AU Outcome: TLC 1.0

Allen College courses will reflect Quality Matters standards.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 07/01/2015

Measures	Results	Actions
<p>SL: Survey - Mean rating of all 8 items on course evaluation tool completed by students (1.0 = strongly disagree, 2.0 = disagree, 3.0 = agree, 4.0 = strongly agree). The mean rating of each item will be averaged for an overall mean rating for each course.</p> <p>Target: 100% of courses will have a mean rating for all 8 items of at least a 3.0 (agree) on a 4.0 (strongly agree) scale.</p> <p>Timeframe: Health Sciences courses based on evaluation cycle. Nursing courses based on curriculum course review schedule.</p> <p>Responsible Parties: TLC Chair and Committee Members</p> <p>Related Documents:</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes 100% (4/4) of the Undergraduate nursing courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: Nursing Report 16-17 Final.xlsx Nsg Report</p>	<p>Action: Target was met. Continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)</p>
<p>Target: 100% of courses will have a mean rating for all 8 items of at least a 3.0 (agree) on a 4.0 (strongly agree) scale.</p> <p>Timeframe: Health Sciences courses based on evaluation cycle. Nursing courses based on curriculum course review schedule.</p> <p>Responsible Parties: TLC Chair and Committee Members</p> <p>Related Documents:</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes 100% (11/11) of the Graduate Nursing Courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: Grad Nsg Report 16-17 Final.xlsx Grad Nsg Report</p>	<p>Action: Target was met. Continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. Announcement made to Faculty regarding student response rate for graduate courses. (02/08/2018)</p>
<p>Responsible Parties: TLC Chair and Committee Members</p> <p>Related Documents:</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No 95% (35/37) Undergraduate Health science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan among Health Science Faculty. Will</p>

Admin - Teaching & Learning Committee

AU Outcome: TLC 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Allen College Course Evaluation Criteria.pdf	Related Documents: HS Report 16-17 Final.xlsx HS Report	continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)
	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 82% (23/28) of the Graduate Health Science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018) Related Documents: Grad HS Report 16-17 Final.xlsx Grad HS Report	Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan among Health Science Faculty. Will continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)

AU Outcome: TLC 2.0

Allen College courses will reflect Chickering and Gamson's 7 principles of good teaching/education practice.

Outcome Status: Inactive

Start Date: 05/08/2017

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Survey - Mean rating of 7 items on instructor evaluation tool (1.0 = strongly disagree, 2.0 = disagree, 3.0 = agree, 4.0 = strongly agree). The mean rating of each item will be averaged for an overall mean rating for each course. Target: 100% of courses will have an overall mean rating at least 3.0. Timeframe: Health Sciences courses based on evaluation cycle. Nursing courses based on curriculum course review schedule. Responsible Parties: TLC Chair and Committee Members	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (4/4) of the Undergraduate Nursing courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the seven-item instructor evaluation. (02/08/2018)	Action: First time measure assessed. Target was met. Assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)
	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (11/11) of the graduate nursing courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the seven-item instructor evaluation. (02/08/2018)	Action: First time measure was assessed. Target was met. Assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. Faculty notified of students response rate. (02/08/2018)
	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 95% (35/37) undergraduate health science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item	Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan

Admin - Teaching & Learning Committee

AU Outcome: TLC 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Related Documents: Allen College Instructor Evaluation Criteria.pdf	course evaluation. (02/08/2018)	among Health Science Faculty. Will continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)
	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 71% of Graduate Health science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the seven-item instructor evaluation. (02/08/2018)	Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan among Health Science Faculty. Will continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)

AU Outcome: TLC 3.0

Graduates will demonstrate commitment to lifelong learning

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
AD: Survey - Alumni survey lifelong learning items Target: 100% of alumni will report at least one lifelong learning activity in the previous 12 months Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation and Study Committee/TLC Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No After May 2017, Allen College surveys of alumni included a definition of lifelong learning and respondents were asked to describe their lifelong learning experiences. Lifelong learning . . . is a dynamic process, which encompasses both personal and professional life. This learning process is also both formal and informal. . . . The most essential characteristics of a lifelong learner are reflection, questioning, enjoying learning, understanding the dynamic nature of knowledge, and engaging in learning by actively seeking learning opportunities. Keeping the mind active is essential to both lifelong learning and being able to translate knowledge into the capacity to deliver high quality . . . care. (Davis, Taylor, & Reis, 2014, p. 444) Davis, L., Taylor, H., & Reyes, H. (2014). Lifelong learning in nursing: A Delphi study. Nurse Education Today, 34, 441-445. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.04.014	

Admin - Teaching & Learning Committee

AU Outcome: TLC 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Not all respondents completed this item, but respondents to ASR, MSN, DNP, and BSN alumni surveys of 2015-2016 graduates revealed the following categories of lifelong learning activities currently pursued by Allen College graduates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employer-provided training or education for job competence/effectiveness 2. Studying or preparing for professional licensure and/or certification 3. Earning or planning to earn an additional and/or advanced academic degree 4. Continuing education activities required to maintain licensure or certification 5. Attending professional conferences 6. Providing health care to clients 7. Reflecting on professional practice and experiences 8. Reading professional and/or scholarly publications (e.g., journal articles, textbooks, practice updates, etc.) 9. Collaborating with colleagues 10. Synthesizing and disseminating evidence for evidence-based practice <p>These categories will be used to craft specific items that can be used to assess graduates' commitment to lifelong learning.</p> <p>Additionally, a survey of Allen College Alumni was administered by the Allen College Alumni Association is currently underway (January and February, 2018). Items on this survey measure respondents' interest in continuing education events, speaking at a continuing education event. currently, 62% of respondents expressed interest in attending continuing education events; 14.5% expressed interest in serving as a guest speaker at such an event. (02/13/2018)</p>	

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.1

Students will practice proper radiation protection

Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA: 135 Competency Testing/CCE Part II, numbers 5, 7, 9, 15, 17 Target: Average score of >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level 1-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Lab Instructor/ Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016 = 3.89 (n=13) Previous data 2015 = 3.95 (n=16) 2014 = 3.97 (n=17) (06/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to demonstrate clinical competence and practice proper radiation protection. Although there was a slight decline in the average score for 2016, this was a smaller cohort. A few students received a score of 2 on collimation and many received a score of 3. Benchmark Met. Continue to monitor. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA: 275 Final Clinical Competency Testing/ CCE Part II, numbers 5,7,9,15,17 Target: Average score of >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 = 3.96 (n=15) Previous data: 2016=3.96 (n=17) 2015=3.96 (n=15) 2014=3.99 (n=17) 2013=3.98 (n=16) 2012=3.97 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No significant change in the last 5 years. The students demonstrated clinical proficiency and competency in providing radiation protection. The program's curriculum integrates radiation protection concepts each semester. Each student's performance demonstrates that they are prepared for graduation. Continue to keep this assessment due to variation in the type of patient, and the fact that it is evaluated by the clinical instructor.</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 1.2

Students will apply correct positioning skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 145 Certification Testing/</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to exceed benchmark. The students</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Part I, numbers 3,12,14,15 Target: Average score of >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level I-Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee	2017 = 4 (n=12) Benchmark/Target met. 2016 = 3.96 (n=16) 2015=3.79 (n=17) 2014=3.86 (n=15) 2013=3.9 (n=17) 2012=3.87 (n=17) (06/21/2017)	were able to apply correct positioning skills. The students are demonstrating knowledge of positioning in relation to their level of placement in the ASR program. Faculty would like to continue with this assessment as certification testing is completed at various clinical sites and with different clinical instructors. (06/21/2017)
SL: Didactic - RA: 265 Certification Testing/Part I, numbers 3,12,14,15 Target: Average score of >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016=3.97(n=15) Previous data 2015=3.99 (n=17) 2014= 3.96 (n=15) 2013= 3.96 (n = 17) 2012= 3.99 (n=17) 2011= 3.89 (n=16) (06/21/2017)	Action: Average scores exceed benchmark. Students demonstrated clinical competence by applying correct positioning skills. This is the final semester that certifications are completed in the ASR Program. Beginning in FA17, the program faculty will distribute a list of exams the Clinical Instructors can select for certifications. For example: C-spine with obliques will be included, but hand and foot will not. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

Students will demonstrate effective communication skills in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA: 135 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 average score was 3.56 (N=13)	Action: This year student's scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Numbers 3, 6, 10,11</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>FA 2015=3.81(n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 3, 6,10,11</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II -Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Students achieved an average score of 3.95 (n=15) Benchmark met.</p> <p>SP 2016 3.97 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2015 3.95 (n=15)</p> <p>SP 2014 3.97 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2013 3.99 (n=16)</p> <p>SP 2012 3.94 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in interpersonal relationships and an increase in multicultural diversity. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to use effective communication skills in the clinical</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		setting. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Competency Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016=3.92</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>2015= 3.99 (n=16)</p> <p>2014=3.98 (n=17)</p> <p>2013=3.94 (n=16)</p> <p>2012=3.96 (n=17)</p> <p>2011=3.93 (n=17)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students exceeded the benchmark. The students are demonstrating clinical communication skills reflective of their level in the program. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Final Clinical Competency Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2017=4(n=15)</p> <p>Benchmark met.</p> <p>2016=4 (n=17)</p> <p>2015=3.99 (n=15)</p> <p>2014=3.99 (n=17)</p> <p>2013=4 (n=16)</p> <p>2012=4 (n=16)</p> <p>2011=3.95 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to exceed the benchmark. Students demonstrated excellent communication skills in the clinical setting. Many of this year’s final CCE’s were performed on patients that required multiple exams and extensive patient communication. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

Students will practice written communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=98.01% (n=16) 2014=98.2% (n=17) 2013= 99.1% (n=16) 2012= 98.98% (n=17) 2011= 98.51% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Areas of deduction on the reference page include; four students did not utilize proper spacing of the references, two students did not use the hanging indent, one student did not use the proper font size and one student neglected to center the word reference on the top of the reference page. Under the format portion of the evaluation form; four students did not have proper margins in their paper and one student did not meet the requirements of a two page paper. The research paper is discussed in detail on the first day of class with the instructor. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=15) Previous data: 2015-97.5% (n=17) 2014-98.06% (n=15) 2013= 98.7% (n=17)</p>	<p>Action: This is the third year students wrote and presented two papers for this course. Fourteen of the thirty papers written had deductions on the reference page. Eight papers had errors with spacing, nine papers did not have</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	(06/21/2017)	the hanging indent, two students numbered their references, and five students did not correctly title the reference page. Four students had deductions in the format section for grammar and spelling. The instructor encouraged students to review their first paper presentation to give them the opportunity to improve on the second paper. Six of the fifteen students reviewed their first paper presentation and received feedback from the instructor. Five of these six students improved on their second paper. The requirements for these papers are discussed in detail the first day of class. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

Students will demonstrate oral communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 95% (N=15) Previous data: 2015= 98.82% (n=17) 2014= 99.13%(n=15) 2013= 99.52% (n=17) 2012= 98.58% (n=17) 2011= 94.75% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were four papers that received deductions in the oral presentation portion of the evaluation. Two papers did not meet the length of presentation requirement of eight minutes. Four papers did not include all of the information needed during the presentation of the paper. For example, the discussion of exposure factors used during the procedure and one paper was not presented due to student absence. This could be the reason for the lower score in the oral presentation. Students continue to exhibit effective oral communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 99% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=94.53% (n=16) 2014=100% (n=17) 2013= 99.75% (n=16) 2012= 99.6% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were just two papers with deductions in the oral presentation portion. One student read their paper very quickly and the other was deducted in the area of proper voice level. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

Students will appropriately critique radiographic images

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
-----------------	----------------	----------------

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 255 Radiographic image analysis worksheets Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Summer Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 255 Course Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016: 90.19% (n=16) Previous data 2015: 89.88% (n=17) 2014: 89.13% (n= 15) spring level 1 2013: 93.76% (n= 17). spring level 1 2012: 88.8% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The course weight was changed from 10 to 25% this year to encourage student engagement. This year, a much improved 4th edition textbook was used and the workbook was optional. The 2014 cohort was the first cohort to complete this activity during RA255 summer level 2; previous years were part of the RA145 spring level 1 course. In 2013 and previous years, the online worksheets were unlimited attempts and not timed. 2014 the highest score on the worksheet was recorded. 2015 and 2016 the assignment was allotted two attempts, untimed, and the scores were averaged. A few students within this cohort did not submit scores of 75% or greater on a few of the assignments, but overall this cohort was engaged in radiograph critique. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 265 Radiographic image analysis worksheets Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II- Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes FA 2016 = 91.66% (n=15) Previous data FA 2015= 90.71% (n=17) FA 2014= 93.13% (n=15) FA 2013= 94.63% (n=17) FA 2012 = 96.7% (n=17) FA 2011 = 95.35%. (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to demonstrate their ability to critique radiographic images. No significant change when compared to last year. The overall average is lower than 2014 and all previous years, but in previous years the worksheets were unlimited attempts, not timed and the highest score was recorded. The</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		assignment parameters were changed in 2015 and subsequent years to allow only two untimed attempts and the scores were averaged. In FA 15 the course weight for the worksheets was increased from 15% to 20%. No changes recommended. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.2

Students will demonstrate ability to practice critical thinking

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:145 Scientific Exhibit Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 = 92.14% N= 7 posters (12 students) Previous data 2016 = 92.6% N= 10 posters (16 students) 2015 = 96.5%, N= 11 posters (17 students) 2014= 94%, N = 11 posters (15 students) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Scores for 2017 continue to demonstrate the student’s ability to practice critical thinking skills when developing their scientific exhibits. Average scores continue to exceed the benchmark of 80%. No changes recommended. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - RA: 203B Corectec exams Target: > 80% of the students will achieve a score of 70 or greater on one of the four exams. Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 203B</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 (n=15), 93% of the students received a passing score after the 4th exam. Previous data 2016 (n=17) 100% 2015 (n=15) 93% 2014 (n=17) 76%</p>	<p>Action: One student did not achieve a 70 on any of the 4 Corectec exams. This year’s Corectec exams reflected the new ARRT content specs. Students continue to demonstrate their</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Course Instructor/HS Curriculum Committee	2013 (n=16) 100% 2012 (n=16) 100% (06/21/2017)	ability to practice critical thinking. The course instructor recommends that the benchmark be changed to state "will achieve a Corectec exam score of 70 or greater." (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

Students will be able to critically think in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:145 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016-2017: average score was 3.63 (N=12)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>Spring 2016 3.63(n=16)</p> <p>Spring 2015 3.67 (N-17)</p> <p>Spring 2014 3.62 (N=15)</p> <p>Spring 2013 3.82 (N=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in the area of ability to follow directions. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsys software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. During the 2017 spring semester, two of the clinical sites were part of a pilot study utilizing Trajecsys for the completion of student clinical evaluations. The pilot study was a success. The clinical instructors had no issues with completion of the student evaluations. Trajecsys :allows the clinical instructors to complete the student evaluations online and then each student is</p>

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		able to view their completed evaluation. During summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing Trajecsys to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to use critical thinking skills in the clinical setting. Continue to monitor. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:265 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II- Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 average score was 3.86 (N=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>Fall 2015=3.81(n=17)</p> <p>Fall 2014-3.75(n=15)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year student's scores increased in the areas of application of knowledge, self-image for Level in the ASR Program and composure and adaptability. There was a slight decline in ability to follow directions. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to be able to critically think in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - RA:135 Community</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: The service learning paper</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 135 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: No 2016: 72% (n=13) Previous data 2015: 92.56% (n=16) 2014: 97.94% (n=17) 2013: 99.28 (n=16) 2012= 99.41% (n=17) 2011=99% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>accounts for 10% of the course grade. One student did not submit a paper and received a zero, which decreased the overall average score for this cohort. Many of the students did not follow the assignment instructions and did not earn the highest points possible. Of the students who completed the assignment, the overall average was score was 78.41%. Multiple students performed service learning independently through a variety of organizations. Students have demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism through their service learning activities. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - RA: 265 Community Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016: 93.4% (N=15) Previous data 2015: 82.47% (n=17) 2014: 99.13% (n=15) 2013: 97.59% (n=17). 2012: 100% (n-17) 2011: 98% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: One student was late submitting the assignment and received a grade reduction. Some students missed points for grammar and punctuation errors. Overall, the service learning reflection papers demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

Students will practice professionalism
Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I- Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 average score was 3.6 (N=13)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>FA 2015=3.83 (n=16)</p> <p>FA 2014=3.80 (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year student's scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to practice professionalism. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Spring 2017 average score was 3.96 (n=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>SP 2016 3.98 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2015 3.91 (n=15)</p> <p>SP 2014 3.95 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2013 3.98 (n=16)</p> <p>SP 2012 3.9 (n=16)</p> <p>2010-2011 3.85 (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight increase in organization of assignments and a decrease in initiative and ethical and professional behaviors. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		the evaluation process. Students continue to integrate leadership skills and practice professionalism in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 1.1

Students will practice evidence-based decision making in the dental hygiene profession.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation number 4</p> <p>Target: Average score of > 1. (0-2 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: When course taught</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DH Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 20 points for 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students did a good job writing and presenting how to relate, communicate, teach, and learn from various learning styles and preferences.</p> <p>Will continue with this benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH450 Dental Hygiene Public Health Summer Semester Employer Evaluation question number 1</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>No data-have not sent survey yet. (06/06/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Employer Survey Form for 2017 BHS DH grads.docx</p>	<p>Action: Use tool to send to employers 6 months after first class graduates. (06/06/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Average score of >3. (0-5 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>		

AU Outcome: DHO 1.2

Students will analyze research and apply evidence-based decision making in case planning.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH300 Introduction to Oral Health Research-Fall Semester Final Project-2 parts (paper & worksheet- parts A&F) Rubric available. Target: Student will earn a score of 85% or better. Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught until Fall 2017. No action plan would be expected. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan expected at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH420 Advanced Dental Hygiene Care Planning Spring Semester Module 6 Discussion Post HIV Case Study Target: Student will earn an overall grade score of 85% or better. Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 3.1

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 3.1

Students will demonstrate critical thinking when individualizing patient needs.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH300 Intro to Oral Research Fall Semester Exercise 1.1, Ch. 1: Intro to Gail Exercise 2.1-EBDM worksheet Part A</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% on assignment Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH420 Advanced Dental Hygiene Care Planning Spring Semester Module 3, Case Study E Discussion Post: Tobacco Cessation Target: Average score of >85%. Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 3.2

Students will demonstrate ability to practice critical thinking.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Summer Semester Final overview presentation-Rubric available Target: Average score of 85% or better Timeframe: When course taught</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. Target Met- the average score was 99%, n=2.</p>	<p>Action: Target met: The students demonstrated critical thinking in their final presentation by considering the population’s needs, barriers, and contributing factors that affect oral health.</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>(06/06/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Final Project Rubric.docx</p>	<p>Continue to use the final presentation to evaluate the ability to practice critical thinking.</p> <p>Keep benchmark the same. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Course review-Rubric available.</p> <p>Target: Average score of 85% or better</p> <p>Timeframe: When course taught</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>Target Met-The average score was 99.5%, n=2. (06/06/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Ch11 Educational Plan Example.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Students demonstrated critical thinking by developing an evaluation plan for learner outcomes on an educational topic of their choice. Students were responsible for data gathering, an evaluation period, data analysis and interpretation, and degree to which interventions were successful.</p> <p>Will continue to use this tool and keep the benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - DH460 Management and Leadership In Dental Hygiene Spring Semester Employer Evaluation question number 4</p> <p>Target: Average score >3 (0-5 pt. scale)</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Three students were enrolled in this course, n=3. (06/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Employer surveys have not been distributed, this is the first class to graduate.</p> <p>Employer surveys will be sent out in Spring 2018.</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>		(06/06/2017)
<p>AD: Survey - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation of Student question Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 2 (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Students were successful in developing leadership throughout their practicum.</p> <p>Will continue to use this tool and keep this benchmark next year. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 4.2

Students will practice professionalism.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor evaluation of student question Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 2 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students practiced professionalism at their practicum site by displaying and mentoring students and patients at the site.</p> <p>Will continue to use this measurement tool.</p> <p>Will keep the same benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students were able to practice professionalism</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Vulnerable Populations Summer Semester Preceptor evaluation of student Target: Average score >1. (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee	New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx	while they were educating and/or caring their chosen vulnerable population. Feedback was great. Keep this tool and maintain benchmark. (06/06/2017)

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.2

Students will assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations through the educational preparation and graduation of health science and nursing professionals.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - EdD 710: Leading a Health Sciences Learning Organization – Case Study: Making Changes in Higher Education Target: 100% of students will receive a score of >=85% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2015, 2018, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Grad Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)	
SL: Didactic - EdD 730: Professional, Ethical and Legal Issues and Trends in Health Professions Education – Literature Review Target: Each student will receive an average score of >80%	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No For the Fall 2016 semester, 87.5% of students (n=7 out of 8) received an average score of >80% on the literature review. This was the first time EdD 730 was offered so no historical data is available for comparison. (09/08/2017)	Action: A comprehensive literature review was the main assessment conducted in EdD 730 which helps prepare educators and leaders for roles in a variety of educational

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Timeframe: When course is taught Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Related Documents: EdD 720 and EdD 730 Doctoral Writing Rubric_Final.pdf EdD 730 Literature Review Instructions.pdf</p>	<p>settings. The literature review is required to focus on some form of legal, ethical, or professional issue of the student’s choosing. Having a comprehensive knowledge of the legal, ethical, and professional issues supports Goal #1 and the outcome by preparing the student for their dissertation and graduation from the EdD program. By choosing a topic related to legal, ethical, or professional issues, the students will have the skills necessary to collaborate with the campus community to improve the outcomes of their stakeholders. The target for this measure was not met, and the course instructors and EdD Director discussed resources to improve students’ performance. The most common area where points were lost was in APA formatting and writing structure. As a result, the students will be more informed of the writing resources available to them both before and during the class. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - EdD 740: Today’s Health Sciences Student: Trends, Issues and Challenges – Service Learning Project Target: Students will receive an</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 11 students Earned an average of 20.3 out of 24 points = 84.5%</p>	<p>Action: This project was developed so that students could develop an individual or group interprofessional service learning project. Two groups were able to</p>

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
average score of >80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee	New assessment item for this year. (09/08/2017) Related Documents: EdD 740 Service Learning Project Information - Fall 2016.pdf	implement projects in which their students completed service learning projects. Two other groups worked on planning a project and/or conducting a pilot study. Students were engaged with the project and explored service learning as a viable teaching strategy within their educational setting. The requirement for this project was a narrated presentation. General observations included issues with integrating literature throughout the presentation to help support their observations. Organization was also an issue to guide students to develop presentations that would hold someone's attention while viewing a recorded presentation. Continue to monitor and consider raising target. (09/08/2017)

AU Outcome: EdD 2.1

Students will facilitate curriculum design, development, and evaluation of program and learner outcomes using evidence-based strategies.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - EdD 790: Practicum in Health Professions Education – Project Conferences Target: Students will receive an average score of >80%	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 7 students	Action: Students were directed to complete an education-oriented project that had practical application for this course project (see attachment). The project also

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., Spring 2017) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee</p>	<p>Earned an average of 160 out of 160 points = 100%</p> <p>New assessment item for this year. (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: EdD 790 - Project Guidelines (Conferences) - Spring 2017.pdf</p>	<p>had to contain an evaluation component. Students were given specific deadlines and expectations for three face-to-face conferences to provide an overview of their projects in order to satisfy the requirements for each conference. Students created projects that will continue on after the course is over, meaning that they develop work that is valuable and useable in their teaching environments. Continue to monitor and revise the target. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 760: Pedagogy in Health Professions Education – Student Choice Activities Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 90% across the three student choice activities Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2014, 2017, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

AU Outcome: EdD 4.1

Students will apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 820: Methods of Inquiry - Quantitative Research –</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA</p>	

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Research Proposal Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2016, 2019, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee</p>	<p>Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 830: Dissertation Seminar – Prospectus Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., summer 2016, summer 2017) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 5 students Earned an average of 20 out of 20 points = 100%</p> <p>New assessment item for this year. (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: EdD 830 Prospectus Assignment.docx Dissertation Prospectus_apr2016(2).docx</p>	<p>Action: The goal of this course is for students to examine potential dissertation topics as well as explore the dissertation process – establish a research question, work on a literature review, and consider methodology. Currently, students are directed to take this course during their second summer in the program, and that may be too early for them in the doctoral program to fully understand the process. While the students in this course all did well with the prospectus assignment, a lot of time has passed before they can use what they work on as it applies to the dissertation. There may be a better point in the program to place this course. Continue to monitor and consider revising the target. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 800: Evidence Based Practice in the Health Professions – Final Written Report</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 80%</p> <p>Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2015, 2018, etc.)</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 810: Methods of Inquiry – Qualitative Research – Final Project Paper</p> <p>Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 80%</p> <p>Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2015, 2018, etc.)</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

AU Outcome: EdD 5.1

Students will advance the scholarship of education in a variety of health science and nursing professions.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 790: Practicum in Health Professions Education – Course Discussions</p> <p>Target: Students will receive an average score of >80%</p> <p>Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., spring 2017)</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Spring 2017 7 students</p> <p>Earned an average of 204.7 out of 210 points = 97.5%</p> <p>New assessment item for this year. (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: EdD 790 Discussion Board Scoring Rubric - Spring 2017.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Course discussions centered on the application of teaching concepts covered in the course. Using a textbook designed for K-12 educators, we related the concept of making learning visible to students through different types of learning (surface, deep, and transfer) to health sciences educational environments. Topics were discussed within each</p>

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 5.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	EdD 790 Example Discussions - Spring 2017.docx	module, and then students were asked to demonstrate how they would apply the concepts in their individual settings. This allowed students to visualize different ways they could advance scholarship in their own settings by using advice not necessarily directed to health sciences educational environments. Continue to monitor and raise the target. (09/08/2017)
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 780: Integrating Evolving Technology in Health Professions Education – Homework Assignments Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2015, 2018, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 1.1 Case Study Report

Students will use critical reasoning skills to successfully develop a case study report.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - OT 602 – OT School System Practice Case Report Assignment</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Of the 14 students in the cohort, all 14 achieved an 80% or higher on the assignment. The average was 55.41 out of 60 points for an average of 92.35%. (09/28/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The program is new and this is the first time that this measure has been used to assess</p>

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 1.1 Case Study Report

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Minimum of 80% on case report assignment Timeframe: When course taught (year 2 of program, e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: OT 602 Instructor/ Program Faculty/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Related Documents: Outcome 1-2.pdf Outcome 1.pdf</p>	<p>the program outcomes. (09/28/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MS in OT 1.2 Therapeutic Intervention

Students will accurately use critical reasoning skills in development of therapeutic intervention.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - OT 611 – Written final: Initial evaluation note and intervention plan Target: All students will achieve a minimum score of 80% on initial evaluation note and intervention plan Timeframe: When course taught (Year 2 of program, e.g., Spring 2017) Responsible Parties: OT 611 Instructor/ Program Faculty/HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 13 out of 14 students successfully met the 80% score on the presentation. Only one did not meet the expectation (score of 78%). The average score on the assignment was 68.07 out of 75 points. The average score was a 90.76%. (08/30/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 2.pdf</p>	<p>Action: In an effort to improve the outcome of this measure the program will provide additional in-class practice in case presentations before the associated assignment is given. (08/30/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 1.1

Students will apply theory and principles related to laboratory testing

Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Exam scores – MLS 302: Clinical Hematology and Hemostasis Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 13 students Earned 1039/1170 available points = 88% average score (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS302 2016 Exam 1 Question Set.docx MLS 302 Fall 2016 Exam Scores-CAPDATA.docx</p>	<p>Action: This course represents an entry level course in the MLS program. Three proctored exams were given in this course with 5 extra credit points offered (not included in average exam score). This is a change for 2016-2017 due to curriculum changes. Content was removed so only three exams were necessary. This course was peer reviewed and will be put through a QM template in the future. There will also be additional homework questions added and less extra credit on the exams for 2017-2018. Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - Exam Scores – MLS 404: Clinical Microbiology Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Faculty Org Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 12 students Earned average of 96.08/120 points = 80.1% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 404 Exam Attempts Statistics Spring 2017.docx</p>	<p>Action: Lower scores over the past two years reflect the 2016 change to three proctored multiple choice exams. This was a change from previous years, when low stakes formative open-book exams were given for each chapter. Competency exams were also required for the lab component at the end of this course, and all students passed. Those scores were not included in the averages as the competency exams were scored as pass/fail. Together, the multiple choice exams and the hands-on competency exam help prepare</p>

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		students for clinical rotations, where theory and principles of microbiology will be applied. Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)

AU Outcome: MLS 1.2

Students will apply concepts and principles of laboratory operations in a clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Case study discussions – MLS 406: Clinical Microbiology Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Summer 2016 15 students Earned an average of 92.27/100 available points = 92.3% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 406 Discussion Directions Spring 2017.docx MLS 406 Week 1 Cases.docx MLS Discussion Board Scoring Rubric_spring2017.pdf</p>	<p>Action: This assignment is given to help standardize the organisms and tests included in the knowledge base for the BOC exam, despite the clinical location where students are based. Students did very well identifying microorganisms. Common deductions were due to not following directions on the assignment (late, no references). Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - MediaLab Exam Simulator Scores – MLS 410: Clinical Review Practicum Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 13 students Earned 419.6/440 available points = 95.4% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 410 - ES Assignments - Summer 2016.docx</p>	<p>Action: Exam Simulator (ES) is a preparatory resource we purchase for students to help them prepare for the BOC exam. Points were awarded based on performance on assignments starting in 2015. Students were given percentage goals to meet within this resource as well as a question difficulty level goal to meet as part of the</p>

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		computer-adaptive (CAT) mode that very closely simulates conditions of the BOC exam. Additionally, students in the 2015-2016 cohort started working in the ES earlier than in previous years. We have found performance on the CAT to be a good predictor of performance on the BOC exam. Starting with the 2016-2017 cohort, students will have to meet a prescribed CAT goal in order to successfully complete MLS 410. Continue to monitor and shift measure to CAT difficulty level 5.5. (09/08/2017)

AU Outcome: MLS 2.2

Students will assess the accuracy of laboratory test results by correlating laboratory data with clinical diagnoses

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Graphic Organizer assignment – MLS 402: Clinical Chemistry Practicum</p> <p>Target: Students will receive an average score of >80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>12 students</p> <p>2016-2017</p> <p>Earned average of 98.41/100 points = 98.0% (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>MLS 402 Chemistry Graphic Organizer Directions 2016-17.docx</p> <p>MLS 402 Graphic Organizer Rubric 2016-17.pdf</p>	<p>Action: The graphic organizer assignment incorporates all chemistry analytes from the ASCP BOC Exam Content Guideline as a study supplement to the chemistry practicum course. In this assignment, students complete five categories for each test, including reference ranges, reflex tests, and disease correlation; in order to associate high, low, or normal</p>

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>results and related tests with the clinical condition of the patient. Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical - Virtual Microscope Assignments – MLS 401: Clinical Hematology Practicum Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall – 2016 5 students Earned an average of 171.0/180 available points = 95.0% Spring – 2017 8 students Earned an average of 172.1/180 available points = 95.6% 2016-2017 average = 95.4% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 401 Virtual Microscope Example Assignment 2016-2017.docx MLS 401 GRADING SYSTEM BLOOD MORPHOLOGY - 2016-2017.pdf</p>	<p>Action: The virtual microscope (VM) allows students to practice differentials on their personal computer as a bridging activity to performing them on a microscope during clinical rotations. These assignments provide patient case history, so students are able to correlate their results with potential clinical diagnoses. One of the most powerful aspects of the VM allows the instructor to take snapshots of actual cells on each differential to use as a teaching tool to help students classify cells. Students were required to spend 12 hours of rotation time with a hematology instructor during the didactic portion of the program. Consider revising target. Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - Case study discussions – MLS 410: Clinical Review Practicum Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Faculty Org Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 13 students Earned an average of 91.5/100 available points = 91.5% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 410 Case Study Discussions - Summer 2016.docx MLS 410 Example Case Study - Summer 2016.pdf MLS 410 Example Case Study Answer - Summer 2016.pdf</p>	<p>Action: This assignment was changed this year – students were assigned a certain number of cases to complete which included open-ended questions that referred to the cases. The answer keys released shortly after the due date/time. Students were given</p>

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>points for completing all of the case questions, but determining correctness of their answers was up to the student. Students were asked to reflect on their case answers in a separate assignment. The intent of this assignment was to make their learning more self-directed since this course is essentially the program capstone course. Students lost points for turning in assignments late and not answering all case questions. Continue to monitor and consider raising the target. (09/08/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MLS 3.1

Students will maintain competency in the laboratory field of study

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Annotated Bibliographies – MLS 426: Evidence-Based Laboratory Medicine</p> <p>Target: 75% of students will receive an average score of >80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>13 students</p> <p>Earned an average of 43.3/45 available points = 96.2% (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>MLS 426 Annotated Bibliographies - Spring 2017.docx</p>	<p>Action: Students were required to use the evidence based practice (EBP) process to complete annotated bibliographies on two pieces of evidence that related to a student-selected topic. Skills learned throughout the course culminated in a final project that encompassed the entire EBP process. Students were provided with a list of expectations along with a breakdown of how points</p>

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>were earned to help guide project development. This course was developed to meet the needs of learners with varying backgrounds in research to show how the EBP process is used in the laboratory setting. Some students in this group chose topics that relate to their workplace and were encouraged to share the results of their project with their employer. Continue to monitor and consider raising the target. (09/08/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 3.2

Students will join the Society of Nuclear Medicine and participate in local meetings

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Society of Nuclear Medicine Directory Target: All students will join the Society of Nuclear Medicine Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: NMT Program Chair/HS Faculty Org Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For 2016-2017, 100% of NMT students joined the Society of Nuclear Medicine. For 2015-2016, 100% of NMT students joined the Society of Nuclear Medicine. For 2014-2015, 100% of NMT students joined the Society of Nuclear Medicine. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The 2016-2017 results were unchanged from 2015-2016. The students demonstrate a commitment to life-long learning and excellence by joining the Society of Nuclear Medicine and receiving the Journal of Nuclear Medicine. The students even discussed attending the SNMMI annual meeting in June 2017 in Denver, Colorado. (09/21/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Eastern Iowa of Society of Nuclear Medicine Attendance Roster Target: All students will attend one meeting per year Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: NMT Program Chair/HS Faculty Org Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Spring 2017 semester 100% of the students attended a local meeting. For the Spring 2016 semester 100% of the students attended a local meeting. For the Spring 2015 semester 100% of the students attended a local meeting. No results are available from 2014 because the EIS-SNM subchapter was in hiatus due to lack of officials. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The results from spring 2017 were unchanged from spring 2016. This year, the student had the option to go to any face-to-face continuing education meeting due to the paucity of live meetings. Both students provided documentation of participating in a meeting hosted by the radiopharmacy locally in Waterloo. The students demonstrated commitment to participating in the local meeting and mentioned it was an excellent networking opportunity with other technologists. (09/21/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 1.1

Student will be able to identify determinants of health and illness

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 430 Final exam Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS APG committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, one student took the class and earned an 83% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, six students took the class and earned an average of 88.16% on the final exam. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes it difficult to predict future results. This outcome and measure will be revisited in the CAP for 2017-2018 academic year to be more specific to the goal. (06/20/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Community needs assessment as part of mid-term project. Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Spring semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes This was the PH 440 mid-term project. All (n=2) students scored above 80%, with an average score of 94.5%. In Fall 2015, five students earned an average of 88.16% on the assignment as part of PH 420. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the first time this project was offered in this course. It will be used again next year to monitor progress. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 1.2

Student will be able to identify sources of public health data and information

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Community needs assessment as part of mid-term project. Target: Successful completion of report Average score of >80% Timeframe: Spring semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes As a part of the mid-term needs assessment in PH 440, students were asked to identify data sources. All (n=2) students scored above 80%, with an average score of 87.5%. In Fall 2015, five students earned an average of 88.16% on the assignment in PH 420. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the first time this measure was separated from the midterm project as a whole. It will be used again next year to monitor progress. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 2.1

Student will be able to gather information on policy

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH 490 Final Exam (Ethics, Law, and Health Care Policy) Target: Average score > 80%</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes One student took the course and received a 93% on the final exam. Previous years data is not available due to a transition in program staff. (08/17/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the first time the measure was used and there was only one student in the course. This</p>

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Timeframe: Summer semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee		measure will remain in place until there is more data. (08/17/2017)

AU Outcome: PH 2.2

Student will be able to identify mechanism to evaluate programs for their quality and effectiveness

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH 480 Final Exam. (Public Health Research and Evaluation) Target: Average score > 80% Timeframe: Spring semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes All (n=2) students scored above 80%, with an average score of 93.6%. The Previous year's data not available due to change in program staff. (06/20/2017)	Action: This tool appears to be effective and will be used again next year. (06/20/2017)

AU Outcome: PH 3.2

Student should be able to describes the role of governmental and non-governmental organizations in the delivery of community health services

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 410 Final exam Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Faculty Org. committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, four students took the class and earned an average of 83.7% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, seven students took the class and earned an average of 94.71% (06/20/2017)	Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes it difficult to predict future results. Additionally, the instructor, course text, and final text changed between academic years, making these results impossible to compare year-over-year. This measure will be revisited in the CAP

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		for 2017-2018 academic year to create a more precise measurement. (06/20/2017)

AU Outcome: PH 4.1

Student should be able to describe the scientific foundation of the field of public health

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 400 Identify prominent events in the history of public health Midterm Exam and assignments Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No No midterm was given. One student in the course received cumulative scores for quizzes from the half of the course were 33/44, or 75%. In the previous year, seven students took the class. They earned an average of 312.8/335 points = 93.37 % on the mid-term examination (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The new instructor was unaware of the measure and this score was the closest proxy. The drop in score was likely do to a change in instructor and in course materials. Instructor will review the assessment plan to create a more specific measure. (06/20/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 430 Final exam Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Faculty Org. committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, one student took the class. They earned an 83% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, six students took the class, earning an average of 88.16% on the final exam. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes it difficult to predict future results. This measure was also used in Outcome 1.3, so a new measure will be created for the 2017-2018 CAP. (06/20/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 1.0 Lead

Provide basic organizational and systems leadership.

Outcome Status: Active

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 1.0 Lead

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to provide basic organizational and systems leadership (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to provide basic organizational and systems leadership. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 BSN graduates: 53.33% well; 33.33% very well. May '15, Dec. '14, Aug. '14 graduates surveyed spring 2016: 38% well; 63% very well. Results from most recent survey a slightly less favorable than previous survey, but previous survey included several reporting years and had a better, albeit low, response rate. Response rate for most recent alumni survey was 12%. (10/02/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, value of results questionable. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/02/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate provides basic organizational and systems leadership (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that the BSN graduate provides basic organizational and systems leadership well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 205-2016 graduates (n = 5 responses): poorly = 1, well = 1, very well = 3 (60%); well + very well = 4/5 (80%). Target was exceeded, but results demonstrate decrease in percentage of favorable responses compared to previous survey: Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates (n = 16 responses): poorly 6.3%, well 31.3%, very well 62.5% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Low response rate creates risk that results do not accurately represent employer perceptions. Response rate of employer survey relies on graduates to provide employers with the survey. A better response by graduates may result in a better response by employers. Traditionally employers can be depended on to complete the survey if it is given to them. (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU 450 Teaching Project assignment Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on the teaching</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The teaching paper was discussed frequently during class and questions answered weeks prior to the due date. Summer 2016 –100% of students achieved above 75% on the teaching</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target in the future course faculty will review the teaching project assignment criteria a minimum of 2</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 1.0 Lead

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>project assignment. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>project assignment. Fall 2016 (UD) - 100% of students achieved above 75% on the teaching project assignment. Fall 2016 (LPN)—100% of students achieved above 75% on the teaching project assignment. Spring 2017 (UD)- 100% of students achieved above 75% on the teaching project assignment (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 1 NU 450 Teaching Project Assignment.docx</p>	<p>times and provide 1:1 guidance during office hours for those who request additional assistance. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU 460 Change Proposal Paper Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on change proposal paper. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes A new rubric was created for this assignment for this academic year. Students completed a root cause analysis to help them determine the root of the problem before writing their change proposal. 100% of UD/Acc students for Summer 16, Fall 16, and Spring 17 100% of students achieved 73% or higher on Change Proposal (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 1 NU 460 Change Proposal Rubric.docx</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target, faculty will remind students of the importance of changes in health care and how to identify needs and take steps to make improvements. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice you provide basic organizational and systems leadership (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they provide basic organizational and systems leadership some or most of the time in their current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE,</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: 0% rarely; some of the time 46.67%; Most of the time 53.33%. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: 8% rarely, 29% some of the time, 63% most of the time. Results show that graduates consistently report performing the outcome some of most of the time. (10/02/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, value of results questionable. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/02/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 1.0 Lead

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Evaluation & Study Committee		
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate provides basic organizational and systems leadership (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome or outcome not applicable to current role).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate provides basic organizational and systems leadership some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates (n = 5): some of the time (2) or most of the time (3); some or most of the time = 5 (100%). Target met again. Consider low response rate.</p> <p>Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates (n = 16): not at all 6.3%, some of the time 25%, most of the time 68.8% (10/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: BSN 2.0 EBP

Integrate evidence-based practice in nursing care.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey item: How well BSN education prepared you to integrate evidence-based practice in nursing care (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 alumni (n = 15 responses): well = 9 (60%), very well = 5 (33.33%), poorly = 0. Favorable response rate = 15 (100%). Target is exceeded, but response rate low.</p> <p>Survey of 2014-2015 alumni: 42% well, 54% very well. (10/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 2.0 EBP

Measures	Results	Actions
<p>report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to integrate evidence-based practice in nursing care. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		<p>g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey item: How well BSN graduate integrates evidence-based practice in nursing care (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate integrates evidence-based practice in nursing care well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly 0, 2 well, 3 very well. Well or very well = 5 (100%). Target exceeded, but cannot ignore implications of low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 6.3%, well 18.8%, very well 75% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical - NU480 Nursing care plan, refereed journal article provided to support nursing interventions Target: 100% of students will provide refereed journal article to support nursing interventions for nursing care plan Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Clinical paperwork was emphasized during clinical orientation. Guidelines for paperwork highlights the importance of supporting an intervention with an evidence based article. 100% of students from Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 provided an evidence based article with each journal reflection. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 2 NU 480 Nursing Care Plan.docx</p>	<p>Action: References for all aspects of clinical paperwork must be either a textbook or an evidence based article. Students will no longer be able to use internet based resources for clinical paperwork. The clinical journal format was changed to emphasize this requirement. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey item:</p>		

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 2.0 EBP

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>How often in current professional nursing practice you integrate evidence-based practice in nursing care (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that they integrate evidence-based practice in nursing care some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 graduates (15 responses): rarely = 2 (13.33%), some of the time = 4 (26.7%) most of the time = 9 (60%). Some or most of the time = 13 (86.7%). Target exceeded, but response rate low (12%).</p> <p>Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: some of the time = 42%, most of the time = 58% (10/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey item: How often BSN graduate integrates evidence-based practice in nursing care (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate integrates evidence-based practice in nursing care some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: CIRE,</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: some of the time = 2, most of the time = 3. Some or most of the time = 5 (100%). Target met again, but consider low response rate.</p> <p>Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: some of the time 31.3%, most of the time 68.8% (10/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 2.0 EBP

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Evaluation & Study Committee		
<p>SL: Clinical - NU485C Nursing care plan, refereed journal article provided to support nursing interventions</p> <p>Target: 100% of students will provide refereed journal article to support nursing interventions for nursing care plan</p> <p>Timeframe: Year 3</p> <p>Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>It was difficult to track submission of an EBP journal article to support the students' nursing interventions when the assignment was submitted electronically. Not all students provided a copy of the article nor did they cite the article in the assignment. Students were docked 1-3 points if no article was cited in the assignment and/or submitted. Summer, 2016 71% Fall 2016 - LPN 53% and Fall 2016 -68% met the target. Results did not improve and in fact were worse.</p> <p>(11/16/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Outcome 2 NU 485C Nursing Care Plan.docx</p>	<p>Action: Change the measure to: NU 485C Clinical Seminar, refereed journal article provided to support nursing interventions. And target to: 100% of students will provide referred journal article to support nursing interventions discussed in clinical seminar. (11/16/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: BSN 3.0 Informatics

Manage healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2015

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well your BSN education prepared you to manage healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to manage healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: CIRE,</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly = 3, well = 7, very well = 5; well or very well = 12/15 (80%). Target exceeded. Low survey response rate (12%).</p> <p>Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 4%, well 42%, very well 54%. (10/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 3.0 Informatics

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Evaluation & Study Committee</p> <p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate manages healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate manages healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 3 of 5 (60%) employers reported that the BSN graduate performs this outcome very well. 1 reported very well, and one reported poorly. 80% reported well (20%) or very well (60%). (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target was exceeded, but low representation of employers cannot be ignored. Consider different means of obtaining employer perceptions of how well Allen College BSN graduates perform the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - NU480 informatics clinical competencies on clinical evaluation tool Target: 100% of students will receive "S" rating for Informatics clinical competencies on clinical evaluation tool. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The clinical evaluation tool was reviewed at clinical orientation. A CEU offering for preceptors was available during the 2016-2017 academic year on the clinical evaluation tool and method to evaluate students on each criteria was included. Students typically receive an "S" rating for the Informatics competency on the clinical evaluation tool. FA 16 and SP 17 100% of students received an "S" rating on the informatics competency. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 3 NU 480 Clinical Evaluation Tool.docx</p>	<p>Action: The clinical evaluation tool will be reviewed at clinical orientation starting in Fall 2017 so students are aware of the criteria with which they will be evaluated during this clinical experience. Clinical faculty will also be encouraged to review the clinical evaluation tool with preceptors when making site visits. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice you manage healthcare data, information,</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: rarely 0, some of the time= 7, Most of the time = 8; Some or most of the time = 15 (100%). Target exceeded. Response rate low.</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 3.0 Informatics

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>knowledge, and technology (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they manage healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: rarely 4%, some of the time 13 %, Most of the time 83%. (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate manages healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate manages healthcare data, information, knowledge, and technology some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: not at all = 1, rarely = 0, some of the time = 1, most of the time = 3. Some or most of the time = 3 (60%). Target not met. Must consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: rarely 6.3%, most of the time 93.8% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - NU485C</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 3.0 Informatics

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
informatics clinical competencies on clinical evaluation tool Target: 100% of students will receive "S" rating for Informatics clinical competencies on clinical evaluation tool. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee	Target Met: Yes During clinical orientation faculty reviewed the clinical evaluation tool with all students. Fall 2016 - 100%, Summer 2016 - 100%, Fall 2016, LPN- 100% of students met the target. Results remain the same. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 3 NU 485 Clinical Evaluation Tool.docx	Action: In order to continue to meet this target in the future, course faculty will remind students that they will be evaluated on their informatics competency by their clinical preceptor. (11/16/2017)

AU Outcome: BSN 4.0 HC Policy & Finance

Demonstrate understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to demonstrate understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their How well BSN education prepared them well or very well to demonstrate understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: very poorly =0, poorly= 5 (33/33%), well = 7 (46.67%), very well = 3 (20%); well or very well = 67%. Target not met this year, but was met last year. It may be that graduates rarely have the opportunity to demonstrate outcome. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: very poorly 4%, poorly 21%, well 63%, very well 13%. (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf	Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)
AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item:	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)	

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 4.0 HC Policy & Finance

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>How well BSN graduate demonstrates understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate demonstrates understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly = , well = , very well = , Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 6.3%, well 43.8%, very well 43.8%, NA-- does not perform outcome or outcome not applicable to role 6.3% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU460 Health Care Costs assignment Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 73% on health care costs assignment Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Students were able to choose their own countries for the assignment. During class each group presented their comparison to the class. Summer 2016 (Accel): 100% of students achieved 73% on the health care costs assignment; Fall 2016 (UD) 100% of students achieved 73% on the health care costs assignment. Spring 2017 (UD) 100% of students achieved 73% or greater on the healthcare costs assignment. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 4 NU 460 Healthcare Costs Assignment.doc</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target, this assignment will be completed in class where students work in groups comparing health care costs to the US. They will then present their findings to the class and lead class discussion. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice they demonstrate understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 =</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: not at all = 0, rarely = 3 (20%), some of the time = 7 (46.67%), most of the time = 5 (33.33%), 80% reported demonstrating outcome some or most of the time, which is an increase compared to last year, but must consider low response rate. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: not at all 13%, rarely 8%, some of the time 46%, most of the time 29%, NA 4%. 75% reported demonstrating outcome some or most of the time.</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 4.0 HC Policy & Finance

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they demonstrate understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>(10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate demonstrates understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate demonstrates understanding of healthcare policy, finance, and regulatory environments some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: not at all =0, rarely 1= 2, some of the time = 2, most of the time =1. Some or most of the time = 3 (60%). Target not met. Consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: not at all 6.3%, rarely 12.5%, some of the time 37.5%, most of the time 43.8% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 5.0 Teamwork & Collaboration

Facilitate inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to facilitate inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to facilitate inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: very poorly = 2, poorly = 2, well = 5, very well = 6. Well or very well = 11/15 (73.33%). Results demonstrate improvement compared to previous year, but target not met. Respondents did not have perception that they were prepared to facilitate IPC and collaborate in a healthcare team. Response rate low. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 4%, well 33%, very well 63% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate facilitates inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate facilitates inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE,</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2017 graduates: 100% well (60%) or very well (40%). Results consistent with previous reporting year. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Results must be considered in the context of a low response rate to the survey. Consider alternate means of obtaining employers' perceptions of graduates' performance of program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 5.0 Teamwork & Collaboration

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Evaluation & Study Committee</p> <p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice you facilitate inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that facilitate inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice . Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: some of the time 3 (20%), most of the time 12 (80%). Target met. Results demonstrate that respondents do have the opportunity to perform this outcome, but results about how well they were prepared to do it are unfavorable. Target met last year as well. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: some of the time 13%, most of the time 88%. (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate facilitates inter-professional communication and collaboration in healthcare teams (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate facilitates inter-professional communication</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: some of the time = 1, most of the time = 4; some or most of the time = 5 (100%). Target met again. Consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates; rarely 6.3%, some of the time 12.5%, most of the time 81.3%. (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 5.0 Teamwork & Collaboration

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
and collaboration in healthcare teams some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice . Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee		
SL: Didactic - NU 480 & NU 485C Interprofessional Simulation Activity Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on Interprofessional simulation rubric. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Communication with simulation faculty was not adequately completed. Students were not graded using the simulation rubric and thus no points were awarded for this experience. Fall 2016 - 100% of students satisfactorily completed the interprofessional simulation. No score was given for the simulation. (11/16/2017)	Action: This has been a difficult measure to capture for the past two academic years. Students are at multiple hospitals and different types of units for this clinical experience where the interprofessional collaboration varies. The measure will change to NU 499 Interprofessional Assignment. The target will be 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on the Interprofessional assignment. (11/16/2017)

AU Outcome: BSN 8.0 QI

Use data to monitor outcomes and improve care.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to use data to monitor outcomes and improve care. Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly= 4, well = 4 (26.67), very well = 7 (46.67)%; well or very well = 11 (73.34%). Target not met this year; it was met last year. Response rate must be considered. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 4%, well 50%, very well 46% (10/05/2017)	Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 8.0 QI

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>prepared them well or very well to use data to monitor outcomes and improve care (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well). Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate uses data to monitor outcomes and improve care. Target: 75% of respondents will report that the BSN graduate uses data to monitor outcomes and improve care (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 alumni: 100% (n = 5) reported well (40%) or very well (60%). Improvement compared to previous survey. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 alumni: very poorly 6.3%, well 31.3%, very well 62.5% (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Low response rate warrants consideration of more productive way to obtain employers' perceptions of graduates' performance of program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice you use data to monitor outcomes and improve care (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they use data to monitor outcomes and improve care some or</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: Rarely = 2, Some of the time 2, Most of the time 10. NA = 1. Some or most of the time = 12/14 = 86%. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: Not at all 8%, Rarely 4%, Some of the time 17%, Most of the time 71% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 8.0 QI

Measures	Results	Actions
most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee		
SL: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate uses data to monitor outcomes and improve care (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate uses data to monitor outcomes and improve care some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: some of the time =2, most of the time = 2, NA = 1; some or most of the time = 4/4 (100%). Target met, but consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: not at all 12.5%, some of the time 18.8%, most of the time 68.8% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf	Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)
SL: Didactic - NU460 fish bone diagram assignment Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on the fish bone diagram assignment Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The fishbone diagram was continued as an in class activity for this measure during the academic year. 100% of students completed and achieved at least 75% on this assignment. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 8 NU 460 Cause and Effect Diagram (Fishbone) Assignment.docx	Action: In order to better measure this outcome in the future, the measure will be changed to the root cause analysis assignment. The target will be that 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on the root cause analysis assignment. (11/16/2017)

AU Outcome: BSN 9.0 Safe Care

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 9.0 Safe Care

Deliver safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - NU405 Safety assessment activity Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 80% on safety assessment activity Timeframe: Annually (starting 2019-2020; assessed Year 3 prior to 2019-2020) Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Using the grading rubric for the safety assessment ensured consistency among clinical faculty and clear expectations for students. 100% of the students received 100% on the safety assessment. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 9 NU 405 Safety Assessment.xlsx</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target in the future the rubric and assignment will be explained to clinical adjuncts during the preparation for the semester meeting and students during clinical orientation. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to deliver safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to deliver safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly = 1, well = 7, very well = 6. Well or very well = 13 (86.67%). Target met again this year. Consider low response rate. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 4%, well 8%, very well 88% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate delivers safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: very well = 5 (100%). Target met again. Consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 12.5%, well 18.8%, very well 68.8% (10/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 9.0 Safe Care

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate delivers safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU400 home safety assessment assignment Target: 100% of students will achieve a 80% of home safety assessment assignment Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes A separate rubric for the safety assessment was created which assisted students in meeting this target. 100% of the students received 100% on the safety assessment. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 9 NU 400 Home Safety Assessment.docx</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target in the future, course faculty will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the current rubric for grading of the safety assessment. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - NU499 ATI RN Predictor exam, QSEN Category of Safety Target: Group score of at least 75% will be achieved in the QSEN Category of Safety on ATI RN Predictor exam Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No ATI Capstone course was implemented during the FA16 semester. This 8 week course assists students to prepare for the ATI RN Predictor. The ATI RN Predictor was moved to the 9th week of the semester so students had time to complete the Capstone course prior to taking the predictor. The SP17 cohort did perform well on the predictor as 31/44 achieved the benchmark score on the first attempt and group scores were higher than they have historically been for this group. Average group score of 73.54% was achieved in the QSEN safety category on the first attempt of the ATI RN Predictor. Of note, the spring 2017 group achieved a group score of 76.4% on the first ATI RN Predictor which could be the result of completing the Capstone Course prior to taking the first predictor. (11/16/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This course continues to be limited related to credit hour as it is only a 1 credit hour course and it is a challenge to add additional requirements. Virtual ATI is only required for students who do not attend all 3 days of the NCLEX Live Review at the end of the semester. Requiring VATI for those students who do not achieve the benchmark on the ATI RN Predictor and for those students who have performed poorly on the ATI content mastery exams will be considered for the FALL 2017</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 9.0 Safe Care

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>continue to be administered during the first 8 weeks of the semester and the predictor will be given at week 9; The use of Lippincott RN PassPoint will continue to be used during the second half of the semester to continue to prepare students for NCLEX and for the second RN Predictor if the student need to repeat it. These actions may assist in raising this score in the future. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice you deliver safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they deliver safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice . Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: Some of the time= 3, Most of the time = 12. Some or most of the time = 15 (100%). Target met again this year. Consider low response rate. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: Some of the time 8%, Most of the time 88%, NA 4%. (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate delivers</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 9.0 Safe Care

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate delivers safe care through system effectiveness and individual performance some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice . Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: some of the time =1, most of the time = 4; some or most of the time = 5 (100%). Target met again. Consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: rarely 6.3%, some of the time 6.3%, most of the time 87.5% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: BSN 10.0 Synthesis of Knowledge

Synthesize knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - NU499 ATI RN Predictor exam, predicted probability of passing NCLEX-RN Target: 80% of students will achieve at least 94% predicted probability of passing NCLEX-RN on RN Predictor ATI exam Timeframe: Annually (starting 2019-</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Capstone course was implemented in the FA16 semester. Students were not required to enroll in VATI unless they did not attend all 3 days of the NCLEX Live Review course. Points were assigned based on ATI RN Predictor scores and for the LWW assignments; this will continue as it does appear to provide motivation for meeting the benchmark on the ATI RN Predictor. 67.5% of students (summer, fall, spring) achieved a predictability score of 94% on the first attempt of the ATI RN Predictor. This is significantly increased since 2015-2016. 45% of students achieved a predictability score of 94% or higher on the second RN predictor.</p>	<p>Action: Will possibly consider requiring virtual ATI again during the Fall 2017 semester for those students who have not performed well on the ATI content mastery series. Will continue to offer evidence based case studies during class time related to prioritization, including alternate format items to</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 10.0 Synthesis of Knowledge

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
2020; assessed Year 3 prior to 2019-2020) Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee	(11/16/2017)	provide the students additional preparation for the ATI RN predictor and NCLEX. (11/16/2017)
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to synthesize knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to synthesize knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly = 2, well = 9, very well = 6; well or very well =14 (93%). Target met again this year. Consider low response rate.</p> <p>Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: well 46%, very well 54%. (10/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate synthesizes knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate synthesizes knowledge from liberal</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: well = 2, very well = 3; well or very well = 5 (100%). Target met again. Consider low response rate.</p> <p>Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 6.3%, well 25%, very well 68.8% (10/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 10.0 Synthesis of Knowledge

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in professional nursing practice you synthesize knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they synthesize knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: rarely = 2, some of the time = 7, most of the time = 6; some or most of the time = 13 (86.67%). Target met again this year. Consider low response rate. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: some of the time 38%, most of the time 63%. (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate synthesizes knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: some of the time 2, most of the time 3; some or most of the time = 5 (100%). Target met, but low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: not at all 6.3%, some of the time 18.8%, most of the time 75.0% (10/05/2017) Related Documents:</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 10.0 Synthesis of Knowledge

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate synthesizes knowledge from liberal and baccalaureate nursing education to guide generalist practice some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - NU 400 Nutrition Proctored ATI Assessment & NU 405 Nutrition Proctored ATI Assessment Target: 60% of students will achieve at least a Level 2 or 3 on Nutrition proctored ATI exam Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Goal was met by moving the exam to a later semester. Additional data will be gathered during the 2017-2018 academic year to evaluate if this move to a later semester is beneficial. Due to the change of placement in the curriculum, the exam was not given in NU 400 during the 2016-2017 academic year. It was only administered once, Spring 2017, in NU 405, results are as follows: 88.8% of students received a level 2 or 3. (11/16/2017)</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target, the results of student performance on the exam will be evaluated each semester to assist in determining if this exam has been correctly placed in the curriculum. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - NU450 Community Health proctored ATI exam Target: 80% of students will achieve at least a Level 2 or 3 on Community Health proctored ATI exam Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Students continue to demonstrate the ability to synthesize knowledge gained from their BSN education as their take the ATI proctored exam. Content from the ATI book is used in developing classroom activities and exam questions so students must access this information/study by reading their ATI book. Classroom instructors encourage students throughout the semester (at least 3-4 times) to review their ATI books. Summer 2016– 91.6% (33/36) of students achieved a Level 2 or 3 on the Proctored Community Health ATI exam. Fall 2016 (UD/Accel) – 90.5 % of the students achieved a Level 2 or 3 on the Proctored Community Health ATI exam. Fall 2016 (LPN) -75% (12/16) of students achieved a Level 2 or 3 on the Proctored community Health ATI exam. Spring 2017 (UD)-81.8%of students achieved a</p>	<p>Action: In order to consistently achieve this target, course faculty will encourage students several times throughout the semester to utilize their ATI text and study as they proceed through the semester and not wait until right before the exam. The instructor will continue to ask students at least twice during the semester to indicate the time they have spent studying for</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 10.0 Synthesis of Knowledge

Measures	Results	Actions
	level 2 or 3 on the proctored ATI exam. Total students achieving Level 2 or 3 on the Proctored Community Health ATI exam 112/135=82.96% (11/16/2017)	the ATI exam and indicate which content area was the most challenging for them. (11/16/2017)
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - NU460 Leadership proctored ATI exam Target: 55% of students will achieve at least a Level 2 or 3 on Leadership proctored ATI exam Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The target for this measure was decreased to 55% due to historical trends of student performance. Summer 2016 (Acc)-69.4% 25/36 students achieved a Level 2 or Level 3 on the Leadership Proctored ATI exam. Summer 2016 (LPN)-31.25% 5/16 students achieved a Level 2 or Level 3 on the Leadership Proctored ATI exam. Fall 2016 (UD)- 45% 9/20 students achieved a Level 2 or Level 3 on the Leadership Proctored ATI. Fall 2016 (Acc)- 95 % 18/19 students achieved a Level 2 or Level 3 on the Leadership Proctored ATI. Spring 2016 (UD)- 84% 38/45 student achieved a Level 2 or Level 3 on the Leadership Proctored ATI. Total number of students achieving a Level 2 or Level 3 on the Leadership Proctored ATI: 95/136 = 69.85% (11/16/2017)</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this benchmark in the future, faculty will encourage students to read the ATI Leadership book and review the content associated with the exams. Faculty will also encourage students to take both versions of the practice ATI before taking the proctored assessment. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - NU480 Pharmacology proctored ATI exam Target: 60% of students will achieve at least a Level 2 or 3 on Pharmacology proctored ATI exam Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Pharmacology and the application of medications continue to be a priority during NU480. Case studies utilized include a heavy emphasis on medications and their use during each particular case study. Students voiced appreciation at the end of the semester for the inclusion of medications during the case study analysis. Students performed well on the Pharmacology Made Easy quizzes and the SP17 group performed well on the Pharmacology content mastery exam. FA16 - 45% achieved a Level 2 or 3; SP17 63.7% achieved a level 2 or 3 on pharmacology content mastery exam. (11/16/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The common medication assignment has been removed from the first clinical journal assignment as students felt it was repetitive. Students will continue to receive exam points for Pharmacology made easy quizzes and case studies will continue to include pharmacology as a main component of each case study. Course faculty will provide weekly lists of medications for students to know for each case study starting in the FA17 semester. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - NU485C Pharmacology proctored ATI exam</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Students completed the Pharmacology Made Easy modules and quizzes in ATI and completed</p>	<p>Action: Continue to use the Pharmacology quizzes and</p>

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 10.0 Synthesis of Knowledge

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 60% of students will achieve at least a Level 2 or 3 on Pharmacology proctored ATI exam Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>15 drug cards. Fall 2016 - 95%, Summer, 2016 - 66%, Fall, 2016 - LPN - 63% of students received a level 2 or 3 on the Pharm ATI. (11/16/2017)</p>	<p>encourage students to utilize the ATI modules to prepare for the quizzes and proctored ATI. Students will not complete drug cards. Students are required to identify and discuss medications as part of the clinical journal assignments. (11/16/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 1.0

Practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually upon program completion Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (05/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates'</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>to practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them to practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>"very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates: Both respondents perceived that their DNP education prepared them very well to practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well graduates practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduate practices at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation &</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Study Committee/CIRE		
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how often they practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome most of the time. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education most of the time. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often graduates practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates practice at the highest level of nursing through integration and application of nursing science in clinical practice, management, and education some</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE		
SL: Didactic - NU710 Advanced Theory Final Theory Application assignment Target: 100% of students will achieve 73% or higher on Final Theory Application assignment Timeframe: Each time course is offered Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course is on a 2-year cycle and was not offered during the 2016-2017 academic year. (02/02/2018)	Action: Evaluate results at next course offering. (02/02/2018)

AU Outcome: DNP 2.0

Demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Summative Evaluation - Demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually upon program completion Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)	Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (05/05/2017)
SL: Didactic - NU720 Quality	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)	Action: Evaluate results at next

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Outcomes for Organizations and Systems CQI Analysis Paper Target: 100% of students will achieve 73% or higher on CQI Analysis Paper Timeframe: Each time course is offered Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: NA Course is on a 2-year cycle and was not offered during the 2016-2017 academic year. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>course offering. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them to demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them well or very well to demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being "well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey. Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them very well to demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change (very poorly, poorly, well,</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how often they demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome rarely. These results are not consistent with the previous alumni survey. Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change most of the time. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Low response rate (n = 1 of 2 graduates), so results not likely representative of all DNP graduates. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time).</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change some or most of the time.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>		

AU Outcome: DNP 3.0

Apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines</p> <p>Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually upon program completion</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (05/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them to apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being "very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey.</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them to apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them well (n =1) and very well (n =1) to apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduates perceptions of how often they apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they apply analytical methods and research to develop</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome some of the time. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines some of the time (n = 1) and most of the time (n =1). (10/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome most of the time. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
best practices and practice guidelines some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE	Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf	
AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)	
SL: Didactic - NU740 Analytical Methods for Evidence-Based Practice Critique of DNP Sample Project final exam Target: 100% of students will achieve 80% or higher on the Critique of DNP Sample Project final exam Timeframe: Each time course is offered Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course is on a 2-year cycle and was not offered during the 2016-2017 academic year. (02/02/2018)	Action: Evaluate results at next course offering. (02/02/2018)

AU Outcome: DNP 4.0

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 4.0

Use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually upon program completion Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (05/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them to use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them to use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being "very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey. Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them well (n =1) and very well (n =1) to use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 4.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
individuals, families and populations well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE		
AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)	
AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduates perceptions of how often they use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations (not at all, rarely,	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome some of the time. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical	Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 4.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations some of the time (n = 1) and most of the time (n =1). (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates apply analytical methods and research to develop best practices and practice guidelines (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates use information systems and technology-based resources to support clinical and administrative decision making and to improve the health care of individuals, families and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Didactic - NU541 Health Care Informatics WWW Evaluation assignment</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Not evaluated as no students took NU541 during the 2015-2016 academic year.</p>	<p>Action: Evaluate this target/measure the next time DNP students take the NU541 course.</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 4.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 100% of students will achieve 85% or higher on the WWW Evaluation assignment</p> <p>Timeframe: Each time course is offered</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	(02/02/2018)	(02/02/2018)

AU Outcome: DNP 5.0

Advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation.</p> <p>Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually upon program completion</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them to advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being "very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey.</p> <p>Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them well (n =1) and very well (n =1) to advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation. (10/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 5.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>prepared them to advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduates perceptions of how often they advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation &</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome some of the time. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation some of the time . (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 5.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Study Committee/CIRE</p> <p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates advocate for healthcare change through policy development and evaluation some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Didactic - NU810 Health Care Economics, Finance, and Policy Health Care Policy White Paper assignment Target: 100% of students will achieve 80% or higher on the Health Care Policy White Paper assignment Timeframe: Each time course is offered Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 9 of 9 students (100%) achieved 80% or higher on this assignment during the Spring 2017 offering. This is the first time an assignment-specific target was established this outcome, so a trend is not applicable. It should be noted that due to some changes in course structure, the assignment was changed to allow more student choice in the format of the assignment (designated as Student Choice Assignment). (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target next year, course faculty will continue to offer up-to-date resources on health care finance and economics topics. Faculty will also provide references for common types of Student Choice Assignment (SCA) formats so there is a shared understanding of expectations for high quality SCAs of different types. Finally, modify target to read "100% of students will achieve 80% or higher on the Health Care Policy Student Choice Assignment" (02/02/2018)</p>

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

Assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations</p> <p>Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually upon program completion</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (05/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU750 Leadership and Collaboration Service-Learning Project assignment</p> <p>Target: 100% of students will achieve 80% or higher on the Service-Learning Project assignment</p> <p>Timeframe: Each time course is offered</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>6 of 6 (100%) of students met this target during the Summer 2016 course offering. This is the first time an assignment-specific target was established this outcome, so a trend is not applicable. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target with all groups next year, course faculty will provide opportunities for collaboration throughout the course, in addition to the assigned service learning project. Providing examples of where the service learning project might be implemented may assist students with realistic settings for the summer. In addition, providing more opportunities for student dialogue among peers regarding the service learning project would be beneficial. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates'</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>to assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them to assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>"very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey. Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them very well to assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduates perceptions of how often</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>they assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome most of the time. These results are an improvement compared to previous alumni survey. Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations rarely (n = 1) and most of the time (n = 1). (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 7.0

Incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health. Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually upon program completion Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (05/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them to incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them to incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being "very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey.</p> <p>Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them well (n = 1) and very well (n = 1) to incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>clinical prevention and population health (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduates perceptions of how often they incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome most of the time. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health rarely (n = 1) and some of the time (n = 1). (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>time).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates incorporate a firm conceptual foundation for clinical prevention and population health some or most of the time.</p> <p>Timeframe: When course offered</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>		
<p>SL: Didactic - NU730 Clinical Prevention and Population Health Health Disparities Presentation assignment</p> <p>Target: 100% of students will achieve 80% or higher on Health Disparities Presentation assignment</p> <p>Timeframe: Each time course is offered</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>Course is on a 2-year cycle and was not offered during the 2016-2017 academic year. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Evaluate results at next course offering. (02/02/2018)</p>

AU Outcome: DNP 8.0

Synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role.</p> <p>Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually upon program completion</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017.</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 8.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>		<p>(05/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them to synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them to synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being "very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey. Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them very well to synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation &</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 8.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Study Committee/CIRE		
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduates perceptions of how often they synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome most of the time. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role most of the time. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates synthesize advanced practice nursing knowledge and competencies into the practice role some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 1.0

Synthesize knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in order to develop a foundation to guide practice.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to synthesize knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in order to develop a foundation to guide practice (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to synthesize knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in order to develop a foundation to guide practice.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (50%) or very well (50%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How often MSN graduates synthesizes knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in order to develop a foundation to guide practice (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that they synthesize knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in order to</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported perform this outcome some of the time (20%) or most of the time (80%). These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
develop a foundation to guide practice some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee		
AD: Survey - MSN Graduate Employer Survey--How well employers perceive that MSN graduates synthesize knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in order to develop a foundation to guide practice (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of employers will report that MSN graduates provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service, and scholarship well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee, CIRE	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf	
AD: Survey - MSN Graduate Employer Survey--How often MSN graduate synthesizes knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in order to develop a foundation to guide practice (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates synthesize knowledge from nursing science and related disciplines in	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>order to develop a foundation to guide practice some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Didactic - NU696 Graduate Seminar II Paper 3 Target: 100% of students achieve 73% or higher on Paper 3 (Draft of MSN Graduate Project Proposal). Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Results were as follows: Summer 2016: 100% (14 of 14) achieved at least 73%, Fall 2016: 100% (12 of 12) achieved at least 73%, Spring 2017: 95% (21 of 22) achieved at least 73% 2016-2017 total: 98% (47 of 48) These results show some improvement from the rate of 95% that was achieved during the 2015-2016 academic year. It is believed that front loading more course content to allow students longer to write and revise this Paper III Draft of the MSN Graduate Project Proposal assignment has been effective in allowing more students to be successful. Note that one part of the action plan was to revise the target to a more realistic 90%, however it was determined by program leadership that the target should stay at 100% for at least one more year to establish trends with assignment-specific targets. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target with all groups next year, the target will be revised to reflect "100% of all students who complete the Paper III Draft of MSN Grad Project Proposal assignment will achieve at least 73%." This revision was suggested by the Graduate Curriculum Committee to reflect the potential negative impact on results from students who leave the course too late in the semester to be considered formally "withdrawn," but do not complete the assignment. In addition, the schedule will be front-loaded to the degree possible in all three semesters to allow for at least one revision for students who do not achieve 73% on Paper III on first submission. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - Clinical Evaluations Target: 90% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on all criteria on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% of students in NU600C, NU605C, NU610C, 612C, 615C, 620C, 625C, 635C, 675C, 680C, and 685C achieved an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Critical Thinking" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. In NU600C, 98% of students (40 of 41) achieved this target, and in NU620C, 92% (11of 12) achieved the target. These data are consistent with findings</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet target with all groups in the next academic year, faculty will continue to evaluate student self-ratings and preceptor ratings of students on this criterion. Will</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: MSN Clinical Coordinator / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>from the 2015-2016 academic year when 100% of students in clinical courses also achieved (1) or better for the “Critical Thinking” criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. As indicated in the action plan, faculty members have documented contact with students and preceptors throughout the clinical courses to evaluate progress toward established outcomes. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>maintain contact with preceptors throughout individual precepted clinical experiences to evaluate progress toward outcomes. Also note that the single student in NU600C who failed to achieve the target dropped the course, but did not do so by the established deadline so received a failing grade and related failure to achieve target for clinical evaluation criteria. For this reason, it is also recommended that the target be re-worded to state, “90% of students who complete the clinical experience achieve an acceptable level (1) or better for the “Critical Thinking” criterion on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. (02/02/2018)</p>

AU Outcome: MSN 2.0

Provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service and scholarship.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service and scholarship (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (60%) or very well (40%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype).</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 75% of MSN graduates will report being well or very well prepared by their MSN education to provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service and scholarship.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		<p>(10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How often MSN graduates provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service, and scholarship (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time).</p> <p>Target: 75% of MSN graduates will report that they provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service, and scholarship some or most of the time.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 90% of respondents (n = 9) reported perform this outcome some of the time (50%) or most of the time (40%). One reported "not at all." These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome.</p> <p>(10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Employer Survey-- How well employers perceive that MSN graduates provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service and scholarship (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of employers will report that MSN graduates provide organizational and systems</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
leadership in practice, service and scholarship well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee		
AD: Survey - MSN Employer Survey-- How often employers perceive that MSN graduates provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service, and scholarship (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of employers will report that MSN graduates provide organizational and systems leadership in practice, service, and scholarship some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)	
SL: Didactic - NU505 Nursing Leadership for Advanced Practice Leadership Development paper Target: 100% of students will achieve 73% or better on Leadership Development paper Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Results were as follows: Fall 2016 - 88.24% (15 of 17) achieved at least 73% Spring 2017 - 97.37% (37 of 38) achieved at least 73% This reflects a total for the year of: 52/55 (95%), which is a significant improvement from the previous academic year (42/55; 76%). Note that one part of the action plan was to revise the target to a more realistic 90%, however it was determined by program leadership that the target should stay at 100% for at least one more year to establish trends with assignment-specific targets. (02/02/2018)	Action: In order to better meet this target with all groups next year, course faculty will add a rubric describing more specifically what is expected on the final paper. The Panopto recording will also be recreated with updated information. In addition, the target wording will be revised to read "100% of students who complete the assignment will achieve 73% or better on the Leadership

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		Development paper." This revision was suggested by the Graduate Curriculum Committee to reflect the potential negative impact on results from students who leave the course too late in the semester to be considered formally "withdrawn," but do not complete the assignment. (02/02/2018)

AU Outcome: MSN 3.0

Apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Graduate Project Evaluation Form - Item #3 Apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive outcomes Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 63 of 63 (100%) of students achieved an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation. This is consistent with previous outcomes and as expected for an end-of-program project that is guided by a faculty preceptor and approved prior to the final presentation. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target for all students, graduate project faculty advisers will maintain close working relationships with students as they plan, implement, and evaluate their evidence-based practice/quality improvement projects. This should assure a high quality presentation and summary paper at the end of the process. This is still perceived to be a valuable measure of student attainment of this outcome; maintain measure and target. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>that their MSN education prepared them to apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (30%) or very well (70%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How often MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report applying quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported perform this outcome some of the time (30%) or most of the time (70%). These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 75% of respondents will report MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes well or very well.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes some or most of the time.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - Clinical Evaluations</p> <p>Target: 90% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on all criteria on a scale of 0-2</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: MSN Clinical Coordinator / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>100% of students in NU600C, NU605C, NU610C, 612C, 615C, 620C, 625C, 635C, 675C, 680C, and 685C achieved an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. In NU600C, 98% of students (40 of 41) achieved this target. These data are consistent with findings from the 2015-2016 academic year when 100% of students in clinical courses also achieved (1) or better for the "Critical Thinking" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. As indicated in the action plan, faculty members have documented contact with students and preceptors throughout the clinical courses to evaluate progress toward established outcomes. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Will maintain contact with preceptors throughout individual precepted clinical experiences to evaluate progress toward outcomes. Also note that the single student in NU600C who failed to achieve the target dropped the course, but did not do so by the established deadline so</p>

College Goal 1 - Prepare outstanding healthcare practitioners who are committed to lifelong learning.

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		received a failing grade and related failure to achieve target for clinical evaluation criteria. For this reason, it is also recommended that the target be re-worded to state, "90% of students who complete the clinical experience achieve an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criterion on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. (02/02/2018)

AU Outcome: MSN 4.0

Use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (20%) or very well (80%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey--</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 4.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>How often MSN graduates use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report using scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 90% of respondents (n = 9) reported perform this outcome some of the time (10%) or most of the time (80%). One respondent reported rarely performing outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well employers perceive that MSN graduates use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often employers perceive that MSN graduates use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 4.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>report that MSN graduates use scholarly inquiry and evidence to advance the practice of nursing some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Didactic - NU540 Preliminary Literature Review assignment Target: 100% of students achieve 73% or better on Preliminary Literature Review assignment Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results were as follows: Fall 2016 - 100% (35 of 35) achieved at least 73%, Spring 2017 - 100% (19 of 19) achieved at least 73% on this assignment. This is an improvement from the previous academic year (50 of 54; 94%). Note that one part of the previous action plan was to revise the target to a more realistic 90%, however it was determined by program leadership that the target should stay at 100% for at least one more year to establish trends with assignment-specific targets. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target with all groups, will continue current strategies to provide clarity on course assignment and additional resources to students as requested. In addition, suggest re-wording of target to read, "100% of students who complete assignment will achieve 73% or better on Preliminary Literature Review assignment." This revision was suggested by the Graduate Curriculum Committee to reflect the potential negative impact on results from students who leave the course too late in the semester to be considered formally "withdrawn," but do not complete the assignment. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU596 Major Written Assignment Target: 100% of students achieve 73% or better on the major written assignment. Timeframe: Annually</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Fall semester 2016: 91% (39 of 43) achieved at least 73% on Academic Paper Assignment; 9 students scored <73% on the paper and were eligible to revise. All 9 revised; 4 scored <73% on the revised paper; 3 passed the class despite failing grades on the paper; 1 failed the class.</p>	<p>Action: Score of at least 73% will be required to pass the class. The course paper will be simplified by removing content about classifying sources as research or non-research evidence. Recognizing</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 4.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Spring semester 2017: 88% (36 of 41) achieved at least 73% on Academic Paper Assignment; 9 students scored <73% on the paper and were eligible to revise: 1 chose not to revise, 3 scored <73% on the revised paper; 2 passed the class despite failing grades on the paper; 1 failed the class.</p> <p>These results represent slightly poorer performance compared the 2015-2016 academic year when 93% (Fall '15) and 97% (spring '16) of students score at least 73% on the academic paper. The 2015-2016 action plan to require students who scored <73% on the paper to revise it was not implemented. However, only one student (spring '17) chose not to revise the paper and still passed the class; 7 students who scored < 73% on the revised paper were still able pass the class. Students struggle with the evidence-based practice concepts, which involve using the Johns Hopkins Nursing EBP model to differentiate between research and non-research evidence. Students also struggle with the concept of primary-source information and basic rules of APA editorial style (e.g., grammar, punctuation, citations, reference list entries).</p> <p>Measure has been assessed last two reporting years (2015-2016, 2016-2017). Target not met either year. (05/23/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: NU596 Academic Paper Assignment Spring 2017.pdf NU596 Academic Paper Assignment Fall 2016.docx</p>	<p>primary-source information and correct application of APA editorial style will be emphasized. (05/23/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MSN 5.0

Use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (50%) or very well (50%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 5.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>healthcare systems (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How often MSN graduates use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report using informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported perform this outcome some of the time (50%) or most of the time (50%). These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well employers perceive that MSN graduates use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 5.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems well or very well.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often employers perceive that MSN graduates use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates use informatics and healthcare technologies to enhance patient care and to improve healthcare systems some or most of the time.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Didactic - NU541 Health Care Informatics WWW Evaluation Assignment</p> <p>Target: 100% of students will achieve 73% or higher on Health Care Informatics WWW Evaluation Assignment</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>Results were as follows:</p> <p>Summer 2016: 98% achieved at least 73%, (Not offered Summer 2015)</p> <p>Fall 2016: 92%% achieved at least 73%, (66% achieved at least 73% in Fall 2015)</p> <p>Spring 2017: 100% achieved at least 73% (95% achieved at least 73% in Spring 2016)</p> <p>These data show considerable improvement over the results from the 2015-2016 academic year (see results next to 2016-2017 data above). As begun in Spring 2016, information on the</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target with all groups next year, the target will be revised to reflect "100% of all students who complete the Health Care Informatics WWW Evaluation assignment will achieve at least 73%." This revision was</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 5.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>directions/rubric document for the WWW assignment was revised so that the assignment more closely followed the MSN Program outcome #5. The assignment was also revised to focus more on evaluating health care websites, and determining professional and patient use. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>suggested by the Graduate Curriculum Committee to reflect the potential negative impact on results from students who leave the course too late in the semester to be considered formally "withdrawn," but do not complete the assignment. (02/02/2018)</p>

AU Outcome: MSN 6.0

Employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 80% of respondents (n = 8) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (50%) or very well (30%) to perform this outcome. One respondent reported "poorly" and another reported "very poorly." These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How often MSN graduates employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 50% of respondents (n = 5) reported perform this outcome some of the time (40%) or most of the time (10%). Three reported "rarely," and 2</p>	<p>Action: Target not achieved, which could be a function of the low response rate. Consider relevance of the outcome to actual practice.</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 6.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>outcomes of care (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report employing advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>reported "not at all." These results are not consistent with those of previous reporting year. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Respondents reported being well prepared to perform it, but may have no opportunities to do so. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well employers perceive that MSN graduates employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will that MSN graduates employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often employers perceive that MSN graduates employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care (not at all, rarely,</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 6.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates employ advocacy strategies to influence health policy and to improve outcomes of care some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Didactic - NU520 Policy, Organization, and Financing of Health Care Paper III: Health Care Policy Brief Target: 100% of students achieve 73% or higher on Paper III: Health Care Policy Brief Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Results were as follows: Fall 2016: 100% (14 of 14) achieved at least 73%, Spring 2017: 94% (32 of 34) achieved at least 73%. Total for 2016-2017: 96% (46 of 48) A considerable improvement over the 2015-2016 data (91% overall) was noted. This may be in part due to instructor provision of more real world examples of policy briefs to facilitate understanding of the assignment. In addition, one part of the action plan was to revise the target to a more realistic 95%, however it was determined by program leadership that the target should stay at 100% for at least one more year to establish trends with assignment-specific targets. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target with all groups next year, course faculty will give targeted feedback to students on Papers I and II that build to Paper III. Also note that in Spring 2017, two students who did not meet target were again students who had dropped from the course (but too late to be removed from the course). To address this issue, this target will be modified to read "100% of students who complete the assignment will achieve at least a 73%..." per the recommendation of the Graduate Nursing Curriculum Committee. (02/02/2018)</p>

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

Collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
-----------------	----------------	----------------

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Graduate Project Evaluation Form - Item #7 Collaborate within interprofessional teams.</p> <p>Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>63 of 63 (100%) of students achieved an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation. This is consistent with previous outcomes and as expected for an end-of-program project that is guided by a faculty preceptor and approved prior to the final presentation. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target for all students, graduate project faculty advisers will maintain close working relationships with students as they plan, implement, and evaluate their evidence-based practice/quality improvement projects. This should assure a high quality presentation and summary paper at the end of the process. This is still perceived to be a valuable measure of student attainment of this outcome; maintain measure and target. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (70%) or very well (30%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey--</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>How often MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report collaborating within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations some or most of the time.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported perform this outcome some of the time (50%) or most of the time (50%). These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome.</p> <p>(10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well employers perceive that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations well or very well.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often employers perceive that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - Clinical Evaluations Target: 90% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on all criteria on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: MSN Clinical Coordinator / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% of students in NU600C, NU605C, NU610C, 612C, 615C, 620C, 625C, 635C, 675C, 680C, and 685C achieved an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. In NU600C, 98% of students (40 of 41) achieved this target. These data are consistent with findings from the 2015-2016 academic year when 100% of students in clinical courses also achieved (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. As indicated in the action plan, faculty members have documented contact with students and preceptors throughout the clinical courses to evaluate progress toward established outcomes. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Will maintain contact with preceptors throughout individual precepted clinical experiences to evaluate progress toward outcomes. Also note that the single student in NU600C who failed to achieve the target dropped the course, but did not do so by the established deadline so received a failing grade and related failure to achieve target for clinical evaluation criteria. For this reason, it is also recommended that the target be re-worded to state, "90% of students who complete the</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		clinical experience achieve an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criterion on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. (02/02/2018)

AU Outcome: MSN 8.0

Integrate patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to integrate patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to integrate patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (50%) or very well (50%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How often MSN graduates integrate patient-centered and culturally</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 80% of respondents (n = 8) reported perform this</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 8.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report integrating patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>outcome some of the time (10%) or most of the time (70%). One reported that the outcome was not applicable; another reported rarely performing the outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well employers perceive that MSN graduates integrate patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates integrate patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 8.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often employers perceive that MSN graduates integrate patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates integrate patient-centered and culturally responsive strategies into the delivery of clinical prevention, health promotion, and population-focused services some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - Clinical Evaluations Target: 90% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on all criteria on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: MSN Clinical Coordinator / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% of students in NU600C, NU605C, NU610C, 612C, 615C, 620C, 625C, 635C, 675C, 680C, and 685C achieved an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Clinical Interventions" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. In NU600C, 98% of students (40 of 41) achieved this target. These data are consistent with findings from the 2015-2016 academic year when 100% of students in clinical courses also achieved (1) or better for the "Clinical Interventions" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. As indicated in the action plan, faculty members have documented contact with students and preceptors throughout the clinical courses to evaluate progress toward established outcomes. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Will maintain contact with preceptors throughout individual precepted clinical experiences to evaluate progress toward outcomes. Also note that the single student in NU600C who failed to achieve the target dropped the course, but did not do so by the established deadline so received a failing grade and related failure to achieve target for clinical evaluation criteria. For this reason, it is also recommended that the target be re-worded to state, "90% of students who complete the</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 8.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		clinical experience achieve an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Clinical Interventions" criterion on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. (02/02/2018)
<p>SL: Didactic - NU530 Population Health Issues Paper Target: 100% of students will achieve 73% or better on Population Health Issues Paper Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Results were as follows: Summer 2016 95% or (18/19) achieved at least 73% (N/A Summer 2015) Fall 2016 100% or (17/17) achieved at least 73% (90% [18 of 20] Fall 2015) Spring 2017 95% or 19/20 achieved at least 73% (93% [27 of 29] Spring 2016) Overall 2016-2017 Academic Year: 96% (54 of 56) (Overall 2015-2016 Academic Year 92% [45 of 49])</p> <p>A considerable improvement over the 2015-2016 data (92% overall) was noted. This may be in part due to fact that course faculty reviewed the assignment criteria with the students and revised the instructions to assist the students in understanding the expectations. The instructor also provided helpful announcements prior to this assignment to assist students in addressing each section of the paper. The course was completely revised and is now a certified Quality Matters course. Finally, one part of the action plan was to revise the target to a more realistic 95%, however it was determined by program leadership that the target should stay at 100% for at least one more year to establish trends with assignment-specific targets. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target with all groups next year all assignment instructions and point values will be evaluated in order to make clarifications or revisions based on student feedback. In addition, the target will be revised to reflect "100% of all students who complete the NU530 Population Health Issues Paper assignment will achieve at least 73%." This revision was suggested by the Graduate Curriculum Committee to reflect the potential negative impact on results from students who leave the course too late in the semester to be considered formally "withdrawn," but do not complete the assignment. (02/02/2018)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Admin - Teaching & Learning Committee

AU Outcome: TLC 1.0

Allen College courses will reflect Quality Matters standards.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 07/01/2015

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Survey - Mean rating of all 8 items on course evaluation tool completed by students (1.0 = strongly disagree, 2.0 = disagree, 3.0 = agree, 4.0 = strongly agree). The mean rating of each item will be averaged for an overall mean rating for each course.</p> <p>Target: 100% of courses will have a mean rating for all 8 items of at least a 3.0 (agree) on a 4.0 (strongly agree) scale.</p> <p>Timeframe: Health Sciences courses based on evaluation cycle. Nursing courses based on curriculum course review schedule.</p> <p>Responsible Parties: TLC Chair and Committee Members</p> <p>Related Documents: Allen College Course Evaluation Criteria.pdf</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (4/4) of the Undergraduate nursing courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018) Related Documents: Nursing Report 16-17 Final.xlsx Nsg Report</p>	<p>Action: Target was met. Continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)</p>
	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (11/11) of the Graduate Nursing Courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018) Related Documents: Grad Nsg Report 16-17 Final.xlsx Grad Nsg Report</p>	<p>Action: Target was met. Continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. Announcement made to Faculty regarding student response rate for graduate courses. (02/08/2018)</p>
	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 95% (35/37) Undergraduate Health science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018) Related Documents: HS Report 16-17 Final.xlsx HS Report</p>	<p>Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan among Health Science Faculty. Will continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)</p>
	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 82% (23/28) of the Graduate Health Science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018) Related Documents: Grad HS Report 16-17 Final.xlsx</p>	<p>Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan among Health Science Faculty. Will continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Admin - Teaching & Learning Committee

AU Outcome: TLC 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	Grad HS Report	results. (02/08/2018)

AU Outcome: TLC 2.0

Allen College courses will reflect Chickering and Gamson's 7 principles of good teaching/education practice.

Outcome Status: Inactive

Start Date: 05/08/2017

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Survey - Mean rating of 7 items on instructor evaluation tool (1.0 = strongly disagree, 2.0 = disagree, 3.0 = agree, 4.0 = strongly agree). The mean rating of each item will be averaged for an overall mean rating for each course.</p> <p>Target: 100% of courses will have an overall mean rating at least 3.0.</p> <p>Timeframe: Health Sciences courses based on evaluation cycle. Nursing courses based on curriculum course review schedule.</p> <p>Responsible Parties: TLC Chair and Committee Members</p> <p>Related Documents: Allen College Instructor Evaluation Criteria.pdf</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (4/4) of the Undergraduate Nursing courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the seven-item instructor evaluation. (02/08/2018)</p>	<p>Action: First time measure assessed. Target was met. Assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)</p>
	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% (11/11) of the graduate nursing courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the seven-item instructor evaluation. (02/08/2018)</p>	<p>Action: First time measure was assessed. Target was met. Assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. Faculty notified of students response rate. (02/08/2018)</p>
	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 95% (35/37) undergraduate health science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the eight-item course evaluation. (02/08/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan among Health Science Faculty. Will continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)</p>
	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 71% of Graduate Health science courses achieved a 3.0 or above on the seven-item instructor evaluation. (02/08/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Target was not met. Dean of Health Sciences notified of measure to discuss action plan among Health Science Faculty. Will</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Admin - Teaching & Learning Committee

AU Outcome: TLC 2.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		continue to assess annually and observe for patterns and trends in results. (02/08/2018)

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.1

Students will practice proper radiation protection

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA: 135 Competency Testing/CCE Part II, numbers 5, 7, 9, 15, 17 Target: Average score of ≥ 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level 1-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Lab Instructor/ Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016 = 3.89 (n=13) Previous data 2015 = 3.95 (n=16) 2014 = 3.97 (n=17) (06/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to demonstrate clinical competence and practice proper radiation protection. Although there was a slight decline in the average score for 2016, this was a smaller cohort. A few students received a score of 2 on collimation and many received a score of 3. Benchmark Met. Continue to monitor. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA: 275 Final Clinical Competency Testing/ CCE Part II, numbers 5,7,9,15,17 Target: Average score of ≥ 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/Program Faculty/HS</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 = 3.96 (n=15) Previous data: 2016=3.96 (n=17) 2015=3.96 (n=15) 2014=3.99 (n=17) 2013=3.98 (n=16) 2012=3.97 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No significant change in the last 5 years. The students demonstrated clinical proficiency and competency in providing radiation protection. The program's curriculum integrates radiation protection concepts each semester. Each student's</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Curriculum Committee		demonstrates that they are prepared for graduation. Continue to keep this assessment due to variation in the type of patient, and the fact that it is evaluated by the clinical instructor. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.2

Students will apply correct positioning skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 145 Certification Testing/ Part I, numbers 3,12,14,15</p> <p>Target: Average score of ≥ 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2017 = 4 (n=12)</p> <p>Benchmark/Target met.</p> <p>2016 = 3.96 (n=16)</p> <p>2015=3.79 (n=17)</p> <p>2014=3.86 (n=15)</p> <p>2013=3.9 (n=17)</p> <p>2012=3.87 (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to exceed benchmark. The students were able to apply correct positioning skills. The students are demonstrating knowledge of positioning in relation to their level of placement in the ASR program. Faculty would like to continue with this assessment as certification testing is completed at various clinical sites and with different clinical instructors. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 265 Certification Testing/Part I, numbers 3,12,14,15</p> <p>Target: Average score of ≥ 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016=3.97(n=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>2015=3.99 (n=17)</p> <p>2014= 3.96 (n=15)</p> <p>2013= 3.96 (n = 17)</p>	<p>Action: Average scores exceed benchmark. Students demonstrated clinical competence by applying correct positioning skills. This is the final semester that certifications are completed in the ASR Program. Beginning in FA17,</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee	2012= 3.99 (n=17) 2011= 3.89 (n=16) (06/21/2017)	the program faculty will distribute a list of exams the Clinical Instructors can select for certifications. For example: C-spine with obliques will be included, but hand and foot will not. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

Students will demonstrate effective communication skills in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/ Numbers 3, 6, 10,11</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 average score was 3.56 (N=13) FA 2015=3.81(n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year student’s scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 3, 6,10,11</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II -Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Students achieved an average score of 3.95 (n=15) Benchmark met.</p> <p>SP 2016 3.97 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2015 3.95 (n=15)</p> <p>SP 2014 3.97 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2013 3.99 (n=16)</p> <p>SP 2012 3.94 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in interpersonal relationships and an increase in multicultural diversity. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to use effective communication skills in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Competency Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016=3.92</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>2015= 3.99 (n=16)</p> <p>2014=3.98 (n=17)</p> <p>2013=3.94 (n=16)</p> <p>2012=3.96 (n=17)</p> <p>2011=3.93 (n=17)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students exceeded the benchmark. The students are demonstrating clinical communication skills reflective of their level in the program. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Final Clinical Competency</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to exceed the benchmark. Students</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8 Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee	2017=4(n=15) Benchmark met. 2016=4 (n=17) 2015=3.99 (n=15) 2014=3.99 (n=17) 2013=4 (n=16) 2012=4 (n=16) 2011=3.95 (n=16) (06/21/2017)	demonstrated excellent communication skills in the clinical setting. Many of this year's final CCE's were performed on patients that required multiple exams and extensive patient communication. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

Students will practice written communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=98.01% (n=16) 2014=98.2% (n=17) 2013= 99.1% (n=16) 2012= 98.98% (n=17) 2011= 98.51% (n=17) (06/21/2017)	Action: Areas of deduction on the reference page include; four students did not utilize proper spacing of the references, two students did not use the hanging indent, one student did not use the proper font size and one student neglected to center the word reference on the top of the reference page. Under the format portion of the evaluation form; four students did not have proper margins in their paper and one student did not meet the requirements of a two page paper.

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>The research paper is discussed in detail on the first day of class with the instructor. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=15) Previous data: 2015-97.5% (n=17) 2014-98.06% (n=15) 2013= 98.7% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the third year students wrote and presented two papers for this course. Fourteen of the thirty papers written had deductions on the reference page. Eight papers had errors with spacing, nine papers did not have the hanging indent, two students numbered their references, and five students did not correctly title the reference page. Four students had deductions in the format section for grammar and spelling. The instructor encouraged students to review their first paper presentation to give them the opportunity to improve on the second paper. Six of the fifteen students reviewed their first paper presentation and received feedback from the instructor. Five</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		of these six students improved on their second paper. The requirements for these papers are discussed in detail the first day of class. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

Students will demonstrate oral communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 95% (N=15) Previous data: 2015= 98.82% (n=17) 2014= 99.13%(n=15) 2013= 99.52% (n=17) 2012= 98.58% (n=17) 2011= 94.75% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were four papers that received deductions in the oral presentation portion of the evaluation. Two papers did not meet the length of presentation requirement of eight minutes. Four papers did not include all of the information needed during the presentation of the paper. For example, the discussion of exposure factors used during the procedure and one paper was not presented due to student absence.</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		This could be the reason for the lower score in the oral presentation. Students continue to exhibit effective oral communication skills. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 99% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=94.53% (n=16) 2014=100% (n=17) 2013= 99.75% (n=16) 2012= 99.6% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were just two papers with deductions in the oral presentation portion. One student read their paper very quickly and the other was deducted in the area of proper voice level. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

Students will appropriately critique radiographic images

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 255 Radiographic image analysis worksheets Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Summer Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 255 Course Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016: 90.19% (n=16) Previous data 2015: 89.88% (n=17) 2014: 89.13% (n= 15) spring level 1 2013: 93.76% (n= 17). spring level 1 2012: 88.8% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The course weight was changed from 10 to 25% this year to encourage student engagement. This year, a much improved 4th edition textbook was used and the workbook was optional. The 2014 cohort was the first cohort to complete this activity during RA255 summer level 2; previous years were part of the RA145 spring level 1 course. In 2013 and previous</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>years, the online worksheets were unlimited attempts and not timed. 2014 the highest score on the worksheet was recorded. 2015 and 2016 the assignment was allotted two attempts, untimed, and the scores were averaged. A few students within this cohort did not submit scores of 75% or greater on a few of the assignments, but overall this cohort was engaged in radiograph critique. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 265 Radiographic image analysis worksheets</p> <p>Target: Average score of >= 80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II- Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>FA 2016 = 91.66% (n=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>FA 2015= 90.71% (n=17)</p> <p>FA 2014= 93.13% (n=15)</p> <p>FA 2013= 94.63% (n=17)</p> <p>FA 2012 = 96.7% (n=17)</p> <p>FA 2011 = 95.35%. (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to demonstrate their ability to critique radiographic images. No significant change when compared to last year. The overall average is lower than 2014 and all previous years, but in previous years the worksheets were unlimited attempts, not timed and the highest score was recorded. The assignment parameters were changed in 2015 and subsequent years to allow only two untimed attempts and the scores were averaged. In FA 15 the course weight for the worksheets was increased from 15% to 20%. No changes recommended. (06/21/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.2

Students will demonstrate ability to practice critical thinking

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:145 Scientific Exhibit Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 = 92.14% N= 7 posters (12 students) Previous data 2016 = 92.6% N= 10 posters (16 students) 2015 = 96.5%, N= 11 posters (17 students) 2014= 94%, N = 11 posters (15 students) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Scores for 2017 continue to demonstrate the student’s ability to practice critical thinking skills when developing their scientific exhibits. Average scores continue to exceed the benchmark of 80%. No changes recommended. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - RA: 203B Corectec exams Target: > 80% of the students will achieve a score of 70 or greater on one of the four exams. Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 203B Course Instructor/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 (n=15), 93% of the students received a passing score after the 4th exam. Previous data 2016 (n=17) 100% 2015 (n=15) 93% 2014 (n=17) 76% 2013 (n=16) 100% 2012 (n=16) 100% (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: One student did not achieve a 70 on any of the 4 Corectec exams. This year’s Corectec exams reflected the new ARRT content specs. Students continue to demonstrate their ability to practice critical thinking. The course instructor recommends that the benchmark be changed to state “will achieve a Corectec exam score of 70 or greater.” (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

Students will be able to critically think in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:145 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016-2017: average score was 3.63 (N=12)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>Spring 2016 3.63(n=16)</p> <p>Spring 2015 3.67 (N-17)</p> <p>Spring 2014 3.62 (N=15)</p> <p>Spring 2013 3.82 (N=17)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in the area of ability to follow directions. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. During the 2017 spring semester, two of the clinical sites were part of a pilot study utilizing Trajecsyst for the completion of student clinical evaluations. The pilot study was a success. The clinical instructors had no issues with completion of the student evaluations. Trajecsyst :allows the clinical instructors to complete the student evaluations online and then each student is able to view their completed evaluation. During summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to use critical thinking skills in the clinical setting. Continue to monitor. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:265 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 average score was 3.86 (N=15)</p>	<p>Action: This year student’s scores increased in the areas of application of knowledge, self-</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Average score ≥ 3. (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II- Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Previous data Fall 2015=3.81(n=17) Fall 2014-3.75(n=15) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>image for Level in the ASR Program and composure and adaptability. There was a slight decline in ability to follow directions. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to be able to critically think in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - RA:135 Community Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of $\geq 80\%$ Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 135 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 2016: 72% (n=13) Previous data 2015: 92.56% (n=16) 2014: 97.94% (n=17) 2013: 99.28 (n=16) 2012= 99.41% (n=17) 2011=99% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The service learning paper accounts for 10% of the course grade. One student did not submit a paper and received a zero, which decreased the overall average score for this cohort. Many of the students did not follow the assignment instructions and did not earn the highest points possible. Of the students who completed the assignment, the overall average was score was 78.41%. Multiple</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		students performed service learning independently through a variety of organizations. Students have demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism through their service learning activities. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Service - RA: 265 Community Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016: 93.4% (N=15) Previous data 2015: 82.47% (n=17) 2014: 99.13% (n=15) 2013: 97.59% (n=17). 2012: 100% (n=17) 2011: 98% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: One student was late submitting the assignment and received a grade reduction. Some students missed points for grammar and punctuation errors. Overall, the service learning reflection papers demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

Students will practice professionalism

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13 Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level I- Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 average score was 3.6 (N=13) Previous data FA 2015=3.83 (n=16) FA 2014=3.80</p>	<p>Action: This year student's scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee	(n=17) (06/21/2017)	for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to practice professionalism. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Spring 2017 average score was 3.96 (n=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>SP 2016 3.98 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2015 3.91 (n=15)</p> <p>SP 2014 3.95 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2013 3.98 (n=16)</p> <p>SP 2012 3.9 (n=16)</p> <p>2010-2011 3.85 (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight increase in organization of assignments and a decrease in initiative and ethical and professional behaviors. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to integrate leadership skills and practice professionalism in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.1

Students will practice written communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester AC306 Professional Communications Academic Paper Assignment</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH400 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Fall Semester Written Assignment of Course Review</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 20 points for 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students did a good job writing and presenting how to relate, communicate, teach, and learn from various learning styles and preferences.</p> <p>Will continue with this benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AC306 Issues in Healthcare Presentation Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/ Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. The average score was 2/2 (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Preceptor evaluations were very positive regarding effective oral communication skills. Continue to use this tool and keep the benchmark the same. (06/06/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 1.1

Students will show knowledge of ultrasound transducers

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Ultrasound Transducer Exam Target: Students will receive an</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes All students received score above target. Student Scores: 93,99,97,90,82,94,100,92 % Results exceeded Target. With exception of one student in one cohort year, results met</p>	<p>Action: Graded homework assignments and construction of transducer model were required prior to exam.</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>target. Fall 2015 =93.5(n=5) Fall 2014=90%(6),59%(1) Fall 2013- 104.6%(n=7) Fall 2012-92%(n=8) Fall 2011-83.4%(n=5) Fall 2010-100% (n=6) (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Students were also encouraged to participate in tutoring sessions. To determine consistency of trend, will continue to use measure. Also, previously, measurement tool occurred in Fall semester. Moved to Spring semester due to restructure of topics in the physics courses. Benchmark changed from students will receive an average score of 80% to Each student will receive score = 80%. This change is a better identifier of knowledge level of each student. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - Students will construct transducer model Target: Each student will receive a score of >= 80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No This is a new measurement tool. Students required to construct a model of an ultrasound transducer. Rubric was furnished. Grade based upon accuracy of information, creativity and craftsmanship. Spring 2107 Scores: 90,82,78,88,88,96,96,94 One score below benchmark. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Lack of craftsmanship was factor in lower grade. Action will include emphasize that all aspects of assignment are importance. Continue as a course assignment. (06/07/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DMS 1.2

Students will apply correct scanning skills
Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Lab - Final Lab Practical</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Students will achieve an average score of $\geq 80\%$. Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: No For the Fall 2016 semester, 7 out of 8 students scored = 80% (range, 83%-92%); 1 out of 8 students scored < 80% (74%). Trend follows previous three years of scores at or just above benchmark. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Faculty will continue to provide Instruction on anatomy, imaging techniques and instrumentation through demonstration, verbal and written instruction, individual and group image, technique review , protocol notebook, and sonographic portfolio Additional scanning sessions will be offered by multiple instructors. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Lab - Practical Testing in Laboratory on Thyroid: Exam Protocol Target: $\geq 90\%$ of students will pass lab practical on 1st attempt Timeframe: Didactic Level - Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 :All 8 students passed the thyroid practical on the 1st attempt. This is the second year in a row that all have passed. This reflects steady increase in score in the last 4 years. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: DMS faculty available for extra scanning sessions beyond regular class time. Student benefitted from additional sessions with faculty that included review of images, scanning techniques ,and adherence to protocol .To enhance learning of exam protocols, students were required to submit a portfolio of specified ultrasound exams.</p> <p>Due to change in curriculum. DMS 307 will no longer be offered and evaluation will take place in DMS 303 ABD 2 The measurement tool will also be changed to evaluate all aspects of the thyroid practical: protocol, image quality, instrumentation (06/07/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

AU Outcome: DMS 2.1

Students will demonstrate effective communication skills in the imaging lab setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:408 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations 2, 3, 10, 11,17 Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4 Timeframe: Didactic Level-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 semester, the student’s average score is 4.80. Scores remain consistently high. Fall 2015 student’s average was 4.89. Students are demonstrating effective communication skills in the clinical setting. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students are demonstrating effective communication skills. CI added comments on students’ performance to rubric and to additional clinical development evaluation form. Faculty will continue to obtain and assess feedback from clinical instructors. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:409 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations 2, 3, 10, 11, 17 Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4 Timeframe: Didactic Level - Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 avg score 4.78 n=4). These results reflect feedback from clinical instructors. Scores remain high and consistent with previous years. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students are demonstrating effective communication skills. CI added comments on students’ performance to rubric and to additional clinical development evaluation form. Faculty will continue to obtain and assess feedback from clinical instructors. To determine consistency of trend, no change in measurement tool for another cycle of data. (09/29/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

Students will successfully obtain patient history

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:408 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Number 1 Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4 Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester Responsible Parties: DMS:408 Course Instructor/Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 avg 4.71. trend is consistent with previous years (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As there was a change in the form and the Likert scale and to establish a trend, there will be no changes to measurement tool or benchmark. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Lab - Ultrasound Imaging 2 Lab Target: Each student will receive score >= 80% Timeframe: Didactic Level Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 100 % of students passed. Results are consistent with results of previous cohorts when data obtained in Fall DMS 207 course Fall 2015 100% Fall 2014 100% Fall 2013- 100% Fall 2012 - 100% Fall 2011- 100% (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As this tool has achieved benchmark for last six years, proposal for 2017-2018 is to identify a new outcome and measurement tool for this goal. DMS 300 Patient Care offered in Spring 2018 will be an opportune platform for new outcome /tool. (09/29/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Lab - DMS:207 Lab Practical</p> <p>Target: 100 % of students will pass lab practical</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DMS:207 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2015 100% of students passed. The trend is consistent with results of previous years. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As this tool has achieved benchmark for last six years, proposal for 2017-2018 is to identify a new outcome and measurement tool for this goal. DMS 300 Patient Care offered in Spring 2018 will be an opportune platform for new outcome /tool. (06/07/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DMS 3.1

Students will successfully analyze sonographic images

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Ultrasound Imaging Imaging Portfolio</p> <p>Target: Each student will receive score >= 80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Course Instructor/ Program Faculty/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>Fall 2016: 7 out of 8 students scored = 80% (82-88%) 1 received 78%</p> <p>this is new measurement tool (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is a new measurement tool. Students submit a portfolio of required ultrasound images of the 8 organs included in a complete ABD exam. This assignment is opportunity for faculty and students to identify what factors contribute to make an exam “diagnostic”. Continue to use Portfolio assignment in course (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DMS:307 Ultrasound Imaging 2 Portfolio - Thyroid</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p>	<p>Action: This is a new measurement tool.</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Each student will receive score >= 80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DMS 307 Course Instructor/ Program Faculty/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Spring 2017 7 out of 8 students scored = 80% (82-88%) 1 of 8 received 77% new assessment tool (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Students submit a portfolio of required ultrasound images of the thyroid. Criteria for evaluation included adherence to protocol (including correct organ, measurements) and image quality (correct instrumentation, position, artifacts, diagnostic quality) Expectations were that students would evaluate (analyze) images when scanning(accept/reject) then evaluate (analyze) images for quality/ protocol a 2nd time when compiling images for portfolio for submission.</p> <p>This assignment was opportunity for faculty and students to identify what factors contribute toward qualifying images of an ultrasound exam as “diagnostic”.</p> <p>Continue to use Portfolio assignment in course.</p> <p>Continue to use measurement tool but will change to DMS 303 ABD 2 due to changes in curriculum plan (09/29/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DMS 3.2

Students will be able to critically reflect on their performance in the clinical lab

Outcome Status: Active

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:408 Student Self Evaluation</p> <p>Target: On a scale from 0-4, 4 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >= 3</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Average score Fall 2016 = 3.35. Compared to previous reporting years, scores remain high; target is consistently met. Comparing this information against feedback from clinical instructors has proven to provide good feedback to the students. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: To determine consistency of trend, no change in measurement tool for another cycle of data. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:409 Student Self evaluation</p> <p>Target: On a scale from 0-4, 4 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >= 3</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Average score Spring 2017 avg 3.57 (n=4). These results do not differ substantially from those of previous reporting years. The target is consistently met.</p> <p>(06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: To determine consistency of trend, no change in measurement tool for another cycle of data (06/07/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DMS 4.1

Students will demonstrate professional growth or learning

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Sonography webinar</p> <p>Target: 80% of students will view</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: Change target to graded</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
webinar Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: DMS Program Director/H.S. Faculty Org	Target Met: Yes 100% viewed webinar. Trend is consistent with previous three years. (06/07/2017)	assignment or presentation of viewed webinar for 2017-2018. (06/07/2017)
SL: Didactic - Directory: SDMS, I.S.U., AIUM Target: 80% of students will join by year's end Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: DMS Program Director/HS Faculty Org Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: 2016-2017 100% student participation. This is consistent with previous years. (06/07/2017)	Action: Change of measurement tool and benchmark that requires student to submit graded report or PP presentation from a minimum of 3 professional sources. Suggested topics :new trends in sonography, bioeffects of sonography (06/07/2017)

AU Outcome: DMS 4.2

Students will practice professionalism in the clinical lab setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:408 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,2,10-13,15-19 Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4 Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester Responsible Parties: DMS 408 Instructor/ Program Faculty/HS	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: For the fall 2016 semester, the student's average score is 4.86 (n=5). Scores remain high. (06/07/2017)	Action: To determine consistency of trend, no change in measurement tool for another cycle of data. (06/07/2017)

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Curriculum Committee		
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:409 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,2,10-13,15-19</p> <p>Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level - Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DMS 408 Instructor/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: For Spring 2017 avg 4.83. Results remain consistently high over the last 4 years (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: To determine consistency of trend, no change in measurement tool for another cycle of data (06/07/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.1

Students will demonstrate advanced educator competencies to enact increasingly complex faculty and leadership roles.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 720: Finance and Fiscal Management – Budget Assignment</p> <p>Target: Each student will receive an average score of >80%</p> <p>Timeframe: When course is taught</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Spring 2017 semester, 100% of students (n=12) scored >80% on the budget assignment. This was the first time EdD 720 was offered so no historical data is available for comparison. (09/08/2017) Related Documents:</p>	<p>Action: The budget assignment directly supports the outcome that the students can demonstrate competence in a faculty and/or leadership role. The budget assignment is a scenario-driven</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>(e.g. Spring 2017) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>EdD 720 budget assignment.pdf</p>	<p>approach where the students are expected to develop a pro-forma (budget) financial summary for a proposed new health professions program. Preparing a budget is a critical skill necessary to be successful in a leadership position as a health professions educator and this assignment allows for the demonstration of competence in preparing a budget. The only suggested change for this assignment will be to add more points to the overall weight of the assignment in comparison to the other class activities. The students spent significant time on this assignment and it was only worth 15% of the overall course grade. This assignment should be worth ~25-30% of the overall course grade. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 790: Practicum in Health Professions Education – Let’s Get Creative Assignment Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., Spring 2017) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 7 students</p> <p>Earned an average of 20 out of 20 points = 100% for assignment #1</p> <p>Earned an average of 20 out of 20 points = 100% for assignment #2</p> <p>New assessment item for this year.</p>	<p>Action: This assignment was completed over two modules. In one assignment, students were grouped together as instructors and had to create an assignment that the students had to complete. When in the student group, students worked individually. Instructors had to reflect on the process of working as a group to</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>(09/08/2017) Related Documents: EdD 790 - Let's Get Creative Assignment.docx</p>	<p>create the assignment and about the assignment they created. This allowed students to work from two different vantage points – a leadership role to complete a faculty-level project and as a student to work within a framework created by fellow students. The assignments created by the students were complex and related to the course content. Continue to monitor and revise the target. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 780: Integrating Evolving Technology in Health Professions Education – ASSURE Technology Integration Final Project Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., Fall 2015, Fall 2018, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 700: Organizational Development and Change in Education – Final Paper Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., Fall 2017) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Grad Curriculum</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Committee</p> <p>SL: Didactic - EdD 740: Today's Health Sciences Student: Trends, Issues and Challenges – Final Paper Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 11 students Earned an average of 48.1 out of 56 points = 85.9%</p> <p>New assessment item for this year. (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: EdD 740 Final Paper Overview - Fall 2016.pdf</p>	<p>Action: The purpose of this paper was for students to speak to the course objectives which included addressing trends within, the culture of, and solutions/adaptations for health sciences educational environments. This assignment was graded using a rubric based on the writing rubric developed for the EdD program. General observations of the feedback given included verbs used that affected how the writing was construed – fact vs. opinion. Additionally, feedback included the necessity for using transitions, including citations, and integrating literature. Students in this class were a mix of newly incoming students and those with more writing experience, so these observations can be used to help develop writing support seminars or activities to benefit all students within the program. The findings from this assignment were used to help develop content for the EdD 845d: Literature Review Prep elective course. Continue to monitor and consider revising target. (09/08/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

AU Outcome: EdD 2.1

Students will facilitate curriculum design, development, and evaluation of program and learner outcomes using evidence-based strategies.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 790: Practicum in Health Professions Education – Project Conferences Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., Spring 2017) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 7 students</p> <p>Earned an average of 160 out of 160 points = 100%</p> <p>New assessment item for this year. (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: EdD 790 - Project Guidelines (Conferences) - Spring 2017.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Students were directed to complete an education-oriented project that had practical application for this course project (see attachment). The project also had to contain an evaluation component. Students were given specific deadlines and expectations for three face-to-face conferences to provide an overview of their projects in order to satisfy the requirements for each conference. Students created projects that will continue on after the course is over, meaning that they develop work that is valuable and useable in their teaching environments. Continue to monitor and revise the target. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 760: Pedagogy in Health Professions Education – Student Choice Activities Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 90% across the three student choice activities</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2014, 2017, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate Curriculum Committee		

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 2.1 Models of practice/frames of reference

Students will demonstrate accurate application of models of practice/frames of reference in clinical decision-making.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - OT 601 –Care Plan Assignment Target: Minimum of 80% on care plan assignment Timeframe: When course taught (2nd Year, e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Of the 14 students in the cohort, 2 out of the 14 did not meet the standard with scores of 23.5 and 19.0 out of a possible 30 points. A score of 24 was required to meet the minimum 80% require in the measure. The average score of cohort members was 27.64, which is equivalent to a 92.13%. (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 3.pdf Outcome 3-2.pdf	Action: To better meet the targeted minimum, more practice with case studies in classes will be provided. (09/28/2017)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 2.2 Collaborative Approaches

Students will demonstrate collaborative approaches to decision-making with patients/clients/consumers/families.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Clinical - OT 602 - Treatment Note Target: Minimum of 80% on documentation note	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Of the 14 students in the cohort, all students met the minimum 80% on the assignment. The average score was 19 out of a possible 20 points and the students averaged a 95% on the	Action: This is the first year of the program and the first time that this measure was employed.

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 2.2 Collaborative Approaches

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Timeframe: When course taught (2nd Year, e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>assignment. (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 4.pdf</p>	<p>(09/28/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MS in OT 4.1 Apply adaptive equipment

Students will demonstrate the ability to select and apply appropriate adaptive equipment/technology in treatment.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - OT 522 – Final Exam Video Case Target: Minimum score of 80% on final exam video case Timeframe: When course taught (1st Year, e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The average score on the exam was 91 out of 100 points. The average percentage was 91%. The scores of all 14 students in the cohort met the minimum percentage (80% or above). (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 7.pdf</p>	<p>Action: This is the first year that this measure was used. The tool will be reviewed and adjusted as necessary to better align with the national certification format. (09/28/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MS in OT 4.2 Modify Environments

Students demonstrate the ability to modify environments to support best outcomes in care.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - OT 523 – Case Study Assignment Target: Minimum score of 80% on case study assignment Timeframe: When course taught (1st</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Of the 14 students in this cohort, all achieved an 80% or better on the assignment. The average score was 96.57 out of 100 points. The average percentage was 96.57%. (09/28/2017) Related Documents:</p>	<p>Action: This was the first year that this measure was used in evaluating the program. (09/28/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 4.2 Modify Environments

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Year, e.g., Summer 2016) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee	Outcome 8.pdf	

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 2.1

Students will demonstrate technical competency in the delivery of quality laboratory service

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Clinical evaluation tool - Clinical rotation checklist – MLS 401: Clinical Hematology Practicum and MLS 406 Clinical Microbiology Practicum Target: 90% of students will satisfy requirement Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes MLS 401: Fall 2017 – 100% Spring 2017 – 100% MLS 406: Summer 2016 – 100% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 406 - Microbiology Checklist 2016.pdf MLS 401 Clinical Rotation Checklist 2016-2017.pdf	Action: Starting the 2015-2016 academic year, we stopped providing a grade based on student competency levels on checklists due to subjectivity noted from the various rotation sites. The requirement for the checklists was changed to submission only for feedback purposes and to record the level of technical competency the students achieved while in rotation. All checklists for the courses included in this tool were submitted. Because this item provides limited data, it will be deleted from the CAP going forward. (09/08/2017)
SL: Clinical - Affective evaluation–	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)	Action: This is final semester for

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>MLS 418: Immunohematology Practicum Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes 12 students Earned an average of 91.4% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 418 Affective Eval - Summer 2016.pdf</p>	<p>students and the third or fourth rotation as they progress through the program, so students are learning and retaining behaviors needed to be successful in a workplace setting. However, we have noticed disparities in how different clinical sites grade students. As a result, we have streamlined our affective evaluation for the 2016-2017 clinical rotations to make it more objective. Students will be assessed on interest in learning, initiative, communication skills, acceptance of constructive criticism, and safety. Additionally, this grade will contribute less weight-wise to the overall course grade. Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MLS 4.2

Students will communicate effectively in an online environment

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Discussion Board posts – MLS 408: Clinical Laboratory Management and Education Target: Students will receive an average score of >= 80%</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 13 Students Earned an average of</p>	<p>Action: Students discuss laboratory-based cases each week that are related to the weekly objectives. As the cases presented in the discussions mimic real world</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS APG Committee</p>	<p>194.9/200 available points = 97.5% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 408 Discussion Board Post Examples - Spring 2017.docx MLS 408 Discussion Board Scoring Rubric_spring2017.pdf</p>	<p>examples, students tend to be engaged and interested in the discussions. Faculty facilitate the discussions and provide real-life examples related to each case with examples of solutions to the cases while pushing students to critically think through the cases each week. The discussion boards are graded with a rubric used in all MLS courses. Since this is a discussion-intensive course, we will continue to monitor this item to assess communication effectiveness in the online environment. We will also consider raising the target. (09/08/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - Journal entries – MLS 406: Clinical Microbiology Practicum Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Summer 2016: 15 students Earned an average of 13.87/15 available points = 92.5% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: MLS 406 Phlebotomy Journal Directions - 2016.docx MLS 406 Phlebotomy Journal Scoring Rubric - 2016.pdf</p>	<p>Action: In MLS 406, students were required to complete a journal entry after each clinical rotation day. Prompts were provided to help structure their entries. Journal entries help provide a sense of community and help the instructor gauge how the rotation is progressing for each student, in addition to reflecting on what has been learned. Lower averages this year were due to a couple students not completing all required entries. Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 1.1

Students will be competent in Nuclear Medicine Procedures

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - Procedure Competencies (CCEs) - fall Target: Students will have 2 CCEs completed by the end of the fall semester with a score of 75% or higher Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Fall 2016 semester, 100% of students completed 2 CCEs with a score of 75% or higher (n=2). For the fall 2015 semester 100% of all students completed 2 CCEs with a score of 75% or higher. For the fall 2014 semester 100% of all students completed 2 CCEs with a score of 75% or higher. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The Fall 2016 results were not changed from Fall 2015. This assessment has been met for the past three academic years. The tool evaluates how the students are performing clinically during the fall semester. The students only have 35 clinical days in the fall semester so it does not provide much time for students to demonstrate competency. This is a programmatic requirement to ensure the students are exerting clinical effort. Since the NMT program is suspended for the 2016-2017 academic year, no changes are recommended. (09/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical - Procedure Competencies (CCEs) - spring Target: Students will have 18 CCEs completed by the end of the spring semester with a score of 75% or higher Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For 2016-2017, 100% of students passed 18 CCEs with a score of 75% or higher (n=2). For 2015-2016, 100% passed (n=3). For 2014-2015, 67% passed 18 CCEs (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The scores from spring 2017 were unchanged from spring 2016. The students were able to obtain the necessary competencies to complete the minimum before the end of the semester. This year was the first year that one student was solely assigned to Allen Hospital and one Student at Covenant. They both had more</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		opportunities to participate in general NM procedures and can demonstrate competence in those procedures. (09/21/2017)

AU Outcome: NMT 1.2

Students will practice proper aseptic technique while preparing kits

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - NMT:401 Pharmacy Competency Examination, Numbers, 3,4,5,6 Target: Students will have an average score of $\geq 80\%$ while demonstrating aseptic technique Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Fall 2016 semester, the student's average score was 88% (n=2). For the Fall 2015 semester, the student's average score was 98.1%. For the Fall 2014 semester, the student's average score for the Pharmacy Competency Exam (number 3-6) was 97.3%. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The Fall 2016 results decreased substantially compared to the Fall 2015 results. One student was admittedly not prepared for this competency evaluation and struggled with the content. Nevertheless, this tool measures how students are demonstrating aseptic technique. The scores from this cohort of students demonstrated their ability to display competency in aseptic technique with radiopharmacy kit preparation. Since the NMT program is suspended for the 2016-2017 academic year, no changes are recommended. (09/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: NMT 1.3

Students will practice proper radiation protection measures

Outcome Status: Active

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 1.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - Dosimetry Reports Target: 0% of students receive notification letter from the radiation safety officer Timeframe: Quarterly Responsible Parties: Radiation Safety Officer/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 (Oct-Dec): No NMT students received notification of a Level I ALARA from the Radiation Safety Officer. Spring 2017 (Jan-March) No NMT students received notification of a Level I ALARA from the Radiation Safety Officer. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The 2016-2017 results did not change from 2015-2016. Throughout the history of the NMT program, no student has received a Level I ALARA. The student's dosimeter reports are closely monitored by the RSO and the NMT Program Director. The radiation levels for all students are well below the Level I ALARA limits (for both monthly and quarterly exposure). This demonstrates the students have received proper radiation safety classroom education and was shown proper radiation safety techniques in the clinic. The students are applying this knowledge and are demonstrating proper radiation protection measures. Radiation safety has been a topic of discussion with the clinical preceptors to ensure they are correcting any habits that could potentially pose a radiation safety concern. (09/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: NMT 2.2

Students will successfully analyze Nuclear Medicine Images

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
-----------------	----------------	----------------

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - NMT:401 Procedures Evaluation Target: Students will have an average score of $\geq 80\%$ Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: NMT: 401 Course Instructor/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Fall 2016 semester, the average score was 94%. For the Fall 2015 semester, the average score was 97.6%. For the Fall 2014 semester, the student's average score for the Procedures Evaluation was 95.6%. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The Fall 2016 scores were unchanged from the Fall 2015 scores. The results are well above the target of $>80\%$. The examination includes several new NMT images from various procedures that the students need to analyze to identify the protocol used. Since the NMT program is suspended for the 2016-2017 academic year, no changes are recommended. (09/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical - NMT:403 Camera Quality Control Assignment Target: Students will achieve an average score of $\geq 80\%$. Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: NMT 403 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Spring 2017 semester, the average score on the QC assignment is 97.5%. For the Spring 2016 semester, the average score on the QC assignment was 93.6%. For the Spring 2015 semester, the average score on the QC assignment was 90%. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The spring 2017 scores increased from spring 2016. The Quality Control Assignment is a set of images/data results/artifacts on it and the students must determine if the equipment is working properly and/or what corrective actions need to be taken. A new set of images was used this year compared to 2016 (due to a new textbook that provided updated images). The images had more choices of artifacts and were more relevant for newer SPECT/CT systems. The students were successfully able to analyze the images and demonstrated the ability to critically think through QC artifacts and/or errors. (09/21/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

AU Outcome: NMT 2.3

Students will demonstrate a thorough knowledge of Nuclear Medicine procedures

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - NMT:404 Mock Board Exam</p> <p>Target: Students will achieve an average score of $\geq 70\%$</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: NMT: 404 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>For the Spring 2017 Semester, the average score for the mock board exam is 72%. For the Spring 2016 Semester, the average score for the mock board exam was 81.6%. For the Spring 2015 Semester, the average score for the mock board exam was 67.3%. For 2013-2014 students, the average score for the mock board exam was 70.25%. For 2012-2013, the average score was 71%.</p> <p>Grade Distribution: 100-90% = 0 89-80% = 0 79-70% = 2 69-60% = 0 59-50% = 0 < 50% = 0 (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year's scores decreased substantially with previous year's scores. The end of the spring semester relates to 2/3rds of the entire program and even at this stage, the students are demonstrating knowledge of nuclear medicine. The mock board exam scores will be correlated with the national registry exam when complete and as long as the certification exams continue to have a 100% pass rate, no changes are recommended. The students will take 3 more mock board exams throughout the remainder of the summer semester to prepare them for the registry examination. (09/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: NMT 4.1

Students will demonstrate effective communication skills in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - NMT:402 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/ Numbers 3,4,10,11 Target: On a scale from 0-4, 4 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses ≥ 3 Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Preceptors/ Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Fall 2016 semester, the average score is 3.725. For the Fall 2015 semester, the average score is 3.25. For the fall 2014 semester, the average score was 2.56. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: In 2016, the scores increased substantially comparable to the 2015 results. Both students performed extremely well clinically and technologists from both clinical sites have made several comments about how well their students are performing. Since the NMT program is suspended for the 2016- 2017 academic year, no changes are recommended. (09/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - NMT:403 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 3,4,10,11 Target: On a scale from 0-4, 4 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses ≥ 3 Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Preceptors/ Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Spring 2016-2017 students, the average score is 3.75 (n=2). For the Spring 2015-2016 students, the average score is 3.5 (n=3). For the Spring 2014-2015 students, the average score was 3.1125 (n=3). (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The results from the spring 2017 semester were slightly higher than the spring 2016 results. Review of the clinical evaluations showed that the students are demonstrating effective communication. This cohort of students had a very high level of communication reported on their fall clinical evaluations which is not common. The personalities of both students allow them to excel in this area and will make them great technologists. (09/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - NMT:404 Clinical Competency Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The average score for the 2016-2017 students is 4.0 (n=2). The average score for the 2015- 2016 students is 3.75 (n=3). The average score for the 2014-2015 students was 3.75 (n=3). The average score for the 2013-2014 students was 3.133 (n=2). (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The spring 2017 results were slightly higher than the spring 2016 results. The students' scores on the clinical competency</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: On a scale from 0-4, 4 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses ≥ 3 Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Preceptors/Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>		<p>demonstrate that they are showing the skills necessary to be competent members of the healthcare team. This assessment reviews how the students interact with other staff and the patient and conduct the exam in accordance with the ethics of the profession. (09/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: NMT 4.2

Students will successfully write a scientific report

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - NMT:401 Radiopharmacy Research Paper Target: Students will have an average score of $\geq 80\%$ Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: NMT:401 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Fall 2016 semester, the student's average score was 94%. For the Fall 2015 semester, the student's average score on the radio pharmacy paper was 97%. For the Fall 2014 semester, the student's average score on the radio pharmacy paper was 90.7%. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The Fall 2016 results were essentially unchanged over the Fall 2015 results. Based upon last year's assessment data, the students were given more writing assignments, specifically in NMT 300. The students demonstrated a solid understanding of APA that was developed with the papers they wrote in NMT 300 and that was demonstrated with this assignment. It is recommended to continue to look for assessments to evaluate students written communication skills. (09/21/2017)</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 4.3

Students will successfully present a report

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - NMT:401 Radiopharmacy Research Presentation Target: Students will receive an average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: NMT:401 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For the Spring 2017 semester, the student's average score on the radio pharmacy presentation is 100% (note, this presentation was moved to the spring semester for the 2016/2017 academic year due to inclement weather at the end of the fall semester). For the Fall 2015 semester, the student's average score on the radio pharmacy presentation was 100%. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The results from the spring 2017 semester were unchanged from the spring 2016 semester. Since there were only two students in this year's cohort, the presentations were conducted a little different than previous years. The students were given 30 minutes to give their presentation, including a 10 minute interactive session where they had to perform a hand's on demonstration. The students commented that they really liked this activity and excelled with their topics. The students clearly demonstrated their ability to present in front of a group with this assessment. (09/21/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 1.1

Student will be able to identify determinants of health and illness

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 430 Final exam Target: Average score of >80%</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, one student took the class and earned an 83% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, six</p>	<p>Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS APG committee</p>	<p>students took the class and earned an average of 88.16% on the final exam. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>it difficult to predict future results. This outcome and measure will be revisited in the CAP for 2017-2018 academic year to be more specific to the goal. (06/20/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - Community needs assessment as part of mid-term project. Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Spring semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes This was the PH 440 mid-term project. All (n=2) students scored above 80%, with an average score of 94.5%. In Fall 2015, five students earned an average of 88.16% on the assignment as part of PH 420. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the first time this project was offered in this course. It will be used again next year to monitor progress. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 1.2

Student will be able to identify sources of public health data and information

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - Community needs assessment as part of mid-term project. Target: Successful completion of report Average score of >80% Timeframe: Spring semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes As a part of the mid-term needs assessment in PH 440, students were asked to identify data sources. All (n=2) students scored above 80%, with an average score of 87.5%. In Fall 2015, five students earned an average of 88.16% on the assignment in PH 420. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the first time this measure was separated from the midterm project as a whole. It will be used again next year to monitor progress. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 1.3

Student will be able to analyze data

Outcome Status: Active

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 1.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 430 Final exam Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Faculty Org. committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, one student took the class. They earned an 83% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, six students took the class. They earned an average of 88.16% on the final exam. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes it difficult to predict future results. This outcome and measure will be revisited in the CAP for 2017-2018 academic year to be more specific to the goal. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 2.2

Student will be able to identify mechanism to evaluate programs for their quality and effectiveness

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH 480 Final Exam. (Public Health Research and Evaluation) Target: Average score > 80% Timeframe: Spring semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes All (n=2) students scored above 80%, with an average score of 93.6%. The Previous year's data not available due to change in program staff. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This tool appears to be effective and will be used again next year. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 3.1

Student will be able to recognizes the role of cultural factors in the delivery of public health services

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - PH: 420 Final report Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, two students taking the course received average of 81%. For fall 2015, five students took the class. They earned an average of 56.4/60 points = 94 %. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The drop in score was likely do to a change in instructor and course materials. Additionally, the small number of students in the</p>

College Goal 2 - Develop and implement accessible academic programs of excellence that are responsive to the workforce needs of Iowa and the nation.

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
/ HS Curriculum committee		course make it difficult to gauge the quality of the results. This measure will be used again and compared to year-over-year results. (06/20/2017)

AU Outcome: PH 4.1

Student should be able to describe the scientific foundation of the field of public health

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 400 Identify prominent events in the history of public health Midterm Exam and assignments Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No No midterm was given. One student in the course received cumulative scores for quizzes from the half of the course were 33/44, or 75%. In the previous year, seven students took the class. They earned an average of 312.8/335 points = 93.37 % on the mid-term examination (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The new instructor was unaware of the measure and this score was the closest proxy. The drop in score was likely do to a change in instructor and in course materials. Instructor will review the assessment plan to create a more specific measure. (06/20/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 430 Final exam Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Faculty Org. committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, one student took the class. They earned an 83% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, six students took the class, earning an average of 88.16% on the final exam. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes it difficult to predict future results. This measure was also used in Outcome 1.3, so a new measure will be created for the 2017-2018 CAP. (06/20/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 1.1

Recruit and retain a diverse student body [ODS Goal 1: Representational Diversity--Recruit, retain, advance, recognize, and promote ...]

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Ethnic Diversity Assessment [Report of, based on ethnic diversity data obtained from Student Services and compared to most recent Iowa figures.]</p> <p>Target: Ethnicity of student body reflects the diversity of the state of Iowa (e.g., if 5.5% of the Iowa population is comprised of Hispanics or Latinos, then the AC Hispanic-Latino Target for the student body would be 5.5%)</p> <p>Timeframe: Year 1, Year 3</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DIS Coordinator</p> <p>Related Documents: Dashboards 2018-2019.doc</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>The diversity of the student body for the 2015-2016 academic school year is 5.32%. The percentage of White students is 87.1%. Race/Ethnicity is unknown for 7.58% of students who did not self-identify. The US Census list Iowa's 2016 population as 8.6% diverse by race and 14.4% diverse including those of Hispanic decent. The White percentage for the state of Iowa is 91.4% for White alone and 86.2 including those of Hispanic decent. The White percentage at Allen College falls between the states white percentages.</p> <p>The actual raw number of minority students has increased from 32 to 33 although the percentage of minority students has demonstrated a minor decreased from 2014 (5.57%) to 2016 (5.32%). The record enrollments help to account for the decreasing percentage of minority students while actual raw numbers have increase. In addition, the increasing amount of students who fail to self identify make it difficult to determine the actual number of minority students enrolled and the exact percentages. Overall this goal is unmet because the percentages of diverse students at Allen College are lower than their comparative percentages in the state of Iowa. (09/28/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The ODS continue to offer pipeline programs of Summer Nurse Camp and Career Day programs to reach out to diverse and underrepresented groups to build interest in pursuing careers in Nursing and Allied Health Science Professions post high school graduation. The student services department continues to hold recruiting events aimed at recruiting students from all race/ethnic backgrounds into bachelors and masters health education programs at Allen College. (09/28/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Student Gender Diversity Assessment [Report based on gender diversity data obtained from Student Services and compared to most recent figures for each profession]</p> <p>Target: Gender diversity of student body reflects that of the professions represented by Allen College academic programs (e.g., if males represent 8% of the nursing profession, then males will represent</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>The gender diversity of the student body at Allen College for the 2016-17 school year encompassed 89.35% (554) female students and 10.65% (66) male students.</p> <p>The number and percentage of males increased in the (Year 3) 2016-2017 school year as compared to the 2015--2016 (Year 2) school year. The raw number of men in Year 3 was 66 as compared to 51 in Year 2. The percentage increased significantly from 8.87% in Year 1 to 10.65% in Year 3. (09/28/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The ODS will continue to offer pipeline programs of Career Day and Summer Nurse Camp which encourage males to learn about Nursing and Health Science Careers. The ODS will continue to offer mentor and peer-to-peer support programs for men who are underrepresented on the colleges campus. The ODS will continue to work with the student services to encourage recruiting events for</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>8% of the student composition of the nursing program) Timeframe: Year 1; Year 3 Responsible Parties: DIS Coordinator</p>		<p>prospective male students. (09/28/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Student Recruitment Assessment [Report of efforts to recruit students who represent traditionally under-represented groups, e.g., males, Hispanics, African Americans, etc.] Target: There will be evidence of regular activities designed to recruit students who represent under-represented groups (e.g., student recruiters attend or host 6 recruitment events annually in settings where contact with underrepresented groups is possible). Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Admissions Counselors</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Hosted a booth at the Waterloo West High School Career Fair Hosted a booth at the Waterloo East High School Career Fair Hosted Men in Nursing dinner Hosted A Day in the Life Hosted a booth at the Latino/a Expo at Drake University Hosted a booth at the Meskwaki Higher Education Program College & Career Fair (10/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to provide evidence of regular activities designed to recruit students who represent under-represented groups (e.g., student recruiters attend or host 6 recruitment events annually in settings where contact with underrepresented groups is possible). (10/20/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Pipeline Program Development Report [Report of ODS efforts to recruit students who represent traditionally under-represented groups, e.g., males, Hispanics, African Americans, etc.] Target: There will be evidence of regular activities designed to recruit students who represent under-represented groups (e.g., at least 6</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The ODS held 8 Career Day events for 112 middle and high school students from surrounding communities in the 2016-2017 school year. This is one additional event in comparison to the 2015-2016 year when the ODS held seven Career Day activities for middle and high school students. The ODS held Summer Nurse Camp 2016 enrolling 40 students and graduating 36 for a retention and graduation rate of 90%. We were able to do better with Summer Nurse Camp retention and graduation in the 2015 school year as compared to the 2016. In the year 2015</p>	<p>Action: The ODS will continue to partner with the Waterloo Community School District and other surrounding schools districts to offer Career Day/A Day in the Life immersion activities to middle and high school students to help them develop realistic understandings of what nursing and allied health professionals do</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>career days for surrounding communities annually; annual summer nurse camp for at least 25 students).</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: DIS Coordinator</p>	<p>we enrolled 40 students and graduated 38 for a retention/graduation rate of 95%. Some students reported leaving camp in 2016 for a requirement to attend summer school. We will screen more closely for that in future summers to help keep students who are able to remain enrolled and graduate from the program.</p> <p>(05/22/2017)</p>	<p>in hopes of more students selecting nursing and health care careers post high school graduation.</p> <p>In addition next year we will be working with our Partner In Education Carver Middle School to over Career Day/A Day in the Life immersion programs to the entire 8th grade.</p> <p>We will also continue to work with the University of Northern Iowa's TRIO program and all surrounding school districts to reach out to students interested in the Summer Nurse Camp for 2018. (05/22/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DIS 1.2

Recruit and retain a diverse faculty, staff, and administration [ODS Goal 1: Representational Diversity--Recruit, retain, advance, recognize, and promote ...]

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Associate Ethnic Diversity Assessment [Report of faculty ethnic diversity data obtained from administration and compared to most recent Iowa figures]</p> <p>Target: Diversity of Allen College associates will reflect the ethnic and cultural diversity of the state of Iowa</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Summary: During the 2016-17 academic year 23 persons were interviewed among four departments, which accounted for 13 hires. Of the new hires one (7.6%) was considered from ethnic diverse decent. Two of the additional candidates not hired were from an ethnic diverse decent. The person from an ethnic diverse background was hired for a custodial position.</p> <p>Health Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational Therapy - interviewed two candidates for an assistant profession position; 	<p>Action: The College has met it's ethnic diversity target activities however we realize the need to continue to reach out and interview all qualified candidates for available faculty and staff positions and to continue to create an inclusive environment at the college. All open college positions</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>[e.g., if 5.5% of the Iowa population is comprised of Hispanics or Latinos, then the AC Hispanic-Latino Target for associates would be 5.5%] Timeframe: Year 2 Responsible Parties: DIS Coordinator</p>	<p>both were hired to assistant faculty position. Both are white non-Hispanic females.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DMS – interviewed one candidate (female) non-Hispanic white. • Imaging MR/CT - interviewed one candidate (female) non-Hispanic white. <p>Nursing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty– interviewed one non-Hispanic white, female applicant. One hired. • Adjunct faculty – interviewed 4 candidates for adjunct faculty positions, all non-Hispanic white females. Four were hired. <p>Business, Finance, & Environmental Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Financial Aid Counselor - interviewed three candidates which included two females and one male. All candidates were non-Hispanic and white. The male was hired. . Custodial Services - six people were interviewed for two positions. This included four females and two males. One female and one male were hired. Three African American's were interviewed, which included 1 Hispanic, and two African Americans. One African American male was hired. <p>Student Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Admissions Administrative Assistant - 5 persons were interviewed. All candidates were non-Hispanic white females. <p>Fall 2017 data indicated total ethnic diversity among faculty and staff at Allen is 6.89%.</p> <p>We continue to recruit, interview and hire applicants from underrepresented groups in an attempt to ensure our faculty and staff are reflective of the diversity of the State of Iowa. In the 2014-2015 year our diverse hire percentage was larger than in the 2015-2016 year. However, in 2015-2016 we hired a greater number of employees from historically underrepresented groups. In the 2014-2015 school year we interviewed 23 candidates, hired 13 of which 2 were from underrepresented groups for a total of 23% diverse hires. In 2015-2016 we interviewed 24 individuals, hired 19 of which 4 were from underrepresented groups for a total of 17% diverse hires. (08/29/2017)</p>	<p>are posted on the HR website and all qualified applicants will continue to be interviewed, which is standard HR practice. The position descriptions and access to the application can be accessed by both internal and outside candidates. The College does not have a standard policy to advertise in specialized journals except for a position that is hard to fill with local talent, which at the time we do expand our advertising. (10/23/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Faculty Gender Diversity Assessment [Report of gender diversity data</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Summary: During the 2016-17 academic year 23 persons were interviewed among four</p>	<p>Action: The College has met it's Faculty Gender Diversity target activities however we realize the</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>obtained from administration and compared to most recent figures for each professional program.] Target: Gender diversity of faculty reflects that of the professions represented by Allen College academic programs (e.g., if males represent 8% of the nursing profession, then males will represent 8% of the faculty composition in nursing programs) Timeframe: Year 2 Responsible Parties: DIS Coordinator</p>	<p>departments, which accounted for 13 hires. Of the new hires two (15.3%) were males. One of the additional candidates not hired was a male.</p> <p>Health Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational Therapy - interviewed two candidates for an assistant profession position; both were hired to assistant faculty position. Both are white non-Hispanic females. • DMS – interviewed one candidate (female) non-Hispanic white. • Imaging MR/CT - interviewed one candidate (female) non-Hispanic white. <p>Nursing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty– interviewed one non-Hispanic white, female applicant. One hired. • Adjunct faculty – interviewed 4 candidates for adjunct faculty positions, all non-Hispanic white females. Four were hired. <p>Business, Finance, & Environmental Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Financial Aid Counselor - interviewed three candidates which included two females and one male. The male was hired. . Custodial Services - six people were interviewed for two positions. This included four females and two mails. One female and one male were hired. <p>Student Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Admissions Administrative Assistant - 5 persons were interviewed. All candidates were female. <p>Fall 2017 data indicated total gender diversity among faculty and staff at Allen is 13.79%.</p> <p>The college met and maintained its faculty gender diversity target. (08/29/2017)</p>	<p>need to continue to reach out and interview all qualified candidates for available faculty positions and to continue to create an inclusive environment at the college. All open college faculty positions are posted on the HR website and all qualified applicants will continue to be interviewed, which is standard HR practice. The position descriptions and access to the application can be accessed by both internal and outside candidates. The College does not have a standard policy to advertise in specialized journals except for a position that is hard to fill with local talent, which at that time we do expand our advertising. (10/25/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Associate Recruitment Assessment [Report of efforts to recruit associates who represent under-represented groups for open positions and success of those efforts; e.g., number of newly hired associates who represent</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Allen College hired 13 new employees in the 2016-2017 school year of which 7.6% were ethnically diverse. All open college positions were posted on the HR website and all qualified applicants were interviewed which is standard HR practice. Newly hired employees accounted for a diverse percentage of 7.6 % which is greatly than the diverse percentages in the State of Iowa Currently all new positions at Allen College and there descriptions can be</p>	

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 1.2

Measures	Results	Actions
<p>underrepresented groups]. Target: There will be evidence of regular activities designed to recruit associates who represent under-represented groups to fill open positions (e.g., advertisements in male nurse journals to recruit male faculty; advertisements in African American publications to recruit Black faculty and staff) Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Provost</p>	<p>accessed by both internal and outside candidates. The College does not have a standard policy to advertise in specialized journals except for a position that is hard to fill with local talent or if diverse applicants are consistently not in the applicant pool. Allen College has advertised in specialty sources and is not hesitant to do in the future if our current diverse applicant pool shrinks or positions are difficult to fill. We realize the need to continue to reach out to diverse applicants, to interview all qualified candidates for open positions, to continue to monitor our applicant pools for diversity and to expand our advertising to publications reaching a larger percentage of diverse and male populations as the need arises. (11/10/2017)</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Positions were posted on the HR website, which may be accessed by both internal and outside candidates. The number of candidates for each position was sufficient to fulfill the positions. The OT positions were advertised in two specialty journals, in the Chronical of Higher Education and on a higher education job's website. Twenty three persons were interviewed among four departments, which accounted for 13 hires. Of the new hires three (23%) were considered from underrepresented groups, which included males and ethnic diversity in this report. Three of the additional candidates not hired were from underrepresented groups.</p> <p>The percent of new hires considered to be from an under-represented diverse population increased from 20% in 2014-15 to 33% in 2015-16. (08/29/2017)</p>	

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM 1.0

Retain Students

Outcome Status: Active

Measures	Results	Actions
----------	---------	---------

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM 1.0

Measures	Results	Actions
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Program Completion Rates (Graduation Rates Spreadsheet)</p> <p>Target: 70% of graduate students complete their program</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Spring 2011 cohort graduation rate = 72% (there is still one student enrolled in this cohort)</p> <p>Fall 2011 cohort graduation rate = 79% (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: After review of the current tutoring company and competitors, the student success office determined that a new company had additional resources for masters and doctoral students. Beginning spring 2017, all graduate students were introduced to this new system. (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Graduation Rates within 150%</p> <p>Target: 70% of undergraduate students complete their program within 150% of the program completion time.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>School of Health Sciences Graduation Rates</p> <p>ASR Program - 2014 cohort = 100% graduation rate</p> <p>DMS Program - 2014 cohort = 71% graduation rate</p> <p>MLS Program - 2014 cohort = 78% graduation rate</p> <p>NMT Program - 2014 cohort = 100% graduation rate</p> <p>School of Nursing Graduation Rates</p> <p>BSN Upper Division Program</p> <p>- fall 2013 cohort = 100% graduation rate</p> <p>- spring 13 cohort = 84% graduation rate</p> <p>- Accelerated Nursing Program – SU-2014 cohort = 97% graduation rate</p> <p>Graduation rates are steady in the undergraduate programs. Most graduation rates over the last 2 years have been 90% or above.</p> <p>(09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Although the graduation rates meet the target, there is room for improvement, especially in smaller programs. Admission policies will be reviewed after analyzing data to determine if changes in those policies are necessary. (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Retention Plan</p> <p>Target: 100% of tutees achieve a C or higher in tutored courses</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>Tutoring is no longer hired in-house. Students had access to Tutor.com and NetTutor for the 2016-17 academic year. This outcome should be retired as data cannot be collected in the same way. A new measurement will be used in 2017-18. (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The student success coordinator will develop a measurement tool for measuring the effectiveness of tutoring. (09/29/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM 1.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Student Success Coordinator</p>		
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Retention rates</p> <p>Target: 90% of first year students retained in all programs.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>In the 2015-2016 academic year, 95% of all students were retained. (See page 6 of Dashboard Report). Allen College typically has a first year retention rate of above 90%. (05/10/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Dashboards 2016-2017.doc</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor student retention and offer retention services as needed. (05/10/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Admissions Reports; Dashboard Statistics, Census Report found at http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/19/19013.html</p> <p>Target: Diverse population at Allen College is equal to the diverse population of Black Hawk County.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Dean of Student Services</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>According to the 2010 Census for Black Hawk County, 13.9% are ethnic minority. Allen College had 5.16% ethnic minority in the fall 2016. (06/30/2017)</p>	<p>Action: During the 2017-18 academic year, Diversity Services and Admissions will continue to meet and will work on a collaboration between high school and community college recruitment by merging "Career Days" with "A Day in the Life" activities. (03/01/2019)</p>

AU Outcome: EM 7.0

Qualified students are admitted to college programs

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
-----------------	----------------	----------------

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM 7.0

Measures	Results	Actions
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Program Enrollment (Admissions Report; Correspondence Spreadsheet; Dashboard Statistics)</p> <p>Target: Fill programs with qualified students as follows: School of Health Sciences—100% Accelerated BSN—100% Upper Division BSN—100%</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>For the 2016-2017 academic year, programs were filled as follows:</p> <p>ASR - filled at 100% (16/16)</p> <p>MLS - filled at 100% (15/15)</p> <p>DMS - filled at 100% (8/8)</p> <p>NMT - filled at 29% (2/7)</p> <p>PH – filled at 25% (1/4)</p> <p>DH – filled at 0% (0/4)</p> <p>Accelerated BSN (Summer Start) - 88% of program filled (28/32)</p> <p>Accelerated BSN (Fall Start) - 91% of program filled (29/32)</p> <p>Upper Division BSN Fall 2016 - 100% of program filled (24/24)</p> <p>Upper Division BSN Spring 2017 - 83% of program filled (40/48) (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: During 2017, targeted marketing dollars were spent on Public Health, Dental Hygiene, and RN-BSN. In working closely with the regional marketing director, an ad agency was hired to produce and promote programs through online ads and social media. (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Enrollment increases in under enrolled programs (Admissions Report; Correspondence Spreadsheet; Dashboard Statistics)</p> <p>Target: Admit students to underenrolled programs at the graduate level. Increase enrollment by 25% in the following programs: NMT, RN-BSN/MSN, MSN-Edu, MSN-CPH, MSN-Lead and DNP.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>Enrollment changes from fall 16 to fall 17:</p> <p>NMT - no longer accepting applications</p> <p>RN-BSN - 13% decrease</p> <p>MSN-ED - 17% increase</p> <p>MSN-CPH - 100% increase</p> <p>MSN-Lead - 100% decrease</p> <p>DNP - 30% increase</p> <p>*The NMT program did not accept applications for the 2017-18 academic year. (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Review viability of NMT and RN-BSN programs. All targeted marketing dollars were spent on under-enrolled programs for the 2017 calendar year. The admissions office is working closely with the regional marketing director to create plans for future target marketing campaigns.</p> <p>Need to change the following: Remove NMT from list Add Public Health (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Google Website Analytics Report</p> <p>Target: An average of 9000 unique</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>Access to Analytics was given in early 2017 and 2016 data was retrieved. From Jan 1, 2016 -</p>	<p>Action: Beginning in early 2017, the admissions office has sought the assistance of the marketing</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>hits per month between January 1 - December 31. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management</p>	<p>Dec 31, 2016, the college averaged 7,717 unique hits. (05/10/2017)</p>	<p>department through UnityPoint Health. The entire marketing strategy has been redesigned and ads will focus on driving prospective students and other visitors directly to the website. This will be evaluated again in 2017. (05/10/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: EM 8.0

Increase the number of underrepresented students enrolled at Allen College.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Retention of ethnic minority and male students (Recruitment Plan; Retention Plan; Graduation Rates; Dashboard Statistics)</p> <p>Target: Retention rates of ethnic minority and male students are equal to or greater than the entire Allen College population.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No</p> <p>The retention rate of ethnic minority students in the 2015-16 academic year was 84%. The retention rate of Allen College was 95%. The retention rate did increase this year. The 2014-15 retention rate of ethnic minority students was 79%.</p> <p>The student success coordinator continues to read peer reviewed articles and other research to find ways to reach minority and male students in health profession majors. Much of what the research presents suggestions that are currently in place. The increase is likely due to the continued research done by the student success coordinator's efforts to maintain services to help struggling students. (05/10/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The retention coordinator continues to monitor student needs and provides services for students who are struggling academically. (05/10/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Student awareness of services provided by retention services (Retention Plan)</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p> <p>All students are notified of services offered by the retention office annually in orientation</p>	<p>Action: Continue to publicize retention services at orientation</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM 8.0

Measures	Results	Actions
<p>Target: 90% of students identified as ethnic minority or male are aware of services provided from retention services.</p> <p>Timeframe: Bi-Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Student Success Coordinator</p>	<p>materials. (09/29/2017)</p>	<p>and using the Student Services course in the online course management system. (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Use of services provided by the retention office (Retention Plan)</p> <p>Target: 25% of students identified as ethnic minority or male attend services provided from retention services.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Student Success Coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Of those students identified as male and/or ethnic minority, 38% used services provided by the Student Success Office (formerly the Retention Office). (10/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The Student Success Office will continue to reach out to ethnic minority and male students and encourage their participation in the services offered. (10/06/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Admissions Reports; Dashboard Statistics, Census Report found at http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/19/19013.html</p> <p>Target: Diverse population at Allen College is equal to the diverse population of Black Hawk County.</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>According to the 2010 Census for Black Hawk County, 13.9% are ethnic minority. Allen College had 5.16% ethnic minority in the fall 2016. (05/10/2017)</p>	<p>Action: During the 2017-18 academic year, Diversity Services and Admissions will continue to meet and will work on a collaboration between high school and community college recruitment by merging "Career Days" with "A Day in the Life" activities. (05/10/2017) (05/10/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM 8.0

Measures	Results	Actions
Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Dean of Enrollment Management		

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

Students will demonstrate effective communication skills in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

Measures	Results	Actions
SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/ Numbers 3, 6, 10,11 Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 average score was 3.56 (N=13) FA 2015=3.81(n=16) (06/21/2017)	Action: This year student's scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)
SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)	Action: Student scores were very

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 3, 6,10,11</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II -Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Students achieved an average score of 3.95 (n=15) Benchmark met.</p> <p>SP 2016 3.97 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2015 3.95 (n=15)</p> <p>SP 2014 3.97 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2013 3.99 (n=16)</p> <p>SP 2012 3.94 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in interpersonal relationships and an increase in multicultural diversity. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to use effective communication skills in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Competency Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016=3.92</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>2015= 3.99 (n=16)</p> <p>2014=3.98 (n=17)</p> <p>2013=3.94 (n=16)</p> <p>2012=3.96 (n=17)</p> <p>2011=3.93 (n=17)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students exceeded the benchmark. The students are demonstrating clinical communication skills reflective of their level in the program. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Final Clinical Competency</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to exceed the benchmark. Students</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8 Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee	2017=4(n=15) Benchmark met. 2016=4 (n=17) 2015=3.99 (n=15) 2014=3.99 (n=17) 2013=4 (n=16) 2012=4 (n=16) 2011=3.95 (n=16) (06/21/2017)	demonstrated excellent communication skills in the clinical setting. Many of this year’s final CCE’s were performed on patients that required multiple exams and extensive patient communication. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

Students will practice written communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=98.01% (n=16) 2014=98.2% (n=17) 2013= 99.1% (n=16) 2012= 98.98% (n=17) 2011= 98.51% (n=17) (06/21/2017)	Action: Areas of deduction on the reference page include; four students did not utilize proper spacing of the references, two students did not use the hanging indent, one student did not use the proper font size and one student neglected to center the word reference on the top of the reference page. Under the format portion of the evaluation form; four students did not have proper margins in their paper and one student did not meet the requirements of a two page paper.

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>The research paper is discussed in detail on the first day of class with the instructor. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=15) Previous data: 2015-97.5% (n=17) 2014-98.06% (n=15) 2013= 98.7% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the third year students wrote and presented two papers for this course. Fourteen of the thirty papers written had deductions on the reference page. Eight papers had errors with spacing, nine papers did not have the hanging indent, two students numbered their references, and five students did not correctly title the reference page. Four students had deductions in the format section for grammar and spelling. The instructor encouraged students to review their first paper presentation to give them the opportunity to improve on the second paper. Six of the fifteen students reviewed their first paper presentation and received feedback from the instructor. Five</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		of these six students improved on their second paper. The requirements for these papers are discussed in detail the first day of class. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

Students will demonstrate oral communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 95% (N=15) Previous data: 2015= 98.82% (n=17) 2014= 99.13%(n=15) 2013= 99.52% (n=17) 2012= 98.58% (n=17) 2011= 94.75% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were four papers that received deductions in the oral presentation portion of the evaluation. Two papers did not meet the length of presentation requirement of eight minutes. Four papers did not include all of the information needed during the presentation of the paper. For example, the discussion of exposure factors used during the procedure and one paper was not presented due to student absence.</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		This could be the reason for the lower score in the oral presentation. Students continue to exhibit effective oral communication skills. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 99% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=94.53% (n=16) 2014=100% (n=17) 2013= 99.75% (n=16) 2012= 99.6% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were just two papers with deductions in the oral presentation portion. One student read their paper very quickly and the other was deducted in the area of proper voice level. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 3.2

Students will demonstrate ability to practice critical thinking

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:145 Scientific Exhibit Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 = 92.14% N= 7 posters (12 students) Previous data 2016 = 92.6% N= 10 posters (16 students) 2015 = 96.5%, N= 11 posters (17 students) 2014= 94%, N = 11 posters (15 students) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Scores for 2017 continue to demonstrate the student's ability to practice critical thinking skills when developing their scientific exhibits. Average scores continue to exceed the benchmark of 80%. No changes recommended. (06/21/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - RA: 203B Corectec exams Target: > 80% of the students will achieve a score of 70 or greater on one of the four exams. Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 203B Course Instructor/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 (n=15), 93% of the students received a passing score after the 4th exam. Previous data 2016 (n=17) 100% 2015 (n=15) 93% 2014 (n=17) 76% 2013 (n=16) 100% 2012 (n=16) 100% (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: One student did not achieve a 70 on any of the 4 Corectec exams. This year's Corectec exams reflected the new ARRT content specs. Students continue to demonstrate their ability to practice critical thinking. The course instructor recommends that the benchmark be changed to state "will achieve a Corectec exam score of 70 or greater." (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

Students will be able to critically think in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:145 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8 Target: Average score >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level I-Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016-2017: average score was 3.63 (N=12) Previous data Spring 2016 3.63(n=16) Spring 2015 3.67 (N=17) Spring 2014 3.62 (N=15) Spring 2013 3.82 (N=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in the area of ability to follow directions. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. During the 2017 spring semester, two of the clinical sites were part of a pilot study utilizing Trajecsyst for the completion of student clinical</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>evaluations. The pilot study was a success. The clinical instructors had no issues with completion of the student evaluations. Trajecsys :allows the clinical instructors to complete the student evaluations online and then each student is able to view their completed evaluation. During summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing Trajecsys to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to use critical thinking skills in the clinical setting. Continue to monitor. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:265 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II- Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 average score was 3.86 (N=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>Fall 2015=3.81(n=17)</p> <p>Fall 2014=3.75(n=15)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year student’s scores increased in the areas of application of knowledge, self-image for Level in the ASR Program and composure and adaptability. There was a slight decline in ability to follow directions. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to be able to critically think in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - RA:135 Community Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 135 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 2016: 72% (n=13) Previous data 2015: 92.56% (n=16) 2014: 97.94% (n=17) 2013: 99.28 (n=16) 2012= 99.41% (n=17) 2011=99% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The service learning paper accounts for 10% of the course grade. One student did not submit a paper and received a zero, which decreased the overall average score for this cohort. Many of the students did not follow the assignment instructions and did not earn the highest points possible. Of the students who completed the assignment, the overall average was score was 78.41%. Multiple students performed service learning independently through a variety of organizations. Students have demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism through their service learning activities. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - RA: 265 Community Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016: 93.4% (N=15) Previous data 2015: 82.47% (n=17) 2014: 99.13% (n=15)</p>	<p>Action: One student was late submitting the assignment and received a grade reduction. Some students missed points for grammar and punctuation errors. Overall, the service learning</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Committee	2013: 97.59% (n=17). 2012: 100% (n-17) 2011: 98% (n=17) (06/21/2017)	reflection papers demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

Students will practice professionalism

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I- Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 average score was 3.6 (N=13)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>FA 2015=3.83 (n=16)</p> <p>FA 2014=3.80 (n=17)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year student's scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to practice professionalism. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Spring 2017 average score was 3.96 (n=15)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight increase in</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Previous data SP 2016 3.98 (n=17) SP 2015 3.91 (n=15) SP 2014 3.95 (n=17) SP 2013 3.98 (n=16) SP 2012 3.9 (n=16) 2010-2011 3.85 (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>organization of assignments and a decrease in initiative and ethical and professional behaviors. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to integrate leadership skills and practice professionalism in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.1

Students will practice written communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester AC306 Professional Communications Academic Paper Assignment</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Didactic - DH400 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Fall Semester Written Assignment of Course Review</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 20 points for 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students did a good job writing and presenting how to relate, communicate, teach, and learn from various learning styles and preferences.</p> <p>Will continue with this benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester AC306 Issues in Healthcare Presentation</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/ Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Preceptor evaluations were very positive</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee	New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. The average score was 2/2 (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx	regarding effective oral communication skills. Continue to use this tool and keep the benchmark the same. (06/06/2017)

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 5.2

Students will evaluate, synthesize, utilize and disseminate the scholarship related to discovery, integration, application, and teaching to further knowledge and competencies of the health science and nursing education professions.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - EdD 770: Assessment and Evaluation in Health Sciences Education – Assessment Process Assignment Target: Students will receive an average score at least 80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2016, 2019, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)	

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 6.1 Collaborate to develop case study

Students will collaborate with other practices to develop a comprehensive case study.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - OT 613 – Multidisciplinary Collaborative Case Assignment Target: Minimum score of 80% on the assignment Timeframe: When course taught (2nd Year, e.g., Spring 2017) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes All 14 students in this cohort successfully met the minimum of 80% or more on this assignment. The average score was 97.14 out of 100 possible points. The average percentage achieved was 97.14%. (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 11.pdf</p>	<p>Action: This was the first time that this measure was used. The instructor is currently reviewing it for any necessary changes. (09/28/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MS in OT 6.2 Research Presentation

Students develop a research presentation to be presented at the state OT association conference.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - OT 618 – Research Poster Target: Minimum score of 80% on the assignment Timeframe: When course taught (2nd Year, e.g., Spring 2017) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes All 14 students in the cohort received 100% on this poster assignment. These results exceeded the required 80% or more need to meet the required outcome. (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 12.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Use of this assignment to meet this measure will be reviewed. If necessary, another assignment in the course, that requires a written article, may be substituted for the next review period. (09/28/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 3.2

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 3.2

Students will integrate team-building skills into professional practice

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - Service Learning Project Target: 75% of students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 13 students Earned an average of 138.5/145 available points = 95.5% (09/08/2017) Related Documents: Service Learning Final Project Description_2017.pdf Service Learning Syllabus_2017.pdf SL Final Project Scoring Rubric_2017.pdf</p>	<p>Action: The Service Learning project was presented as separate weekly modules during the spring 2017 MLS 408 course. Students work on Service Learning projects during the first 11 weeks of the course, individually or in groups. Students were directed to complete projects for a STEM fair developed in conjunction with the recruiting department. One student served as the project manager, and all work on the STEM fair booths was coordinated with her to help promote team-building skills. Students completed module discussions that helped them collect information needed for their final presentation. Additionally, students had to complete weekly journal entries to keep me updated on the progress of their project. Students were engaged with this project and enjoyed sharing information about the lab profession with students that attended the STEM fair. Next year, this project will be carried out in a separate course taught in the fall. Continue to monitor and raise the target. (09/08/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - Journal posts (clinical experience) – MLS 305: Phlebotomy</p> <p>Target: Students will receive an average score of >80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Faculty Org Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016: 11 students</p> <p>Earned an average of 13.64/15 available points = 90.9% (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>MLS 305 Phlebotomy Journal Directions - 2016.docx</p> <p>MLS 305 Phlebotomy Journal Scoring Rubric - 2016.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Students were required to complete a journal entry after each clinical rotation day spent at the ACE-SAP clinic. Journal entries help provide a sense of community and help the instructor see what students are getting out of the rotation experience. Scores were lower this year due to two students that did not meet the deadline for the assignment. Continue to monitor. (09/08/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 2.1

Students will be able to critically reflect on their performance

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - NMT:405 Student Self Evaluation</p> <p>Target: Students will have an average score of >= 85%.</p> <p>Timeframe: Summer Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: NMT: 405 Course Instructor/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>For the Summer 2017 semester, the student’s average score for the self-evaluation is 98% (N=2). For the Summer 2016 semester, the student’s average score for the self-evaluation is 95% (N=3). For the Summer 2015 semester, the student’s average score for the self-evaluation was 98% (N=3) (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The Summer 2017 scores were higher than the summer 2016 scores. The student self-evaluation demonstrates that the students are able to critically reflect on their performance as they prepare to enter the workforce. Both students had jobs lined up after graduation and they had both tremendously increased their confidence</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		throughout the semester. Overall, the students are prepared to take their certification exam and move into the workforce. (09/21/2017)

AU Outcome: NMT 3.1

Students will participate in a service learning project

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - NMT 404: Service Learning Evaluation Target: Students will have an average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: NMT 404 Course Instructor/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes For 2016-2017, the average score for the service learning evaluation is 100%. For 2015-2016, the average score for the service learning evaluation was 100%. For 2014-2015, the average score was 95%. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The students' scores on the service learning project were maximum for the assignment and the spring 2017 results were unchanged from spring 2016. The students completed a pre- and post- journal that was a critical reflection of their participation in a service learning project. (09/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - CELL Community Service Hours Worksheet Target: Students will have a minimum of 5 hours of community service Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: NMT Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No In the Fall 2016 semester, 50% (1 of 2) students completed 5 or more community service hours. In the Fall 2015 semester, 67% (2 of 3) students completed 5 or more community service hours. In the fall 2014 semester, 100% (3 of 3) students completed 5 or more community service hours. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Like the 2015 cohort, the 2016 cohort of students did not complete the necessary service hours and the results were unchanged from fall 2016 to fall 2015. When investigating why one student did not complete the necessary hours, he stated that he works 30+ hours per week and did not have time to complete community service. This</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		assessment is intended to show that students are demonstrating a commitment to lifelong excellence. The student received information about CELL during orientation and their first week in class. Since the NMT program is suspended for the 2016-2017 academic year, no changes are recommended. (09/21/2017)

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 3.1

Student will be able to recognizes the role of cultural factors in the delivery of public health services

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - PH: 420 Final report Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, two students taking the course received average of 81%. For fall 2015, five students took the class. They earned an average of 56.4/60 points = 94 %. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The drop in score was likely do to a change in instructor and course materials. Additionally, the small number of students in the course make it difficult to gauge the quality of the results. This measure will be used again and compared to year-over-year results. (06/20/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 6.0 Patient-Centered Care

Use patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU450 Community Assessment paper Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on community assessment paper. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The community assessment paper was discussed frequently during class. The due date was changed to Sunday night rather than Friday night in the Fall and Spring semesters to allow students a few extra days to complete. Summer 2016 –100% of students achieved above 75% on the community assessment paper. Fall 2016 (UD) - 100% of students achieved above 75% on the community assessment paper. Fall 2016 (LPN)—100% of students achieved above 75% on the community assessment paper. Spring 2017 (UD)- 100% of students achieved above a 75% on the community assessment paper. In order to meet this target in the future course faculty will review the teaching project assignment criteria a minimum of 2 times and provide 1:1 guidance during office hours for those who request additional assistance. (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 6 NU 450 Community Assessment Paper.docx</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target in the future, course faculty will review the paper criteria with the students at the beginning of the semester to acquaint the students with the requirements of this assignment. The assignment criteria will again be reviewed prior to conducting the community assessment. Emphasis will be placed on the use of APA format and completeness in answering all parts of the criteria with examples of what faculty would expect to see. Continue to offer additional assistance during office hours as students needed. (11/16/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to use patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well).. Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to use patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly = 1, well = 7, very well = 7. Well or very well = 14 (93%). Target met again this year. Must consider low response rate. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: poorly 4%, well 29%, very well 67% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 6.0 Patient-Centered Care

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>individuals and populations. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate uses patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable, e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate uses patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: 100% very well. Improvement over previous survey, but low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: well 18.8%, very well 81.3% (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, and results more favorable than previous year. Consider results in context of low response rate. Consider alternative means of obtaining employer/stakeholder perceptions of graduates' performance of program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice you use patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role).</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: rarely = 0, some of the time = 3, most of the time = 12, some or most of the time = 15 (100%). Target met last year as well. Response rate worse this year. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: rarely 8%, some of the time 17%, most of the time 71%, NA 4%. (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>

College Goal 3 - Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent diverse populations and who embrace diversity, cultural and global awareness, and the inclusion of all its members.

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 6.0 Patient-Centered Care

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 75% of respondents will report they use patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate uses patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate uses patient-centered strategies when delivering care to diverse individuals and populations some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates; some of the time = 1, most of the time =4; some or most of the time = 5 (100%). Target met again, but consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates; some of the time 18.8%, most of the time 81.3% (10/05/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

College Goal 4 - Promote a commitment by all members of the Allen College community to lives of service to others.

Admin - Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership

AU Outcome: CELL 1.1

Allen College culture supports and sustains community service and service-learning

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Service-Learning Faculty Scholars Assessment Target: 100% of Allen College programs incorporate service and/or learning activities into their curricula. Timeframe: Years 2 and 4 Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No The McElroy Endowed Chair for Interdisciplinary Studies followed up with the Dean of the School of Health Sciences to discuss ways to promote formalized service-learning into the health sciences curriculums. Faculty Scholars was not offered as an option to faculty during the 2016-2017 academic year. Faculty may be incorporating service-learning opportunities into their classes, but no formal education was completed this year to formalize what they are doing or ensure that the activities are appropriate to be labeled as "service-learning". Programs that have formalized the use of service-learning teaching strategies through the completion of the Faculty Scholars Program are: BSN (Upper Division and Accelerated), MSN (NP tracks), DNP, MLS, and EdD. (12/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Offer the service-learning faculty scholars program in the 2017-2018 academic year to faculty to formalize the use of service-learning in academic programs. (12/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Exit survey question "Do you intend to volunteer in your community in the future?" Target: 50% of exiting students report that they intend to volunteer in their communities in the future. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Data was not collected from the respondents who stated that they did not intend to volunteer in the future. However, this is a very small percentage of the students who were surveyed. 91.7% report they intend to volunteer in the future (n=209/228). College wide results include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerated BSN summer 2016 – 89% (n=32/36) • Accelerated BSN fall 2016 – 94.4% (n=17/18) • Upper division BSN fall 2016 – 95% (n=19/20) • LPN-BSN fall 2016 – 93.8% (n=15/16) • Upper division BSN spring 2017 – 97.7% (n=43/44) • MSN program summer 2016 – 100% (n=7/7) • MSN program fall 2016 – 78.6% (n=22/28) • MSN program spring 2017 – 88.9% (n=24/27) • DNP program spring 2017 – 100% (n=2/2) • ASR program – 93% (n=14/15) • DMS program – 100% (n=2/2) • NMT program – 100% (n=2/2) 	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target in the future, Allen College will continue to offer a variety of service and service-learning opportunities both within and outside of the academic curriculums. For the 2017-2018 academic year, increase the target to 90% from the current 50%. (12/19/2017)</p>

Admin - Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership

AU Outcome: CELL 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLS program – 87.5% (n=7/8) • Public health program – 100% (n=3/3) • Dental hygiene program – 100% (n= 2/2) (12/19/2017)	

AU Outcome: CELL 2.1

Alumni will demonstrate community service

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni survey item: How many hours of community service have you been involved in during the past 12 months? Target: 60% of alumni responding to the survey report performing at least 25 hours of community service each year. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No The response rate for all of the alumni surveys for all programs remains low. This results in inadequate data to draw conclusions. However, there is a trend of recent graduates reporting less than the 25+ hours of community service that we have as our target. 17% (7/41) alumni responding to the 6 month graduate survey reported completing 25+ hours of community service during the past 12 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BSN program – 18.75% (3) 25+ hours of community service, n=16 • MSN program – 30% (3) 25+ hours of community service, n=10 • DNP program – 100% (1) 25+ hours of community service, n=1 • ASR program – 0% (0) 25+ hours of community service, n=8 • DMS program – question not asked on alumni survey • NMT program - 0% (0) 25+ hours of community service, n=1 • MLS program - 0% (0) 25+ hours of community service, n=5 • Public health program – 0% (0) 25+ hours of community service, n=2 (12/19/2017)	<p>Action: In order to meet this target in the future, the target will be changed to be 60% of alumni report performing at least 9 hours of service during the past 12 months. This change in the target will be monitored to determine if Allen College graduates are volunteering after graduation. (12/19/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: CELL 2.2

Promote leadership development through community service

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Survey - Exit Survey: Participation</p>		

Admin - Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership

AU Outcome: CELL 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>in on- and off-campus committees, organizations, or projects. Target: 60% of the respondents report participation in either on- or off-campus committees, organizations, or projects. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Additional questions were not added to any of the surveys for the 2016-2017 academic year. There were 118 of 230 respondents (51.3%) who report participation in on- or off-campus activities while attending Allen College.</p> <p>Program Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerated BSN summer 2016 – 42% (n=15/36) • Accelerated BSN fall 2016 – 66.7% (n=12/18) • Upper division BSN fall 2016 – 80% (n=16/20) • LPN-BSN fall 2016 – 0% (n=0/16) • Upper division BSN spring 2017 – 84.1% (n=37/44) • MSN program summer 2016 – 71% (n=5/7) • MSN program fall 2016 – 39.3% (n=11/28) • MSN program spring 2017 – 18.5% (n=5/27) • DNP program spring 2017 – 100% (n=2/2) • ASR program – 67% (n=10/15) • DMS program – 50% (n=1/2) • NMT program – 100% (n=2/2) • MLS program – 25% (n=2/8) • Public health program – 0% (n=0/3) • Dental hygiene program – 0% (n= 0/2) (12/19/2017) 	<p>Action: To meet this target in the future, the CELL committee as well as the CIRE, deans, and program chairs will work together to re-word this question and clarify exactly what the question is asking. (12/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Honors Program and Service Learning course rosters Target: 20% of each cohort in the upper division pre-licensure BSN program enrolls in the service honors program or a service learning elective. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Service honors as well as travel courses that provided service-learning opportunities were offered during the 2016-2017 academic year. 37% (20/54) upper division pre-licensure BSN students enrolled in service honors or a service-learning elective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2017 cohort – 38% (8/21) enrolled in service honors program or service-learning elective • Spring 2018 cohort – 36.3% (12/33) enrolled in service honors program or service-learning elective • Other cohorts have yet to all enroll in their nursing elective. (12/19/2017) 	<p>Action: Based on the trends from the previous years, the target will be increased to 35% of each cohort in the upper division pre-licensure BSN program enrolls in the service honors program or a service-learning elective. Continue to offer a variety of service-learning options for electives for the upper division nursing students. (12/19/2017)</p>

Admin - Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership

AU Outcome: CELL 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Survey - Exit Survey: Managing or leading an organization. Target: 25% of the respondents report managing or leading an organization. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No An additional question was not added to the exit survey as it was discussed that it may be difficult to get students involved in on and off campus activities in general, and very difficult to become leaders within those organizations. 15.4% reported managing or leading an organization (n=35/228). College wide results include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerated BSN summer 2016 – 11% (n=4/36) • Accelerated BSN fall 2016 – 5.6% (n=1/18) • Upper division BSN fall 2016 – 35% (n=7/20) • LPN-BSN program fall 2016 – 6.3% (n=1/16) • Upper division BSN spring 2017 – 18.2% (n=8/44) • MSN program summer 2016 – 14% (n=1/7) • MSN program fall 2016 – 14.3% (n=4/28) • MSN program spring 2017 – 11.1% (n=3/27) • DNP program spring 2017 – 50% (n=1/2) • ASR program – 27% (n=4/15) • DMS program – question not included on survey • NMT program - 0% (n=0/2) • MLS program – 12.5% (n=1/8) • Public health program – 0% (n=0/3) • Dental hygiene program – 0% (n= 0/2) (12/19/2017) 	<p>Action: These results are lower than the results from the 2015-2016 academic year. Again, if participation in on and off campus activities is low, it will also be harder for many of these students to be leaders if they are not even participating. When looking at the question related to participation, approximately 50% of the students are participating, and if the target is 25% are leading, this would equate to half of the students who participate are serving in leadership roles. Thus, it would be reasonable to decrease this target to 15% for the 2017-2018 academic year. (12/19/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: CELL 3.1

Collaborate with partners in the community

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Sign up sheets from service days Target: 15% of students attend college-wide community service events yearly. Timeframe: Annually</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 18.8 % (117/622 students) participated in the college-wide community service event this academic year. There may be some duplicate students counted in this number, as only numbers were collected, not student names to check for duplication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2016 - 65 students representing the BSN and MS in OT programs participated in 	<p>Action: In order to assure that we are accurately reporting this data, student names will be compiled for each service day during the 2017-2018 academic year so that the number that is reported next year</p>

Admin - Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership

AU Outcome: CELL 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>the Fall 2016 Service Day. Agencies served included NE Iowa Food Bank, Cedar Valley Arboretum, House of Hope, Salvation Army, and St. Vincent DePaul</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spring 2017 – 52 students participated in this activity serving Love, Inc., House of Hope, Salvation Army, Cedar Valley Arboretum, NE Iowa Foodbank, St. Vincent DePaul, and UnityPoint-Allen Hospital. Two days were offered. <p>(12/19/2017)</p>	<p>avoids duplication of students from semester to semester. (12/19/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - Services stories posted on social media Target: Featured service stories on social media will reach 1,500 people and have 15 “likes”. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Center for Engagement, Learning, and Leadership Committee/CELL coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NU445T posting about service trip to Denver, CO - Reach: 1,164 and Likes: 18. ASRO highway clean up - Reach: 1,155 and Likes: 27. Health Fair at Mt. Carmel Baptist Church- Reach: 4,142 and Likes: 53. Salvation Army Waterloo (students helping to paint)- Reach: 3,466 and Likes: 70 <p>(12/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target in the future, the CELL will continue to publicize service events and activities that are happening on the campus. The goal will be to increase the number of events that are publicized which may help to continue to meet this target in the future. (12/19/2017)</p>

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM10.0

Recognize Student Scholarship

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - GPA criteria recorded in CAMS Target: All students who meet honor criteria are recognized Timeframe: Each semester</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes As during the 2015-2016 academic year, all students who qualified for honors were recognized, which is the same as last academic year. Students will continue to be recognized per polices. (05/10/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor the honors policies and recognize students per policy. (05/10/2017)</p>

Admin - Enrollment Management

AU Outcome: EM10.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Responsible Parties: Registrar		

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - RA:135 Community Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 135 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No 2016: 72% (n=13) Previous data 2015: 92.56% (n=16) 2014: 97.94% (n=17) 2013: 99.28 (n=16) 2012= 99.41% (n=17) 2011=99% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The service learning paper accounts for 10% of the course grade. One student did not submit a paper and received a zero, which decreased the overall average score for this cohort. Many of the students did not follow the assignment instructions and did not earn the highest points possible. Of the students who completed the assignment, the overall average was score was 78.41%. Multiple students performed service learning independently through a variety of organizations. Students have demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism through their service learning activities. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - RA: 265 Community</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: One student was late</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee	Target Met: Yes 2016: 93.4% (N=15) Previous data 2015: 82.47% (n=17) 2014: 99.13% (n=15) 2013: 97.59% (n=17). 2012: 100% (n=17) 2011: 98% (n=17) (06/21/2017)	submitting the assignment and received a grade reduction. Some students missed points for grammar and punctuation errors. Overall, the service learning reflection papers demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

Students will practice professionalism

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13 Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level I- Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 average score was 3.6 (N=13) Previous data FA 2015=3.83 (n=16) FA 2014=3.80 (n=17) (06/21/2017)	Action: This year student's scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to practice professionalism. (06/21/2017)

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 average score was 3.96 (n=15) Previous data SP 2016 3.98 (n=17) SP 2015 3.91 (n=15) SP 2014 3.95 (n=17) SP 2013 3.98 (n=16) SP 2012 3.9 (n=16) 2010-2011 3.85 (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight increase in organization of assignments and a decrease in initiative and ethical and professional behaviors. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to integrate leadership skills and practice professionalism in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.1

Students will practice written communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester AC306 Professional Communications</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Academic Paper Assignment</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Didactic - DH400 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Fall Semester Written Assignment of Course Review</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 20 points for 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students did a good job writing and presenting how to relate, communicate, teach, and learn from various learning styles and preferences.</p> <p>Will continue with this benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester AC306 Issues in Healthcare Presentation</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/ Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical - DH410</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Preceptor</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee	Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. The average score was 2/2 (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx	evaluations were very positive regarding effective oral communication skills. Continue to use this tool and keep the benchmark the same. (06/06/2017)

AU Outcome: DHO 3.1

Students will demonstrate critical thinking when individualizing patient needs.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - DH300 Intro to Oral Research Fall Semester Exercise 1.1, Ch. 1: Intro to Gail Exercise 2.1- EBDM worksheet Part A Target: Average score of >85% on assignment Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)	Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)
SL: Didactic - DH420 Advanced Dental Hygiene Care Planning Spring Semester Module 3, Case Study E Discussion Post: Tobacco Cessation Target: Average score of >85%. Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)	Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Director/ HS Curriculum Committee		

AU Outcome: DHO 3.2

Students will demonstrate ability to practice critical thinking.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Summer Semester Final overview presentation-Rubric available Target: Average score of 85% or better Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>Target Met- the average score was 99%, n=2.</p> <p>(06/06/2017) Related Documents: DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Final Project Rubric.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: The students demonstrated critical thinking in their final presentation by considering the population’s needs, barriers, and contributing factors that affect oral health.</p> <p>Continue to use the final presentation to evaluate the ability to practice critical thinking.</p> <p>Keep benchmark the same. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Course review-Rubric available.</p> <p>Target: Average score of 85% or better Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>Target Met-The average score was 99.5%, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Ch11 Educational Plan Example.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Students demonstrated critical thinking by developing an evaluation plan for learner outcomes on an educational topic of their choice. Students were responsible for data gathering, an evaluation period, data analysis and interpretation, and degree to which interventions were successful.</p> <p>Will continue to use this tool and</p>

College Goal 4 - Promote a commitment by all members of the Allen College community to lives of service to others.

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		keep the benchmark. (06/06/2017)

AU Outcome: DHO 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - DH460 Management and Leadership In Dental Hygiene Spring Semester Employer Evaluation question number 4 Target: Average score >3 (0-5 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Three students were enrolled in this course, n=3. (06/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Employer surveys have not been distributed, this is the first class to graduate.</p> <p>Employer surveys will be sent out in Spring 2018. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation of Student question Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 2 (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Students were successful in developing leadership throughout their practicum.</p> <p>Will continue to use this tool and keep this benchmark next year. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 4.2

Students will practice professionalism.

Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor evaluation of student question Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. The average score was 2 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students practiced professionalism at their practicum site by displaying and mentoring students and patients at the site. Will continue to use this measurement tool. Will keep the same benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Summer Semester Preceptor evaluation of student Target: Average score >1. (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students were able to practice professionalism while they were educating and/or caring their chosen vulnerable population. Feedback was great. Keep this tool and maintain benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

Students will successfully obtain patient history

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:408 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: As there was a change in the form and the Likert scale and</p>

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses ≥ 4 Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester Responsible Parties: DMS:408 Course Instructor/Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Fall 2016 avg 4.71. trend is consistent with previous years (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>to establish a trend, there will be no changes to measurement tool or benchmark. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Lab - Ultrasound Imaging 2 Lab Target: Each student will receive score $\geq 80\%$ Timeframe: Didactic Level Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 100 % of students passed. Results are consistent with results of previous cohorts when data obtained in Fall DMS 207 course Fall 2015 100% Fall 2014 100% Fall 2013- 100% Fall 2012 - 100% Fall 2011- 100%</p> <p>(09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As this tool has achieved benchmark for last six years, proposal for 2017-2018 is to identify a new outcome and measurement tool for this goal. DMS 300 Patient Care offered in Spring 2018 will be an opportune platform for new outcome /tool. (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Lab - DMS:207 Lab Practical Target: 100 % of students will pass lab practical Timeframe: Didactic Level Fall Semester Responsible Parties: DMS:207 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Fall 2015 100% of students passed. The trend is consistent with results of previous years. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As this tool has achieved benchmark for last six years, proposal for 2017-2018 is to identify a new outcome and measurement tool for this goal. DMS 300 Patient Care offered in Spring 2018 will be an opportune platform for new outcome /tool. (06/07/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

AU Outcome: DMS 4.2

Students will practice professionalism in the clinical lab setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:408 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,2,10-13,15-19</p> <p>Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DMS 408 Instructor/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Results: For the fall 2016 semester, the student’s average score is 4.86 (n=5). Scores remain high. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: To determine consistency of trend, no change in measurement tool for another cycle of data. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:409 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,2,10-13,15-19</p> <p>Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level - Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DMS 408 Instructor/ Program Faculty/HS</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Results: For Spring 2017 avg 4.83. Results remain consistently high over the last 4 years (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: To determine consistency of trend, no change in measurement tool for another cycle of data (06/07/2017)</p>

College Goal 4 - Promote a commitment by all members of the Allen College community to lives of service to others.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Curriculum Committee		

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 3.1

Students will demonstrate organizational and systems leadership to advance quality improvement and systems change.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 710: Leading a Health Sciences Learning Organization – Strategic Planning Project</p> <p>Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 80%</p> <p>Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2015, 2018, etc.)</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 3.1 Required formats to document

Students will use required formats to accurately document intervention.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - OT 601 - Treatment Note</p> <p>Target: Minimum of 80% on</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Of the 14 students in the cohort, all 14 successfully met the minimum 80% on their note. The</p>	<p>Action: This is the first year that the program was evaluated using this measure. (09/28/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 3.1 Required formats to document

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
documentation note Timeframe: When course taught (2nd Year, e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee	students averaged 18.89 out of a possible 20 points and the average percentage was 94.5% on the assignment. (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 5.pdf Outcome 5-2.pdf Outcome 5-3.pdf	

AU Outcome: MS in OT 3.2 Ethical Principles

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply ethical principles in decision-making.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - OT 509 – Ethics Quiz Target: When course taught (1st Year, e.g., Fall 2016) Timeframe: Minimum score of 80% on quiz Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Of the 19 students in this cohort, all 19 met the minimum of 80% or more on the quiz. The average score was a 48.54 out of 50 points. The average score was a 97.68%. (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 6.pdf	Action: The current quiz is being reviewed for revisions to better align with the format of the national exam. (09/28/2017)

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 3.1

Students will maintain competency in the laboratory field of study

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - Annotated Bibliographies – MLS 426: Evidence-Based Laboratory Medicine	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 13 students	Action: Students were required to use the evidence based practice (EBP) process to complete

Program (HS) - Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

AU Outcome: MLS 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: 75% of students will receive an average score of >80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS APG Committee</p>	<p>Earned an average of 43.3/45 available points = 96.2% (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: MLS 426 Annotated Bibliographies - Spring 2017.docx</p>	<p>annotated bibliographies on two pieces of evidence that related to a student-selected topic. Skills learned throughout the course culminated in a final project that encompassed the entire EBP process. Students were provided with a list of expectations along with a breakdown of how points were earned to help guide project development. This course was developed to meet the needs of learners with varying backgrounds in research to show how the EBP process is used in the laboratory setting. Some students in this group chose topics that relate to their workplace and were encouraged to share the results of their project with their employer. Continue to monitor and consider raising the target. (09/08/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 3.1

Students will participate in a service learning project

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - NMT 404: Service Learning Evaluation</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes</p>	<p>Action: The students' scores on the service learning project were</p>

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Students will have an average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Spring Semester Responsible Parties: NMT 404 Course Instructor/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>For 2016-2017, the average score for the service learning evaluation is 100%. For 2015-2016, the average score for the service learning evaluation was 100%. For 2014-2015, the average score was 95%. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>maximum for the assignment and the spring 2017 results were unchanged from spring 2016. The students completed a pre- and post- journal that was a critical reflection of their participation in a service learning project. (09/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - CELL Community Service Hours Worksheet Target: Students will have a minimum of 5 hours of community service Timeframe: Fall Semester Responsible Parties: NMT Program Chair/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No In the Fall 2016 semester, 50% (1 of 2) students completed 5 or more community service hours. In the Fall 2015 semester, 67% (2 of 3) students completed 5 or more community service hours. In the fall 2014 semester, 100% (3 of 3) students completed 5 or more community service hours. (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Like the 2015 cohort, the 2016 cohort of students did not complete the necessary service hours and the results were unchanged from fall 2016 to fall 2015. When investigating why one student did not complete the necessary hours, he stated that he works 30+ hours per week and did not have time to complete community service. This assessment is intended to show that students are demonstrating a commitment to lifelong excellence. The student received information about CELL during orientation and their first week in class. Since the NMT program is suspended for the 2016-2017 academic year, no changes are recommended. (09/21/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 3.1

Student will be able to recognizes the role of cultural factors in the delivery of public health services

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - PH: 420 Final report Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, two students taking the course received average of 81%. For fall 2015, five students took the class. They earned an average of 56.4/60 points = 94 %. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The drop in score was likely do to a change in instructor and course materials. Additionally, the small number of students in the course make it difficult to gauge the quality of the results. This measure will be used again and compared to year-over-year results. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 3.2

Student should be able to describes the role of governmental and non-governmental organizations in the delivery of community health services

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 410 Final exam Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Faculty Org. committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, four students took the class and earned an average of 83.7% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, seven students took the class and earned an average of 94.71% (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes it difficult to predict future results. Additionally, the instructor, course text, and final text changed between academic years, making these results impossible to compare year-over-year. This measure will be revisited in the CAP for 2017-2018 academic year to create a more precise measurement. (06/20/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 7.0 Professional Role

Model the professional role.

Outcome Status: Active

Start Date: 08/01/2014

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How well BSN education prepared you to model the professional role (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their BSN education prepared them well or very well to model the professional role. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: poorly = 1, well = 6, very well = 8; well or very well = 93%. Target met again this year, but at a lower rate than last year. Must consider low response rate. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: well 8%, very well 92% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How well BSN graduate models the professional role (1= very poorly, 2 = poorly, 3 = well, 4 = very well, NA = not applicable (e.g., does not perform outcome, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate models the professional role well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: well 40%, very well 60%= 100% well or very well. consistent with previous survey results. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: well 25%, very well 75% (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Consider alternative means of measuring employers' perceptions of graduates' performance of program outcomes, given low response rate. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - NU480 Clinical Evaluation Tool Professional Behavior clinical competencies Target: 100% of students will receive "S" rating for Professional Behavior clinical competencies on clinical</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes During clinical orientation faculty reviewed the clinical evaluation tool with all students. FA16 and SP17 – 100% of students received an "S" rating on the clinical evaluation tool related to the professionals behavior clinical competencies (11/16/2017) Related Documents:</p>	<p>Action: The clinical evaluation tool will be reviewed during clinical orientation to orient the students to specifically what they will be evaluated on regarding professional behaviors.</p>

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 7.0 Professional Role

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
evaluation tool. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee	Outcome 7 NU 480 Clinical Evaluation Tool.docx	(11/16/2017)
SL: Clinical evaluation tool - NU485C Clinical Evaluation Tool Professional Behavior clinical competencies Target: 100% of students will receive "S" rating for Professional Behavior clinical competencies on clinical evaluation tool. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes During clinical orientation faculty reviewed the clinical evaluation tool with all students. Faculty made contact with all preceptors to ensure that they did not have any questions about the use of the evaluation tool or concerns with the students professional behaviors. Fall 2016 - 100% , Summer, 2016 - 100%, Fall 2016-LPN - 100% met the target (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 7 NU 485C Clinical Evaluation Tool.docx	Action: In order to continue to meet this target in the future, course faculty will instruct students that they will be evaluated on their professional behavior by their clinical preceptor. (11/16/2017)
SL: Didactic - NU 480 & NU 485C Clinical Reflection #1 Target: 100% of students will achieve at least 75% on Clinical Reflection #1. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: BSN Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: No Students were required to address the nurse's role of patient advocate in Clinical Reflection #1. Summer 2016 - 100%, Fall 2016 - 95%, Fall 2016-LPN - 100% met this target (11/16/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 7 NU 485C Clinical Reflection 1.docx	Action: This assignment has been revised and no longer requires students to discuss the nurses' role as patient advocate. Rather than limiting the role to advocate, students will be able to describe the role that that they fulfilled during the clinical experience. (11/16/2017)
AD: Survey - Alumni Survey Item: How often in current professional nursing practice you model the professional role (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 graduates: Some of the time = 2, most of the time = 13; Some or most of the time = 15 (100%). Target exceeded again, but must consider low response rate. Survey of 2014-2015 graduates: most of the time 100% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf	Action: Given low response rate, responses may not reflect cohort of graduates. Consider alternative methods of assessing alumni perceptions of the extent to which education prepared them to demonstrate program outcome (e.g., online focus groups via Skype or GoTo Meeting). (10/05/2017)

College Goal 4 - Promote a commitment by all members of the Allen College community to lives of service to others.

Program (Nursing) - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

AU Outcome: BSN 7.0 Professional Role

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>report that they model the professional role some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice . Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>AD: Survey - Employer Survey Item: How often BSN graduate models the professional role (1= not at all, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, NA = not applicable, e.g., not working in a BSN nursing role, or outcome not applicable to current role). Target: 75% of respondents will report that BSN graduate models the professional role some or most of the time in current professional nursing practice. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: CIRE, Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of employers of 2015-2016 graduates: some of the time 2, most of the time = 3. Some or most of the time = 5 (100%). Target met again. Consider low response rate. Survey of employers of 2014-2015 graduates: some of the time 12.5%, most of the time 87.5% (10/05/2017) Related Documents: REPORT BSN Employer 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Employer survey response rate is low, most likely due to low graduate response rate. Consider alternative means of identifying employer perceptions of the how often and how well graduates demonstrate program outcomes (e.g., method that does not rely on graduates to provide employers with survey). (10/05/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

Assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Summative Evaluation - Assume</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor and</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations</p> <p>Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually upon program completion Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing /Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes 100% (n=2) of DNP students achieved an acceptable level or above on this criterion of DNP Summative Evaluation. Target was achieved for 2015-2016 as well, with 2 of 2 students meeting all criteria scored on the summative evaluation form. (05/05/2017)</p>	<p>likely use this target as the number of DNP graduates remains low. These two students were in only the fourth graduating DNP class and the total number of grads is only 8 as of May, 2017. (05/05/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - NU750 Leadership and Collaboration Service-Learning Project assignment Target: 100% of students will achieve 80% or higher on the Service-Learning Project assignment Timeframe: Each time course is offered Responsible Parties: Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 6 of 6 (100%) of students met this target during the Summer 2016 course offering. This is the first time an assignment-specific target was established this outcome, so a trend is not applicable. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to meet this target with all groups next year, course faculty will provide opportunities for collaboration throughout the course, in addition to the assigned service learning project. Providing examples of where the service learning project might be implemented may assist students with realistic settings for the summer. In addition, providing more opportunities for student dialogue among peers regarding the service learning project would be beneficial. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduate perceptions of how well their DNP education prepared them to assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported being "very well" prepared by Allen College DNP education to perform outcome. Results are consistent with previous survey.</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>individuals, families, and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that their DNP education prepared them to assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Both respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates perceived that their DNP education prepared them very well to assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how well DNP graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report that DNP graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Survey: Graduates perceptions of how often they assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 DNP graduates (1/2 completed survey): Respondent reported performing the outcome most of the time. These results are an improvement compared to previous alumni survey.</p>	<p>Action: Target met, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they</p>

Program (Nursing) - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

AU Outcome: DNP 6.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>individuals, families, and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that they assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Respondents (n = 2) to the survey of 2013-2014 (n = 2) and 2014-2015 (n = 1) DNP graduates reported they assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations rarely (n = 1) and most of the time (n = 1). (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT DNP 2015-2016 Alumni.pdf</p>	<p>perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DNP Alumni Employer Survey: Employer perceptions of how often DNP graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that graduates assume leadership roles in interprofessional collaboration to improve the health outcomes of individuals, families, and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee/CIRE</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Employer survey not conducted because employer perceptions of DNP graduates' performance of program outcomes will be obtained in a future focus group. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 3.0

Apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Graduate Project Evaluation Form - Item #3 Apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive outcomes Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 63 of 63 (100%) of students achieved an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation. This is consistent with previous outcomes and as expected for an end-of-program project that is guided by a faculty preceptor and approved prior to the final presentation. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target for all students, graduate project faculty advisers will maintain close working relationships with students as they plan, implement, and evaluate their evidence-based practice/quality improvement projects. This should assure a high quality presentation and summary paper at the end of the process. This is still perceived to be a valuable measure of student attainment of this outcome; maintain measure and target. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (30%) or very well (70%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How often MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report applying quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported perform this outcome some of the time (30%) or most of the time (70%). These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017) Related Documents: REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (very poorly, poorly, well, very well). Target: 75% of respondents will report MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes well or very well. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSN 3.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates apply quality principles to promote patient safety and positive individual and systems outcomes some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - Clinical Evaluations Target: 90% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on all criteria on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: MSN Clinical Coordinator / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% of students in NU600C, NU605C, NU610C, 612C, 615C, 620C, 625C, 635C, 675C, 680C, and 685C achieved an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. In NU600C, 98% of students (40 of 41) achieved this target. These data are consistent with findings from the 2015-2016 academic year when 100% of students in clinical courses also achieved (1) or better for the "Critical Thinking" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. As indicated in the action plan, faculty members have documented contact with students and preceptors throughout the clinical courses to evaluate progress toward established outcomes. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Will maintain contact with preceptors throughout individual precepted clinical experiences to evaluate progress toward outcomes. Also note that the single student in NU600C who failed to achieve the target dropped the course, but did not do so by the established deadline so received a failing grade and related failure to achieve target for clinical evaluation criteria. For this reason, it is also recommended that the target be re-worded to state, "90% of students who complete the clinical experience achieve an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criterion on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. (02/02/2018)</p>

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

Collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations.

Outcome Status: Active

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Graduate Project Evaluation Form - Item #7 Collaborate within interprofessional teams.</p> <p>Target: 100% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Assistant Dean, Graduate Nursing / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>63 of 63 (100%) of students achieved an acceptable level (1) on both paper and presentation. This is consistent with previous outcomes and as expected for an end-of-program project that is guided by a faculty preceptor and approved prior to the final presentation. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: In order to continue to meet this target for all students, graduate project faculty advisers will maintain close working relationships with students as they plan, implement, and evaluate their evidence-based practice/quality improvement projects. This should assure a high quality presentation and summary paper at the end of the process. This is still perceived to be a valuable measure of student attainment of this outcome; maintain measure and target. (02/02/2018)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey-- How well MSN graduates perceive that their MSN education prepared them to collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report feeling well or very well prepared to collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported that the MSN program prepared them well (70%) or very well (30%) to perform this outcome. These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Survey--</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: Target exceeded, but</p>

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>How often MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report collaborating within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations some or most of the time.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Survey of 2015-2016 MSN graduates: 100% of respondents (n = 10) reported perform this outcome some of the time (50%) or most of the time (50%). These results are consistent with the previous alumni survey. (10/19/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>REPORT MSN Alumni Survey 2015-2016 Grads.pdf</p>	<p>response rate low. Consider alternative means of measuring graduates' perceptions of how often they perform the outcome (e.g., focus groups using Go-to-meeting or Skype). Consider importance and relevance of measuring how often graduates perform the outcome. (10/19/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How well employers perceive that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (very poorly, poorly, well, very well).</p> <p>Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations well or very well.</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - MSN Alumni Employer Survey--How often employers perceive that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations (not at all, rarely, some of the time, most of the time). Target: 75% of respondents will report that MSN graduates collaborate within inter-professional teams to manage and improve health care services for individuals, families and populations some or most of the time. Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: Evaluation & Study Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA The employer survey was not administered. Key stakeholders will be surveyed fall 2017 to identify their perceptions of Allen College MSN graduates' performance of the program outcomes. (10/19/2017)</p>	
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - Clinical Evaluations Target: 90% of students achieve an acceptable level (1) on all criteria on a scale of 0-2 Timeframe: Annually Responsible Parties: MSN Clinical Coordinator / Graduate Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 100% of students in NU600C, NU605C, NU610C, 612C, 615C, 620C, 625C, 635C, 675C, 680C, and 685C achieved an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. In NU600C, 98% of students (40 of 41) achieved this target. These data are consistent with findings from the 2015-2016 academic year when 100% of students in clinical courses also achieved (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criteria on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. As indicated in the action plan, faculty members have documented contact with students and preceptors throughout the clinical courses to evaluate progress toward established outcomes. (02/02/2018)</p>	<p>Action: Will maintain contact with preceptors throughout individual precepted clinical experiences to evaluate progress toward outcomes. Also note that the single student in NU600C who failed to achieve the target dropped the course, but did not do so by the established deadline so received a failing grade and related failure to achieve target for clinical evaluation criteria. For this reason, it is also recommended that the target be re-worded to state, "90% of students who complete the</p>

College Goal 4 - Promote a commitment by all members of the Allen College community to lives of service to others.

Program (Nursing) - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)

AU Outcome: MSNO 7.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		clinical experience achieve an acceptable level (1) or better for the "Safety/Outcomes" criterion on the Faculty Clinical Evaluation Tool. (02/02/2018)

College Goal 5 - Adopt management practices that demonstrate outstanding stewardship of all resources to our constituents.

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 3.0

Diverse representation in all college materials and buildings (ODS Goal 3: Welcoming and inclusive campus climate--Events, messages, symbols, and values of the campus make it a welcoming and inclusive environment for all students, faculty, staff, and members of the broader community.)

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Inclusivity Assessment (i.e., Report of advertising, marketing materials, website, pamphlets, etc. to ensure they promote inclusivity) Target: 50% of materials (e.g., advertising, marketing material, website, and images) promote inclusivity. Timeframe: Year 3 Responsible Parties: DIS Coordinator</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes The Allen College website, web pages, and all print material promote inclusivity by including diverse images of in race, age, and gender in more than 50% of the colleges print material and web photos. The ODS highlights underrepresented students by having a Student of the Month from a diverse background four months or each semester. The college advertises in diverse publications each year.</p> <p>This is the first time for measurement of this goal. We will compare this report at the next reporting period. (09/28/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The ODS will continue to monitor the promotion of diverse images in college print media, website and social media. The ODS will ensure the college will continue to subscribe to diverse magazines such as Minority Nurse, and Diverse Issues in Higher Education Resources for the benefit of faculty, staff, and students. The college will continue to advertise in diverse publications locally and regionally to reach a wide array of lowans. (09/28/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DIS 4.0

Offer programs and activities that promote academic success, retention, and graduation of underrepresented students.

(ODS Goal 4: Support diverse students . . .)

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Report - Internal - Retention and graduation rates of underrepresented students [Report of retention and graduation rates of diverse students for all programs] Target: Retention and graduation rates are equal to those of the College. Timeframe: Year 1 and Year 3</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes These numbers represent the latest available data.</p> <p>Of the 1 minority accelerated students in the summer 2014 cohort, all students graduated. (100%) Of the 4 male accelerated students in the summer 2014 cohort, all 4 students graduated (100%)</p>	<p>Action: The ODS will continue to offer Career Day and Summer Nurse Camp programming which contribute to historically underrepresented students learning about opportunities in Nursing and Health Care Programs. The ODS will continue to attend</p>

Admin - Diversity and Inclusion Services

AU Outcome: DIS 4.0

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: DIS Coordinator</p>	<p>Of the 39 accelerated students in the summer 2014 cohort, 38 students graduated. (97%)</p> <p>Of the 3 minority LPN-BSN students in the fall 2012 cohort, 2 students graduated. (67%)</p> <p>There were no male students in the fall 2012 LPN-BSN cohort. (NA)</p> <p>Of the 20 LPN-BSN students in the fall 2012 cohort, 16 students graduated. (80%)</p> <p>Of the 0 minority upper division students in the spring 2013 cohort, NA student graduated (NA%)</p> <p>Of the 4 male upper division students in the spring 2013 cohort, 3 students graduated (75%)</p> <p>Of the 57 upper division students in the spring 2013 cohort, 48 students graduated (84%)</p> <p>Of the 0 minority upper division students in the fall 2013 cohort, NA student graduated (NA%)</p> <p>Of the 1 male upper division students in the fall 2013 cohort, 1 students graduated (100%)</p> <p>Of the 17 upper division students in the fall 2013 cohort, 17 students graduated (100%)</p> <p>26/31 minority students were retained from 2015 to 2016 for a total retention rate of 84%</p> <p>54/59 male students were retained from 2015 to 2016 for a total retention rate of 92%</p> <p>579/611 students were retained from 2015 to 2016 for a total retention rate of 95%</p> <p>Compared to Year 1 reporting these results demonstrate a slight decrease in the actual retention and graduation rates of underrepresented students. However, some of the decrease is attributed to the fact that we had larger numbers of underrepresented students enrolled in the program as compared to the previous reporting year. In the Year 1 (2013-2014) report we had a total of 24 minorities and we increased that number to 31 in Year 3 (2015-2016). In Year 1 (2013-2015) we enrolled 40 male students and retained 38 while in Year 3 (2015-2016) we increased our male enrollment to 59, which is nearly double the number of men enrolled in Year 1, and we graduated 54 of them. Total Retention rates for minority and male students were increase in Year 3 (2015-2016) as compared to Year 1 (2013-2014) which accounts for the overall goal being met.</p> <p>(09/28/2017)</p>	<p>local information sessions in churches, businesses, and community agencies to share information on Nursing and Allied Health Care careers with potential students and their families. The ODS will continue to collaborate with the Student Services staff to reach out to underrepresented groups at recruiting events. The ODS will also continue to work with faculty to identify at-risk students early and get them engaged in services with the retention coordinator in an attempt to improve their overall performance and retention. The ODS coordinator will continue to offer mentor support to demonstrate the institutions commitment to each individuals students success (09/28/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.1

Students will practice proper radiation protection

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA: 135 Competency Testing/CCE Part II, numbers 5, 7, 9, 15, 17 Target: Average score of ≥ 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level 1-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Lab Instructor/ Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016 = 3.89 (n=13) Previous data 2015 = 3.95 (n=16) 2014 = 3.97 (n=17) (06/19/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to demonstrate clinical competence and practice proper radiation protection. Although there was a slight decline in the average score for 2016, this was a smaller cohort. A few students received a score of 2 on collimation and many received a score of 3. Benchmark Met. Continue to monitor. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA: 275 Final Clinical Competency Testing/ CCE Part II, numbers 5,7,9,15,17 Target: Average score of ≥ 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 = 3.96 (n=15) Previous data: 2016=3.96 (n=17) 2015=3.96 (n=15) 2014=3.99 (n=17) 2013=3.98 (n=16) 2012=3.97 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No significant change in the last 5 years. The students demonstrated clinical proficiency and competency in providing radiation protection. The program's curriculum integrates radiation protection concepts each semester. Each student's performance demonstrates that they are prepared for graduation. Continue to keep this assessment due to variation in the type of patient, and the fact that it is evaluated by the clinical instructor.</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 1.2

Students will apply correct positioning skills

Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 1.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 145 Certification Testing/ Part I, numbers 3,12,14,15</p> <p>Target: Average score of >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2017 = 4 (n=12)</p> <p>Benchmark/Target met.</p> <p>2016 = 3.96 (n=16)</p> <p>2015=3.79 (n=17)</p> <p>2014=3.86 (n=15)</p> <p>2013=3.9 (n=17)</p> <p>2012=3.87 (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to exceed benchmark. The students were able to apply correct positioning skills. The students are demonstrating knowledge of positioning in relation to their level of placement in the ASR program. Faculty would like to continue with this assessment as certification testing is completed at various clinical sites and with different clinical instructors. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 265 Certification Testing/Part I, numbers 3,12,14,15</p> <p>Target: Average score of >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016=3.97(n=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>2015=3.99 (n=17)</p> <p>2014= 3.96 (n=15)</p> <p>2013= 3.96 (n = 17)</p> <p>2012= 3.99 (n=17)</p> <p>2011= 3.89 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Average scores exceed benchmark. Students demonstrated clinical competence by applying correct positioning skills. This is the final semester that certifications are completed in the ASR Program. Beginning in FA17, the program faculty will distribute a list of exams the Clinical Instructors can select for certifications. For example: C-spine with obliques will be included, but hand and foot will not. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

Students will demonstrate effective communication skills in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: This year student's scores</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/ Numbers 3, 6, 10,11</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: Yes Fall 2016 average score was 3.56 (N=13) FA 2015=3.81(n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 3, 6,10,11</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale) Timeframe: Level II -Spring Semester Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Students achieved an average score of 3.95 (n=15) Benchmark met. SP 2016 3.97 (n=17) SP 2015 3.95 (n=15) SP 2014 3.97 (n=17) SP 2013 3.99 (n=16) SP 2012 3.94 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in interpersonal relationships and an increase in multicultural diversity. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline the evaluation process. Students</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		continue to use effective communication skills in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Competency Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016=3.92</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>2015= 3.99 (n=16)</p> <p>2014=3.98 (n=17)</p> <p>2013=3.94 (n=16)</p> <p>2012=3.96 (n=17)</p> <p>2011=3.93 (n=17)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students exceeded the benchmark. The students are demonstrating clinical communication skills reflective of their level in the program. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Final Clinical Competency Evaluation/ Part I – Number 4 Part III- Numbers 1,3,6-8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3.5 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructor/ Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2017=4(n=15)</p> <p>Benchmark met.</p> <p>2016=4 (n=17)</p> <p>2015=3.99 (n=15)</p> <p>2014=3.99 (n=17)</p> <p>2013=4 (n=16)</p> <p>2012=4 (n=16)</p> <p>2011=3.95 (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to exceed the benchmark. Students demonstrated excellent communication skills in the clinical setting. Many of this year’s final CCE’s were performed on patients that required multiple exams and extensive patient communication. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

Students will practice written communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=98.01% (n=16) 2014=98.2% (n=17) 2013= 99.1% (n=16) 2012= 98.98% (n=17) 2011= 98.51% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Areas of deduction on the reference page include; four students did not utilize proper spacing of the references, two students did not use the hanging indent, one student did not use the proper font size and one student neglected to center the word reference on the top of the reference page. Under the format portion of the evaluation form; four students did not have proper margins in their paper and one student did not meet the requirements of a two page paper. The research paper is discussed in detail on the first day of class with the instructor. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 97% (N=15) Previous data: 2015-97.5% (n=17) 2014-98.06% (n=15) 2013= 98.7% (n=17)</p>	<p>Action: This is the third year students wrote and presented two papers for this course. Fourteen of the thirty papers written had deductions on the reference page. Eight papers had errors with spacing, nine papers did not have</p>

College Goal 5 - Adopt management practices that demonstrate outstanding stewardship of all resources to our constituents.

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	(06/21/2017)	<p>the hanging indent, two students numbered their references, and five students did not correctly title the reference page. Four students had deductions in the format section for grammar and spelling. The instructor encouraged students to review their first paper presentation to give them the opportunity to improve on the second paper. Six of the fifteen students reviewed their first paper presentation and received feedback from the instructor. Five of these six students improved on their second paper. The requirements for these papers are discussed in detail the first day of class. The course instructor provided a link on APA review-Basic Formatting Rules which is located on the Allen College website to assist students with the research papers. Students continue to demonstrate effective written communication skills.</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

Students will demonstrate oral communication skills

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 2.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:258 Pathology Systems Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 258 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 95% (N=15) Previous data: 2015= 98.82% (n=17) 2014= 99.13%(n=15) 2013= 99.52% (n=17) 2012= 98.58% (n=17) 2011= 94.75% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were four papers that received deductions in the oral presentation portion of the evaluation. Two papers did not meet the length of presentation requirement of eight minutes. Four papers did not include all of the information needed during the presentation of the paper. For example, the discussion of exposure factors used during the procedure and one paper was not presented due to student absence. This could be the reason for the lower score in the oral presentation. Students continue to exhibit effective oral communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 115 Patient Care Presentation Target: Average score of >= 85% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 115 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Results: Fall 2016- 99% (N=13) Previous data: 2015=94.53% (n=16) 2014=100% (n=17) 2013= 99.75% (n=16) 2012= 99.6% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: There were just two papers with deductions in the oral presentation portion. One student read their paper very quickly and the other was deducted in the area of proper voice level. Students continue to demonstrate effective communication skills. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

Students will appropriately critique radiographic images

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
-----------------	----------------	----------------

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 255 Radiographic image analysis worksheets Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Summer Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 255 Course Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016: 90.19% (n=16) Previous data 2015: 89.88% (n=17) 2014: 89.13% (n= 15) spring level 1 2013: 93.76% (n= 17). spring level 1 2012: 88.8% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The course weight was changed from 10 to 25% this year to encourage student engagement. This year, a much improved 4th edition textbook was used and the workbook was optional. The 2014 cohort was the first cohort to complete this activity during RA255 summer level 2; previous years were part of the RA145 spring level 1 course. In 2013 and previous years, the online worksheets were unlimited attempts and not timed. 2014 the highest score on the worksheet was recorded. 2015 and 2016 the assignment was allotted two attempts, untimed, and the scores were averaged. A few students within this cohort did not submit scores of 75% or greater on a few of the assignments, but overall this cohort was engaged in radiograph critique. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA: 265 Radiographic image analysis worksheets Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II- Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes FA 2016 = 91.66% (n=15) Previous data FA 2015= 90.71% (n=17) FA 2014= 93.13% (n=15) FA 2013= 94.63% (n=17) FA 2012 = 96.7% (n=17) FA 2011 = 95.35%. (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Students continue to demonstrate their ability to critique radiographic images. No significant change when compared to last year. The overall average is lower than 2014 and all previous years, but in previous years the worksheets were unlimited attempts, not timed and the highest score was recorded. The</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		assignment parameters were changed in 2015 and subsequent years to allow only two untimed attempts and the scores were averaged. In FA 15 the course weight for the worksheets was increased from 15% to 20%. No changes recommended. (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.2

Students will demonstrate ability to practice critical thinking

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - RA:145 Scientific Exhibit Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Program Faculty/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 = 92.14% N= 7 posters (12 students) Previous data 2016 = 92.6% N= 10 posters (16 students) 2015 = 96.5%, N= 11 posters (17 students) 2014= 94%, N = 11 posters (15 students) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Scores for 2017 continue to demonstrate the student’s ability to practice critical thinking skills when developing their scientific exhibits. Average scores continue to exceed the benchmark of 80%. No changes recommended. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Standardized - RA: 203B Corectec exams Target: > 80% of the students will achieve a score of 70 or greater on one of the four exams. Timeframe: Level II- Spring Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 203B</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2017 (n=15), 93% of the students received a passing score after the 4th exam. Previous data 2016 (n=17) 100% 2015 (n=15) 93% 2014 (n=17) 76%</p>	<p>Action: One student did not achieve a 70 on any of the 4 Corectec exams. This year’s Corectec exams reflected the new ARRT content specs. Students continue to demonstrate their</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Course Instructor/HS Curriculum Committee	2013 (n=16) 100% 2012 (n=16) 100% (06/21/2017)	ability to practice critical thinking. The course instructor recommends that the benchmark be changed to state "will achieve a Corectec exam score of 70 or greater." (06/21/2017)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

Students will be able to critically think in the clinical setting

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:145 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: RA: 145 Course Instructor/HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>2016-2017: average score was 3.63 (N=12)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>Spring 2016 3.63(n=16)</p> <p>Spring 2015 3.67 (N-17)</p> <p>Spring 2014 3.62 (N=15)</p> <p>Spring 2013 3.82 (N=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight decline in the area of ability to follow directions. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. During the 2017 spring semester, two of the clinical sites were part of a pilot study utilizing Trajecsyst for the completion of student clinical evaluations. The pilot study was a success. The clinical instructors had no issues with completion of the student evaluations. Trajecsyst :allows the clinical instructors to complete the student evaluations online and then each student is</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 3.3

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		able to view their completed evaluation. During summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing Trajecsys to streamline the evaluation process. Students continue to use critical thinking skills in the clinical setting. Continue to monitor. (06/21/2017)
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:265 Clinical Instructor/ Preceptor Evaluations/Numbers 2,4,7,8</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3. (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II- Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 average score was 3.86 (N=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>Fall 2015=3.81(n=17)</p> <p>Fall 2014-3.75(n=15)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year student's scores increased in the areas of application of knowledge, self-image for Level in the ASR Program and composure and adaptability. There was a slight decline in ability to follow directions. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to be able to critically think in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Service - RA:135 Community</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p>	<p>Action: The service learning paper</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level I-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 135 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Target Met: No 2016: 72% (n=13) Previous data 2015: 92.56% (n=16) 2014: 97.94% (n=17) 2013: 99.28 (n=16) 2012= 99.41% (n=17) 2011=99% (n=16) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>accounts for 10% of the course grade. One student did not submit a paper and received a zero, which decreased the overall average score for this cohort. Many of the students did not follow the assignment instructions and did not earn the highest points possible. Of the students who completed the assignment, the overall average was score was 78.41%. Multiple students performed service learning independently through a variety of organizations. Students have demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism through their service learning activities. (06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Service - RA: 265 Community Service/Service Learning Evaluation Target: Average score of >= 80% Timeframe: Level II-Fall Semester Responsible Parties: RA: 265 Course Instructors/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes 2016: 93.4% (N=15) Previous data 2015: 82.47% (n=17) 2014: 99.13% (n=15) 2013: 97.59% (n=17). 2012: 100% (n-17) 2011: 98% (n=17) (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: One student was late submitting the assignment and received a grade reduction. Some students missed points for grammar and punctuation errors. Overall, the service learning reflection papers demonstrated leadership skills and professionalism. (06/21/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

Students will practice professionalism
Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:135 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level I- Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 average score was 3.6 (N=13)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>FA 2015=3.83 (n=16)</p> <p>FA 2014=3.80 (n=17)</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This year student's scores decreased in all of the areas. The drop in the scores could be due to a student that failed the RA 135 course or the lower number of students in the course compared to last year. The updated grading scale for the student evaluation and changes to the rating scale on the evaluation form that were implemented in fall 2014 continue to assist the clinical instructors/preceptors with clarification when evaluating students. Students continue to practice professionalism.</p> <p>(06/21/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - RA:275 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Numbers 1,5,9,12,13</p> <p>Target: Average score >= 3 (0-4 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: Level II-Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Spring 2017 average score was 3.96 (n=15)</p> <p>Previous data</p> <p>SP 2016 3.98 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2015 3.91 (n=15)</p> <p>SP 2014 3.95 (n=17)</p> <p>SP 2013 3.98 (n=16)</p> <p>SP 2012 3.9 (n=16)</p> <p>2010-2011 3.85 (06/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Student scores were very comparable to the previous year with a slight increase in organization of assignments and a decrease in initiative and ethical and professional behaviors. The rating scale on the evaluation form was updated to utilize the .5 instead of .25 increments to support the Trajecsyst software. The grading scale was updated to reflect this update. Beginning summer 2017, all student clinical evaluations will be completed utilizing the online software program Trajecsyst to streamline</p>

Program (HS) - Associate of Science in Radiography (ASR)

AU Outcome: ASR 4.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		the evaluation process. Students continue to integrate leadership skills and practice professionalism in the clinical setting. (06/21/2017)

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 1.1

Students will practice evidence-based decision making in the dental hygiene profession.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation number 4</p> <p>Target: Average score of > 1. (0-2 pt. scale)</p> <p>Timeframe: When course taught</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DH Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/ Health Sciences(HS) Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 20 points for 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students did a good job writing and presenting how to relate, communicate, teach, and learn from various learning styles and preferences.</p> <p>Will continue with this benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH450 Dental Hygiene Public Health Summer Semester Employer Evaluation question number 1</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: NA</p> <p>No data-have not sent survey yet. (06/06/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Employer Survey Form for 2017 BHS DH grads.docx</p>	<p>Action: Use tool to send to employers 6 months after first class graduates. (06/06/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 1.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Target: Average score of >3. (0-5 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>		

AU Outcome: DHO 1.2

Students will analyze research and apply evidence-based decision making in case planning.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH300 Introduction to Oral Health Research-Fall Semester Final Project-2 parts (paper & worksheet- parts A&F) Rubric available. Target: Student will earn a score of 85% or better. Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught until Fall 2017. No action plan would be expected. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan expected at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH420 Advanced Dental Hygiene Care Planning Spring Semester Module 6 Discussion Post HIV Case Study Target: Student will earn an overall grade score of 85% or better. Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 2.1

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.1

Students will practice written communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester AC306 Professional Communications Academic Paper Assignment</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH400 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Fall Semester Written Assignment of Course Review</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 20 points for 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students did a good job writing and presenting how to relate, communicate, teach, and learn from various learning styles and preferences.</p> <p>Will continue with this benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - AC306 Professional Communications Fall Semester AC306 Issues in Healthcare Presentation</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% Timeframe: When course taught</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: DH Course Instructor/ Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>		
<p>SL: Clinical - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester</p> <p>Preceptor Evaluation</p> <p>Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 2/2 (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Preceptor evaluations were very positive regarding effective oral communication skills.</p> <p>Continue to use this tool and keep the benchmark the same. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 3.1

Students will demonstrate critical thinking when individualizing patient needs.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH300 Intro to Oral Research Fall Semester Exercise 1.1, Ch. 1: Intro to Gail Exercise 2.1-EBDM worksheet Part A</p> <p>Target: Average score of >85% on assignment Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Didactic - DH420 Advanced Dental Hygiene Care Planning Spring</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA</p>	<p>Action: No action plan needed at this time. (09/27/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 3.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Semester Module 3, Case Study E Discussion Post: Tobacco Cessation Target: Average score of >85%. Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/ HS Curriculum Committee	Course not taught due to sequence of the program of study. (09/27/2017)	

AU Outcome: DHO 3.2

Students will demonstrate ability to practice critical thinking.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SL: Didactic - DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Summer Semester Final overview presentation-Rubric available Target: Average score of 85% or better Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. Target Met- the average score was 99%, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Final Project Rubric.docx	Action: Target met: The students demonstrated critical thinking in their final presentation by considering the population’s needs, barriers, and contributing factors that affect oral health. Continue to use the final presentation to evaluate the ability to practice critical thinking. Keep benchmark the same. (06/06/2017)
SL: Didactic - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Course review-Rubric available. Target: Average score of 85% or better Timeframe: When course taught	Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. Target Met-The average score was 99.5%, n=2. (06/06/2017)	Action: Target met: Students demonstrated critical thinking by developing an evaluation plan for learner outcomes on an educational topic of their choice. Students were responsible for data gathering, an evaluation period, data analysis and interpretation,

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Related Documents: Ch11 Educational Plan Example.docx</p>	<p>and degree to which interventions were successful.</p> <p>Will continue to use this tool and keep the benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 4.1

Students will integrate leadership skills and construct professional practices.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>AD: Survey - DH460 Management and Leadership In Dental Hygiene Spring Semester Employer Evaluation question number 4 Target: Average score >3 (0-5 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Three students were enrolled in this course, n=3. (06/06/2017)</p>	<p>Action: Employer surveys have not been distributed, this is the first class to graduate.</p> <p>Employer surveys will be sent out in Spring 2018. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>AD: Survey - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor Evaluation of Student question Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare.</p> <p>Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2.</p> <p>The average score was 2 (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target met: Students were successful in developing leadership throughout their practicum.</p> <p>Will continue to use this tool and keep this benchmark next year. (06/06/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: DHO 4.2

Program (HS) - Dental Hygiene (DH)

AU Outcome: DHO 4.2

Students will practice professionalism.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DH410 Education Methodology In Dental Hygiene Practicum Fall Semester Preceptor evaluation of student question Target: Average score >1 (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Clinical Instructors/ Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. The average score was 2 100%, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students practiced professionalism at their practicum site by displaying and mentoring students and patients at the site. Will continue to use this measurement tool. Will keep the same benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DH460 Oral Health Service Learning of Vulnerable Populations Summer Semester Preceptor evaluation of student Target: Average score >1. (0-2 pt. scale) Timeframe: When course taught Responsible Parties: DH Program Director/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes New course, new assessment, no previous data to compare. Two students were enrolled in this course, n=2. (06/06/2017) Related Documents: Preceptor Evaluations for BHS-DH.docx</p>	<p>Action: Target Met: Students were able to practice professionalism while they were educating and/or caring their chosen vulnerable population. Feedback was great. Keep this tool and maintain benchmark. (06/06/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

Students will successfully obtain patient history

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical evaluation tool - DMS:</p>		

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>408 Clinical Instructor/Preceptor Evaluations Number 1</p> <p>Target: On a scale from 1-5, 5 being the highest rating, the average of all the responses >=4</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level - Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DMS:408 Course Instructor/Program Faculty/HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2016 avg 4.71. trend is consistent with previous years (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As there was a change in the form and the Likert scale and to establish a trend, there will be no changes to measurement tool or benchmark. (06/07/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Lab - Ultrasound Imaging 2 Lab</p> <p>Target: Each student will receive score >= 80%</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level Spring Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Spring 2017 100 % of students passed. Results are consistent with results of previous cohorts when data obtained in Fall DMS 207 course</p> <p>Fall 2015 100%</p> <p>Fall 2014 100%</p> <p>Fall 2013- 100%</p> <p>Fall 2012 - 100%</p> <p>Fall 2011- 100%</p> <p>(09/29/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As this tool has achieved benchmark for last six years, proposal for 2017-2018 is to identify a new outcome and measurement tool for this goal. DMS 300 Patient Care offered in Spring 2018 will be an opportune platform for new outcome /tool. (09/29/2017)</p>
<p>SL: Lab - DMS:207 Lab Practical</p> <p>Target: 100 % of students will pass lab practical</p> <p>Timeframe: Didactic Level Fall Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: DMS:207 Course Instructor/ HS Faculty Org. Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>Fall 2015 100% of students passed. The trend is consistent with results of previous years. (06/07/2017)</p>	<p>Action: As this tool has achieved benchmark for last six years, proposal for 2017-2018 is to identify a new outcome and measurement tool for this goal. DMS 300 Patient Care offered in Spring 2018 will be an opportune platform for new outcome /tool. (06/07/2017)</p>

College Goal 5 - Adopt management practices that demonstrate outstanding stewardship of all resources to our constituents.

Program (HS) - Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS)

AU Outcome: DMS 2.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 5.1

Students will advance the scholarship of education in a variety of health science and nursing professions.

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 790: Practicum in Health Professions Education – Course Discussions Target: Students will receive an average score of >80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., spring 2017) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/HS Graduate APG Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes Spring 2017 7 students</p> <p>Earned an average of 204.7 out of 210 points = 97.5%</p> <p>New assessment item for this year. (09/08/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: EdD 790 Discussion Board Scoring Rubric - Spring 2017.pdf EdD 790 Example Discussions - Spring 2017.docx</p>	<p>Action: Course discussions centered on the application of teaching concepts covered in the course. Using a textbook designed for K-12 educators, we related the concept of making learning visible to students through different types of learning (surface, deep, and transfer) to health sciences educational environments. Topics were discussed within each module, and then students were asked to demonstrate how they would apply the concepts in their individual settings. This allowed students to visualize different ways they could advance scholarship in their own settings by using advice not necessarily directed to health sciences educational environments. Continue to monitor and raise the target. (09/08/2017)</p>

College Goal 5 - Adopt management practices that demonstrate outstanding stewardship of all resources to our constituents.

Program (HS) - Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

AU Outcome: EdD 5.1

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - EdD 780: Integrating Evolving Technology in Health Professions Education – Homework Assignments Target: Students will receive an average score of at least 80% Timeframe: When course is taught (e.g., 2015, 2018, etc.) Responsible Parties: Program Chair/ HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: NA Course was not offered. (09/27/2017)</p>	

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 5.1 Supervision Guidelines

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the supervision guidelines for OT personnel.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - OT 501 – Midterm Exam Target: Minimum score of 80% on midterm exam Timeframe: When course taught (1st Year, e.g., Fall 2016) Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes All 19 students in this cohort achieved an 80% or better on this exam. The average score was a 98.94 out of 100 points, resulting in an average of 98.94%. (09/28/2017) Related Documents: Outcome 9.pdf Outcome 9-2.pdf</p>	<p>Action: This tool is currently being adapted to better align with the format utilized in the national certification exam. (09/28/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: MS in OT 5.2 Develop program evaluation

Students will develop a comprehensive new program evaluation plan.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>

Program (HS) - Masters in Occupational Therapy (MS in OT)

AU Outcome: MS in OT 5.2 Develop program evaluation

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Didactic - OT 613 – Program Evaluation Assignment</p> <p>Target: Minimum score of 80% on the assignment</p> <p>Timeframe: When course taught (2nd Year, e.g., Spring 2017)</p> <p>Responsible Parties: Instructor/ OT Faculty /HS Grad Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: No</p> <p>Four of the 14 students in this cohort did not meet the minimum score of 80% on this assignment. This assignment was completed in a group format and the 4 students belonged to the same group. This group received a 76% on the assignment. The average score in the class was a 93.14 out of 100 points, resulting in an average of 93.14%. (09/28/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Outcome 10.pdf</p>	<p>Action: Additional examples and additional practice in program development steps will be added to the class prior to this assignment to help clarify the expectations and support improved outcomes. (09/28/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 2.1

Students will be able to critically reflect on their performance

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Clinical - NMT:405 Student Self Evaluation</p> <p>Target: Students will have an average score of >= 85%.</p> <p>Timeframe: Summer Semester</p> <p>Responsible Parties: NMT: 405 Course Instructor/ HS Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3)</p> <p>Target Met: Yes</p> <p>For the Summer 2017 semester, the student’s average score for the self-evaluation is 98% (N=2). For the Summer 2016 semester, the student’s average score for the self-evaluation is 95% (N=3). For the Summer 2015 semester, the student’s average score for the self-evaluation was 98% (N=3) (09/21/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The Summer 2017 scores were higher than the summer 2016 scores. The student self-evaluation demonstrates that the students are able to critically reflect on their performance as they prepare to enter the workforce. Both students had jobs lined up after graduation and they had both tremendously increased their confidence throughout the semester. Overall, the students are prepared to take their certification exam and move into the workforce. (09/21/2017)</p>

Program (HS) - Nuclear Medicine Technology (NMT)

AU Outcome: NMT 2.1

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 2.1

Student will be able to gather information on policy

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH 490 Final Exam (Ethics, Law, and Health Care Policy) Target: Average score > 80% Timeframe: Summer semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes One student took the course and received a 93% on the final exam. Previous years data is not available due to a transition in program staff. (08/17/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This is the first time the measure was used and there was only one student in the course. This measure will remain in place until there is more data. (08/17/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 2.2

Student will be able to identify mechanism to evaluate programs for their quality and effectiveness

Outcome Status: Active

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH 480 Final Exam. (Public Health Research and Evaluation) Target: Average score > 80% Timeframe: Spring semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / Health Science (HS) Curriculum committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes All (n=2) students scored above 80%, with an average score of 93.6%. The Previous year's data not available due to change in program staff. (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: This tool appears to be effective and will be used again next year. (06/20/2017)</p>

AU Outcome: PH 3.2

Student should be able to describes the role of governmental and non-governmental organizations in the delivery of community health services

Outcome Status: Active

Program (HS) - Public Health (PH)

AU Outcome: PH 3.2

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SL: Exam/Quiz - Teacher-made - PH: 410 Final exam Target: Average score of >80% Timeframe: Fall semester Responsible Parties: Program faculty / HS Faculty Org. committee</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2016 - 2017 (Year 3) Target Met: Yes In Fall 2016, four students took the class and earned an average of 83.7% on the final exam. In Fall 2015, seven students took the class and earned an average of 94.71% (06/20/2017)</p>	<p>Action: The target was barely met and low student enrollment makes it difficult to predict future results. Additionally, the instructor, course text, and final text changed between academic years, making these results impossible to compare year-over-year. This measure will be revisited in the CAP for 2017-2018 academic year to create a more precise measurement. (06/20/2017)</p>