

Program Review Committee Efficacy Report--CTE Conditional Reporting (from Spring 2018 efficacy review)

Name of Department: Nursing

Overall Recommendation:

Continuation Conditional Probation

Rationale for Overall Recommendation:

Since its last full efficacy report, the program has made continuous progress with its SLOs and with updating its curriculum to reflect current standards within the profession. The program states that it is well-regarded in the community and that it partners with various hospitals and medical centers, but it does not provide any data for support. There is no specific labor market data—whether locally or nationally—to show the demand for the program. Advisory committee connections are not mentioned. The only external issue that it cites is the need for faculty with the increased number of students. Because of the changes with the BRN and the curriculum, the Perkins and Health Workforce Initiative, a more thorough analysis of external factors and the impact on the program is warranted. Concrete plans are not presented that would incorporate growth that is predicted by the department.

1. Purpose of this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The program's mission aligns with the college mission. The program identifies its mission as "to provide quality instructional programs to prepare a diverse group of students to work in the community as Registered Nurses." The program also states that it prepares its students with the knowledge and skills of the profession, increases the number of healthcare workers, and promotes quality of life and health in the surrounding area.

The program offers an Associate of Science degree. Graduates of the program are eligible to take the national licensing exam, which leads to becoming licensed as a Registered Nurse in California.

2. Demand for this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The program cites FTES as being sustained for the past two academic years due to the Enrollment and Growth Grant. The program discussion focuses on the quality of the program—Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) process and the pass rate for the NCLEX licensing exam. The program

states that it is well-regarded in the community and that it partners with various hospitals and medical centers, but it does not provide any data for support.

There is no specific labor market data—whether locally or nationally—to show the demand for the program. Advisory committee connections are not mentioned. Considering the fairly recent changes to the bachelor degree requirement for Nurses, an examination of the impact of that to the SBVC Nursing Program and the way SBVC’s program will relate to other area colleges is warranted. In the “Quality of Program” section, it does make reference to the curriculum being revised and submitted to Curricunet and to the BRN—the program is waiting to hear from the BRN.

3. Quality of this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The program cites curriculum changes, such as faculty referencing evidence-based care resources to improve teaching and incorporating NCLEX-style questions into exams. The faculty has attended professional development activities. Curriculum was revised and submitted to Curricunet and the BRN.

PLOs and SLOs were evaluated and revised. Faculty collects and evaluates SLOs every semester. The department states the ideas for revisions, restructuring and re-evaluation are discussed. It will implement the new PLOs with the new curriculum.

In the “Demand for Program” section, student success data was addressed. The program cites the Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing as ensuring the quality of the program.

The program also cites the NCLEX licensing exam pass rates to show the quality of the program. The discussion of the drop in the fourth quarter is unclear. It states that the 55% pass rate was a “major outlier” that “had a negative and critical impact on the overall pass rate for the 2016-17 period. It does address the longer period of time that graduates tested after their exit from the program, but does not examine the significant drop further.

The department’s student success rating is consistently above 90%, and its retention rate is consistently at or above 98%. 92 degrees were awarded in 2016-17—a marked increase over previous years.

4. External Issues: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The program mentions the Perkins and Health Workforce Initiative as providing funding for the Nursing Simulation Lab. The dates in the report conflict about its completion (2017 or 2018). It also states that the Enrollment and Growth Grant

has allowed the program to increase the number of students that are accepted into the program.

The only external issue that it cites is the need for faculty with the increased number of students.

Because of the changes with the BRN and the curriculum, the Perkins and Health Workforce Initiative, a more thorough analysis of external factors and the impact on the program is warranted.

5. Cost of this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The program has increased the number of students to 54-57 in spring 2016 from the previous limit of 40 each semester. This is due to the Enrollment and Growth Grant, and the program received funding for the Nursing Simulation Lab from Perkins and the Health Workforce Initiative.

6. Two-Year Plan: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The department has general plans that incorporate growth: exploring funding for professional growth opportunities, continuing to work with Grant and Workforce Initiative for completion of the Nursing Simulation Lab, working to fill vacant positions, continuing to explore teaching innovations to help students, and working with the community to build clear pathways for students from high school to RN to BSN.

Concrete plans are not presented that would incorporate growth that is predicted by the department.

7. Progress on Previous Does Not Meets: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The previous full efficacy report received does not meet in SLOs, productivity, and relevance/currency; therefore, the program was given a conditional rating. A remediation report was reviewed by the committee the following spring. At that time it was determined that the three categories were adequately addressed, and the committee moved them to meets. The program rating was changed to continuation.