



Program Evaluation Committee (PEC)

January 26, 2017

Zoom Meeting

4:00-5:00 pm

NMNEC PEC Committee Members

Shannon Allen NMJC	Karen Ball CNM	Diane Evans-Prior CNM	Donnie Hayes NMJC	Shawna Kemper Co-chair SJC	Siri GuruNam Khalsa Co-chair
Judy Liesveld Leadership Council Liaison UNM	Dusten Marie CNM	Sasha Poole WNMU	Belinda Rincones NMJC	Laura Vanyo UNM	
Mary Wright NMNEC Outreach Program	Elizabeth Dickson NMNEC Research Assistant				
Attendance Color- Code Key:	Present	Absent		Excused	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Review of previous meeting minutes	NO written minutes from the previous meetings in the fall of 2016	
	NMNEC Program Evaluation Committee- January 26, 2017 1600-1710 Breath of Knowledge Survey. Mary presented the BOK work completed by Elizabeth Dickson. Mary and Elizabeth worked together on report. The BOK was utilized in the beginning of the NMNEC curriculum implementation. 44 item questions rated by each student in each level using a 5 point Likert scale. (1 Not at all prepared to 4 Very prepared with 5 Has not been taught). Started in 2014 with the first NMNEC schools who implemented the curriculum. Based on work by the University of Hawaii. Look for curriculum success.	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Hypothesis for the survey. The probably hypothesis. Hypothesis: There are fluctuations and concerns in specific levels of the NMNEC curriculum as reported by students from across NMNEC schools, regarding progress toward preparedness of NMNEC students to perform RN roles. Schools: CNM & UNM had the greatest returns with the surveys. SFCC Proving curriculum success. If the curriculum was not working well, then the data would indicate this. 2014 to 2016 -600 plus surveys mailed. Electronic surveys started in summer 2016. About 774 surveys in total with the 174 electronic surveys from summer 2016. Schools: UNM, CNM, NMJC, SJC, NMSU, SFCC, Clovis CC, WNMU who provided surveys by the end of summer 2016. Total surveys base on level of degree. ADN – 286 (40.6 %); BSN – 419 (59.4%) October 2016, the NMNEC Program Evaluation committee picked 4 items to analyze first. Based on identified linkages between these 4 items and NMNEC Learning Outcomes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Identify problems with quality of care that merit attention through quality improvement projects. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) NMNEC Learning Outcome: Integrate principles of quality improvement and safety into nursing practice within health care organizations and systems. 2) Recognize and address ethical dilemmas in which client’s rights are in conflicts with a clinical situation. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) NMNEC Learning Outcomes: b) Engage in professional nursing practice that is patient-centered and culturally appropriate for individuals, families and communities. c) Demonstrate leadership behaviors through the application of policies that apply to healthcare delivery. 3) Recognize changes in clients condition necessitating intervention. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) NMNEC Learning Outcomes: b) Engage in professional nursing practice that is patient-centered and culturally appropriate for individuals, families, and communities c) Integrate principles of quality improvement and safety into nursing practice within health care organizations and systems. d) Deliver nursing care that is evidence-based. 4) Participate in an inter-professional team meeting to develop a care plan for a patient with multiple chronic conditions. 	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>a) NMNEC Learning Outcome: b) Engage in effective Interprofessional collaboration in the delivery of health care for quality patient outcomes.</p> <p>Based on these 4 questions, students are reporting that they feel prepared. Curriculum Level of Survey Respondents: Level 1- 42.6%(309) Level 2- 16% (116) Level 3- 21.9 % (159) Level 4 – 12.8% (93) Level 5- 6.6 % (48) 1 missing.</p> <p>There is a slight dip in scores in at the end of Level 2. Level 1 – Idealistic. Level 2 – Reality check Level 3- increase in confidence with increase time working with patients. Level 4 & Level 5- Higher than Level 3 but equal between the 2 levels. Nothing showing up by Level as reported by students. Elizabeth looked at the other 40 questions to see if there was any different in the student responses. For the 4 questions: There was no level in the NMNEC curriculum where students reported significant differences in feeling prepared than what would be expected. Do we have curriculum success? Yes, that is the conclusion. What is next? BOK possible replacement or revisions? Is the survey still useful for all schools, all levels, schools who are starting the NMNEC curriculum? We are doing a good job. What to do? Judy- Recommended that we do not need to continue with the survey. We know now that the curriculum is working. Individual schools could use this, but to collect aggregate data from all the schools is not needed. We have the student satisfaction surveys and the faculty course surveys. Is there any way to correlate the student satisfaction survey and the faculty course surveys to the BOK survey to help us keep on track? The faculty course surveys were minimum. Is there something that we need to include to do some spot checking. Sporadically checking with some type of surveys.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Is there something less cumbersome to perform from the students on a periodic bases. Every 3 to 5 years with certain levels.</p> <p>Team seemed to think that we do not need to do the complete BOK every semesters.</p> <p>Curriculum committee will be collecting some information. We are going to be collecting a lot of data in other areas.</p> <p>Would it be feasible to take 4 questions that relate to program outcomes and place these questions on the student satisfaction surveys?</p> <p>Could pick questions that relate to the program outcomes to continue. It is from the student view.</p> <p>Could these questions that relate to program outcomes could be viewed more from the view of being a stabilizing element (A canary in the mine, type of idea).</p> <p>We could think about it. We are going to share this at the NMNEC meeting in Las Cruces.</p> <p>There has been an increase in Faculty Course Surveys responses with putting them on-line and with the revisions to the form last year.</p> <p>As long as the curriculum is the same, then there may not be any need to continue the BOK. If there are any curriculum changes, then that maybe the time to reintroduce this survey.</p> <p>The evaluation plan has been approved by the Leadership Team.</p> <p>Need to implement some of the surveys. One our indicators is retention rates. Transfer rates through schools and the tracks. Need to develop the other types of surveys.</p> <p>Maybe having some smaller groups to work on the surveys.</p> <p>Shawna asked for some volunteers to form small groups to work on these.</p> <p>Sasha has volunteered to work on these new surveys with Shawna.</p> <p>First program goal: Work on some of the surveys that would be due in April.</p> <p>Second program goal: Diversity, retention,</p> <p>Looking at the February meetings. Next 9th. The second meeting in February is 23rd which will be a travel day for the statewide meeting. The curriculum committee is cancelling their 2-23rd meeting. Meetings in March: Suggested March 2nd, March 9th, then either March 23rd or March 30th. (to make up for the February 23rd meeting)</p>	

Meeting Adjourned at 1710 PM