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Portfolio Assessment

- Need for authentic and varied measures of assessment
- Demonstration of program outcomes - accreditation imperative
- Opportunity to assess the acquisition of knowledge and skills not easily evaluated by traditional assessment methods
- Evidence-based means of demonstrating the attainment of program outcomes
Previous Portfolio Program – Midpoint Assessment

- Evaluation of student portfolios at midpoint of program
- Curricular assessment
- Individual feedback to students
- Portfolio process
  - Collected at beginning of 4th semester in nursing program
  - Included cover letter plus 3 artifacts to demonstrate progress toward program outcomes
  - Assessment by nursing faculty
  - Post-session discussion
Change to Terminal Assessment

• Demonstration of achievement of curricular outcomes - accreditation mandate by the CCNE
• Portfolio assessment – valid means of evaluating curricular outcomes
• Terminal assessment (rather than midpoint) to best fulfill this mandate
• Now collect a cover letter plus five artifacts
Rubric Development

- Program outcomes changed…. When program changes, assessment must change!
- Initial step – rubric development
- Identification of criteria to accurately evaluate new program outcomes by subcommittee members
- Pilot assessment session conducted with faculty & student subcommittee members
Issues with Rubric

- Challenging to find evidence of some outcomes
- Varying interpretations of concepts such as quality improvement and informatics – consensus needed
- Back to the drawing board – revisions made
- Expanded rubric developed
- Rubrics approved by portfolio subcommittee & pilot assessment conducted by faculty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>SPRING 2014 n=30 (47%)</th>
<th>FALL 2014 N=31 (53%)</th>
<th>SPRING 2015 N=37 (51%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1: Safe, quality, patient-centered, evidence-based nursing care</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2: Critical thinking/clinical reasoning</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3: Quality improvement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4: Collaborative relationships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5: Information management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6: Professional, ethical, and legal principles</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 7: referencing, grammar, spelling, format, and language</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 8: Reflect on what student has learned and needs to learn</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why are We Not Meeting Benchmarks?

Faculty discussion as to why this could be……

• Continued difficulty in finding evidence of some program outcomes in written assignments?
• Differing interpretations of criteria by faculty?
• Identification of appropriate assignments included by students?
• Decreased investment in portfolio process by students?
• The rubric??
Old Scale and New Scale Benchmarks

Old Scale:
1. Does not Meet Expectations
2. Meets Expectations
3. Exceeds Expectations

New Scale:
0. Does not Meet Expectations
1. Minimally Meets Expectations
2. Meets Expectations
3. Exceeds Expectations
## Evaluation Data with New Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
<th>SPRING 2014</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>FALL 2014</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>SPRING 2015</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>SPRING 2015 (benchmark at 1.5)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe, quality, patient-centered, evidence-based nursing care</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking/clinical reasoning</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative relationships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, ethical, and legal principles</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referencing, grammar, spelling, format, and language</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on what student has learned and needs to learn</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Thoughts

• Assessment is a dynamic and evolving process
• When the program changes, assessment must change
• Pay close attention to benchmarks and scales
Thank You!

• Questions?