**IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE**

**Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Identification Form**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Department Name: | Nursing and Health Technologies |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course Number/Title or Program Title: | VN 116 – Pt Care Mgmt and Critical Thinking |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contact Person/Others Involved in Process: | Lead: Donna Davis Others: Sue Higgins & Craig Luoma & Jack Williams |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| If course is part of a major(s), and/or certificate program(s), please list all below: | |  |  |  |  | |
| Major(s): | Certificate(s): | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Vocational Nursing |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Does course satisfy a community college GE requirement(s)? |  | Yes | x | No |  | N/A |

If yes, check which requirement(s) below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | American Institutions |  | Language and Rationality – English Composition | | | |
|  | | Health Education |  | Language and Rationality – Communication and Analytical Thinking | | | |
|  | | Physical Education / Activity |  | Natural Science | | | |
|  | | Math Competency |  | Humanities | | | |
|  | | Reading Competency |  | Social and Behavioral Sciences | | | |
|  |  | | | |  |  |
|  | **Student Learning Outcome** | | | | **Assessment Tool**  (e.g., exam, rubric, portfolio) | **Institutional Outcome\***  (e.g., ISLO1, ISLO2) | | |
|  | **Example:** Identify, create, critique, and refute oral and written arguments. | | | | Debate + Debate rubric | ISLO1, ISLO2 | | |
|  | Effectively communicate with all appropriate parties regarding patient care and interventions for a given scenario (applied in clinical setting)  Demonstrate critical thinking and judgment in clinical decision making related to interactions with patients  Identify leadership techniques useful to LVN practice. | | | | Clin Eval Tool 110/112  Group Presentation  Group Presentation | ISLO 1, 2, 3, 4  ISLO1, 2, 4  ISLO1, 2, 3, 4 | | |
|  |
|  |

**Each SLO should describe the knowledge, skills, and/or abilities students will have after successful**

**completion of course or as a result of participation in activity/program.** A minimum of one SLO is required

per course/program. You may identify more than one SLO, but please note that you will need to collect and

evaluate data for each SLO that you list above. Attach separate pages if needed. *For assistance contact: Toni Pfister* [*toni.pfister@imperial.edu*](mailto:toni.pfister@imperial.edu) *or X6546*

**\*Institutional Student Learning Outcomes: ISLO1** = communication skills; I**SLO2** = critical thinking skills;

**ISLO**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Course Number & Date of Assessment Cycle Completion | Course: VN116 Patient Care Management and Critical Thinking Date: 12/8/10 |
| 2. People involved in summarizing and evaluating data | Donna Davis, Sue Higgins, Craig Luoma, Jack Williams |
| 3. Data Results  Briefly summarize the results of the data you collected. | Data for all 3 outcomes were collected on all students enrolled in the VN116 course for F10.  Outcome 1: Of 24 students who started the semester, 20 completed VN110. Three dropped due to failing grades and one due to legal issues. Of the 20 remaining, 19 received 100 pts/100 related to clinical performance. One student received 33/100 but passed due to grades. He has received counseling from the VN110 faculty on what to do to improve in the next semester.  Outcome 2: All students completing the group presentation received higher than 75%. Poster presentations were done in small groups and included the poster, research recommendations, references, and question/answer sessions. One student dropped before the presentation was given.  Outcome 3: Students worked in groups of 2-4 to present information based on a group identified health care problem and how, as an LVN, actions could be taken to improve health care outcomes related to the problem. Students received up to 100 points/presentation. Students evaluated each other and 25% of the grade was based on these evaluations. All students met the standard of a minimum of 75 based on creativity, evidence of research, knowledge level, and ability to answer questions related to the topics. A rubric was used when evaluating the presentations. |
| 4. Course / Program Improvement  Please describe what change(s) you plan to implement based on the above results. | Outcome 1: No change is planned. This is an important evaluation of how material learned in one class improves outcomes in the clinical area.  Outcome 2: According to the class, the presentations were an excellent tool to learn how to work together, develop a topic, and present it in a professional situation. Much of the information covered in lecture was incorporated into the problem-solving methods developed by the students and showed evidence of critical thinking. No change is planned.  Outcome 3: A rubric was used to evaluate the presentations. Each group had the opportunity to grade another group and this was incorporated into the grade. Since appraisal techniques was a part of the curriculum, this gave them the opportunity to utilize new skills while listening to the material. The leadership ideas related to health care management were based on research and showed evidence of group cohesiveness on the topics chosen. No change is anticipated.  \*\*Will this include a change to the curriculum (i.e. course outline)? |
| 5. Next Year Was the process effective? Will you change the outcome/ assessment for next year? (e.g., alter the SLO, assessment, faculty discussion process, strategy for providing SLO to student)? If so, h | We plan to keep these 3 outcomes as these have been identified as fair measurement tools for this course. |
| 6. After-Thoughts Feel free to celebrate, vent, or otherwise discuss the process. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |