

2016 Satisfaction Survey Results and Analysis

BSN students (n=164) were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with 11 statements related to participation in decision making, academic policies, adequacy of resources, adequacy of campus services, teaching/learning and evaluation practices, and the curriculum (see raw data for details). Ratings could range from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree, and faculty set the benchmark for each item at 80% of students reporting a score of 4 or higher.

BSN 2016 Satisfaction Survey Results (n = 164)

Item	Percentage Rating Agree or Strongly Agree	Benchmark Met/Not Met	Actionable Item/Response
Input into governance	83.08 %	Met	
Policy Congruence	89.85 %	Met	
Policies Communicated	72.02 %	Not Met	This item was referred to SON Director and to Assistant Director of Undergraduate program. In additional information was referred to all faculty. More information will be provided to students during orientation at beginning of program about Nightingale Café where all policies and handbooks are housed.
Resources sufficient: fiscal	86.93 %	Met	
Resources sufficient: physical	86.15 %	Met	
Resources sufficient: learning	97.69 %	Met	
Support Services sufficient	90.77 %	Met	
Teaching/Learning practices	83.38 %	Met	
Clinical Experiences enable program outcomes	91.54 %	Met	

Orientation to technology/tech support	89.15 %	Met	
Cultural, ethnic and socially diverse concepts included	96.12 %	Met	

Qualitative Data from BSN Students:

1. Students were overall positive regarding the program and no significant issues were noted with the exception of the following:
 - a. Students find the different presentation of course material in the D2L learning platform to be confusing. Many stated that “having to look for information in different locations was time consuming. Students expressed a desire for more uniformity in how material was presented in the online course site.
 - b. Students complained about poor communication responses from faculty at times, and disorganization in how assignment instructions were presented.
 - c. The benchmark for policies being communicated was not met: only 72.02% of students agreed or strongly agreed that policies were communicated effectively. Students stated that did not know where to find policies at times and were uncertain where to go to look for policies.

MSN students (n=62) were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with 11 statements related to participation in decision making, academic policies, adequacy of resources, adequacy of campus services, teaching/learning and evaluation practices, and the curriculum (see raw data for details). Ratings could range from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree, and faculty set the benchmark for each item at 80% of students reporting a score of 4 or higher.

MSN 2016 Satisfaction Survey Results (n = 62)

Item	Percentage Rating Agree or Strongly Agree	Benchmark Met/Not Met	Actionable Item/Response
Input into governance	83.08 %	Met	
Policy Congruence	89.85 %	Met	
Policies Communicated	82.02 %	Met	
Resources sufficient: fiscal	76 %	Not Met	Referred to Director – budget request for additional faculty and clinical placement coordinator made.

Resources sufficient: physical	76%	Not Met	Referred to Director – information shared with manager of Graduate Center. This is an ongoing problem with no immediate solution.
Resources sufficient: learning	97.69 %	Met	
Support Services sufficient	82 %	Met	
Teaching/Learning practices	39 %	Not Met	Referred to Director/Assistant Director Graduate. Additional training and information were provided to faculty from CTL regarding recording. Faculty were instructed to ensure that lectures and material was updated as indicated each semester.
Clinical Experiences enable program outcomes	91.54 %	Met	
Orientation to technology/tech support	89.15 %	Met	
Cultural, ethnic and socially diverse concepts included	96.12 %	Met	

Qualitative Data from MSN Students:

1. Benchmarks were met in all areas except for three:
 - a. In the area of fiscal and physical resources the following qualitative data provided insight into areas of concern for students.
 - i. Classroom on the Macon Campus had poor sound quality. It was difficult to hear especially if you had a large group.
 - ii. The air conditioner was often broken – during immersion week we nearly died of heat.
 - iii. Not enough space for check-offs during immersion week.
 - iv. Finding clinical placement with preceptors is very hard. We need someone to assist with this. Other schools have a person who just does clinical placement.
 - b. Teaching and Learning Practices

- i. The recording quality is not good at times, it is difficult to hear faculty.
- ii. Sometimes faculty use old recordings that need to be updated.
- iii. Faculty are disorganized and often don't return emails or phone calls in a timely manner.
- iv. Faculty who are team teaching are often not on the same page – this makes it hard for students.
- v. Too much busy work and clinical hours in fall semester.

DNP students (n=10) were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with 11 statements related to participation in decision making, academic policies, adequacy of resources, adequacy of campus services, teaching/learning and evaluation practices, and the curriculum (see raw data for details). Ratings could range from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree, and faculty set the benchmark for each item at 80% of students reporting a score of 4 or higher.

DNP 2016 Satisfaction Survey Results (n = 10)

Item	Percentage Rating Agree or Strongly Agree	Benchmark Met/Not Met	Actionable Item/Response
Input into governance	88.08 %	Met	
Policy Congruence	90.85 %	Met	
Policies Communicated	92.02 %	Met	
Resources sufficient: fiscal	94.03 %	Met	
Resources sufficient: physical	92.19 %	Met	
Resources sufficient: learning	97.69 %	Met	
Support Services sufficient	90.77 %	Met	
Teaching/Learning practices	60 %	Not Met	Referred to Director and to DNP Program Coordinator. Additional training and discussion sessions were held with faculty involved with DNP courses to discuss the DNP Project, Expectations, Write-up and expectation of chairs.

			<p>The DNP POS is up for review and some of the concerns related to summer and clinical hours will be addressed during this revision.</p> <p>More mentoring of new chairs by faculty who have worked with DNP students will be ongoing.</p>
Clinical Experiences enable program outcomes	93.54 %	Met	
Orientation to technology/tech support	87.15 %	Met	
Cultural, ethnic and socially diverse concepts included	94.22 %	Met	

Qualitative Data from DNP Students:

1. Benchmarks were met in all areas except for teaching and learning practices.
 - a. Statements from students that was obtained from the qualitative statements related to two specific areas. Committee chairs were often unavailable during summer to assist students. This was difficulty for students, especially when some chairs were working with students and these students were making progress.
 - b. Inconsistent requirements from some committee chairs – statements by students reflected
 - i. This is not a PhD program, but my chair seems to think it is.
 - ii. No consistency regarding expectation for projects and how to write them up.
 - iii. My chair wasn't helpful in terms of letting me know how to complete the IRB in a timely manner. This put me so far behind the other students.

Faculty (n=27) were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with 9 statements related to participation in decision making, academic policies, adequacy of resources, adequacy of campus services, teaching/learning and evaluation practices, and the curriculum (see raw data for details). Ratings could range from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree, and faculty set the benchmark for each item at 80% of students reporting a score of 4 or higher.

Faculty 2016 Satisfaction Survey Results (n = 27)

Item	Percentage Rating Agree or Strongly Agree	Benchmark Met/Not Met	Actionable Item/Response
Input into governance	93.5%	Met	
Policy Congruence	98.85%	Met	
Policies Communicated	92.02%	Met	
Resources sufficient: fiscal	74%	Not Met	Referred to Director. Budget request for clinical coordinator, additional faculty lines, simulation space.
Resources sufficient: physical	74%	Not Met	Referred to Director and Assistant Director of Undergraduate. Discussion held with Dean of CoHS and HSB manager to work on scheduling classes and consideration of additional space for simulation and skills labs. Class/Clinical schedule modified to fully utilize larger classrooms in HSB.
Resources sufficient: learning	97.69%	Met	
Support Services sufficient	85%	Met	
Environment supports faculty in teaching, scholarship, service and practice.	80%	Met	
Teaching – Learning practices and environments support the achievement of	88%	Met	

student's outcomes			
--------------------	--	--	--

Qualitative Data from Faculty:

1. In the area of fiscal and physical resources the benchmark of 80% agree or strongly agree was not met. Qualitative statements reflected the following themes:
 - a. Insufficient classroom space. Often have to go to West Campus. Classrooms not set up with what is needed.
 - b. Skills lab crowded. Difficulty to arrange for additional skills lab time and simulation.
 - c. Insufficient faculty and staff for simulations
 - d. Clinical placement is a nightmare. We need help with this.
 - e. Need more faculty. Part-time faculty often don't come back and we spend all our time orienting new folks.
 - f. Faculty salaries are too low.

Alumni (all programs, n = 52) were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with 3 statements related to their satisfaction with our programs (see raw data for details). Ratings could range from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree, and faculty set the benchmark for each item at a mean of 4 or higher.

Below is the table of means for all 3 items:
 Alumni 2016 Satisfaction Survey Results

Item	Percentage Rating Agree or Strongly Agree	Benchmark Met/Not Met	Actionable Item/Response
I am satisfied with the Georgia College program from which I graduated.	4.32	Met	
I think the Georgia College program prepared me well to practice in my chosen role (RN, FNP, etc.).	4.39	Met	
I would recommend the Georgia College program from which I graduated to others.	4.77	Met	

1. Alumni were asked to comment on the areas where the School of Nursing excels, and the most common areas were:
 - Excellent faculty, loved Georgia College
 - Clinical experiences are great.
 - NCLEX-RN preparation was the best. I felt confident in my ability to pass the exam.
 - I felt well prepared for practice.

2. Alumni were asked for any additional comments:
 - More hours in specialty areas not just med/surg.
 - Rotations during Practicum closer to home.

Employers (all programs, n = 3) were asked to rate graduates from Georgia College on two areas to represent their satisfaction with our programs (see raw data for details).

Below is the table of means for both items:

Employer 2016 Satisfaction Survey Results (n = 3)

Item	Percentage Rating Agree or Strongly Agree	Benchmark Met/Not Met	Actionable Item/Response
On a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the best), how would you rate the quality of the Georgia College School of Nursing graduate?	4.32 (n=3)	Met	Referred to Director Administrative Team made appointments and arranged meeting with all area employers to obtain face to face data about our graduates. We ask stake holder to assist in providing input that we would use in the revision of BSN curriculum.
On a scale of 0-2, (with 0 being worse than other programs, 1 being about the same as other programs, and 2 being better than other	1.5 (n=3)	Met	Referred to Director Administrative Team made appointments and arranged meeting with all area

<p>programs) please rate the preparation of Georgia College School of Nursing graduates for practicing the role for which they were prepared (i.e. BSN, MSN, DNP) in comparison to graduates from other nursing programs.</p>			<p>We ask stake holder to assist in providing input that we would use in the revision of BSN curriculum. employers to obtain face to face data about our graduates.</p>
---	--	--	---

Qualitative Data from Employers:

The response rate from employers was unacceptable low. It is difficulty to garner any quality information from so few responses. The qualitative data provided only positive remarks about the program with no suggestions from improvements.

Data from face to face meetings summarized:

1. Strongly encouraged more simulation to increase student’s ability to critically think, pick up on changing patient status. This is true for all graduates, not just ours.
2. Focus on communication with both the patient and the other members of the healthcare provider team.
3. Increase information about scope of practice and role of the professional nurse.
4. Don’t decrease the number of clinical hours required, this is a strength of your program.