

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 589

TM 005 072

AUTHOR Rott, Robert K.
 TITLE Evaluation of Medical Nurse Practitioner Program:
 Participant Instrument No. 1.
 INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. School of
 Nursing.
 PUB DATE Apr 73
 NOTE 7p.
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS Health Occupations Education; Higher Education;
 *Nurses; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program
 Evaluation; *Rating Scales

ABSTRACT

This instrument was designed to provide a goal-free evaluation of a pilot training program for Medical Nurse Practitioners. With minor modification, the instrument can be applied to programs at several educational levels: secondary, college, adult, and continuing. The instrument uses 5-point Likert-type scales (with positive and negative polarities at the extremes), progresses from general to specific considerations of the program, and contains some open-ended questions, so that respondents can comment ad hoc. Overall, the questionnaire provides information to determine the appropriateness of the training program for the students enrolled.
 (RC)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED 118589

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO
Faculty of Health Sciences
SCHOOL OF NURSING
Office of Research and Evaluation

EVALUATION OF MEDICAL NURSE PRACTITIONER PROGRAM

Participant Instrument No. 1

The principle purpose of this form is to assist in the planning of subsequent programs. Therefore, be completely candid in your responses. Do not sign your name.

For each question or partial statement, below, please circle the number that best reflects your reaction.

1. Overall, how important do you feel the topics of this Program are to medical nurse practice?
very important. 5 4 3 2 1 very unimportant
2. Overall, how relevant was the content to the various topics?
highly relevant 5 4 3 2 1 not at all relevant
3. Leaving aside the quality of instruction for the moment, do you think all the major topics treated in this Program should be treated again in future programs?
definitely 5 4 3 2 1 definitely not
4. The instructors' objectives for this Program were:
very clear to me 5 4 3 2 1 very unclear to me
5. The planning (organization) of this Program was:
excellent 5 4 3 2 1 poor
6. Overall, was the Program long enough to cover the topics adequately?
considerably too long 5 4 3 2 1 considerably too short

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

7.* As a rule, daily sessions were:

considerably too long 5 4 3 2 1 considerably too short

8. Do you feel that you entered the Program with the appropriate prerequisites or prior knowledge?

I had more than enough preparation 5 4 3 2 1 I was seriously lacking in preparation

9.* In terms of your background and preparation for this Program, the content of this Program was:

too elementary 5 4 3 2 1 too advanced

10. Overall, the quality of instruction in this Program was:

excellent 5 4 3 2 1 poor

11.* Overall, how did you find the pace of instruction?

too rapid 5 4 3 2 1 too slow

12.* Were the reading materials made available to you for this Program adequate?

too elementary 5 4 3 2 1 too advanced

13.* Did you receive the reading materials or assignments sufficiently in advance for you to prepare yourself for classwork?

____ Yes, materials or assignments were timed appropriately

____ No, materials or assignments were given too late

____ No materials or assignments were given

14. The instruction was generally:

too lecture oriented	5	4	3	2	1	too discussion oriented
very interesting	5	4	3	2	1	very uninteresting
very informative	5	4	3	2	1	very uninformative

15. Opportunities for asking questions were:

sufficient 5 4 3 2 1 insufficient

16. Opportunities for studying were:

sufficient 5 4 3 2 1 insufficient

17.* The amount of work the instructors required of you was:

far too much 5 4 3 2 1 far too little

18.* Opportunity for you to interact with Program instructors was:

sufficient 5 4 3 2 1 insufficient

19. Written examinations should be included in this program.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

20. Clinical reports (patient work-ups) were evaluated adequately.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

21. Evaluation emphasized the application of concepts or principles.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

22. Criteria for evaluating your work in the Program were specified.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

23. Preceptors were available for conferences as necessary.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

24. In your opinion, the teaching staff members were in general:

very well qualified 5 4 3 2 1 very unqualified

very well prepared 5 4 3 2 1 very unprepared

25. Did the instructional staff seek your reactions to their instructional procedures, scheduling, etc., during the Program?

frequently 5 4 3 2 1 never

26. Did it appear to you that your reactions led to improvements in the instructional procedures, scheduling, etc.?

frequently 5 4 3 2 1 never

27. The classroom facilities for the Program were:

excellent 5 4 3 2 1 poor

28. The clinical facilities for the Program were:

excellent 5 4 3 2 1 poor

29*. If you were able to do it all over again, would you commit yourself to this Program?

_____ Yes _____ Uncertain _____ No

30. If this Program were repeated, would you recommend to other nurses that they attend?

_____ Yes _____ Uncertain _____ No

31. How would you rate the value of each of the following topics to the Program?

(Please circle ONE response for EACH row)

	No opportunity to judge	Very valuable	Worthless
a. Miss Lynough : Intro to trends and issues	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
b. Dr. Salter : Changes in health care delivery system	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
c. Mr. Stevenson : Inter- viewing techniques	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
d. Dr. Dickman : Problem- oriented record	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
e. Dr. Dickman : Basic medical history and physical	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
f. Mr. Nash : Sociological & demographical changes, aspects	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
g. Miss Reh : types of health agencies	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
h. Dr. Addington : Eye examinations	NA	5 4 3 2 1	
i. Dr. Constant : Heart sounds	NA	5 4 3 2 1	

		No opportunity to judge	Very valuable			Worthless	
j.	Lab. tech.: Hematology and clinical pathology	NA	5	4	3	2	1
k.	Dr. Blwood : Hypertension	NA	5	4	3	2	1
l.	Dr. Black : ASHD	NA	5	4	3	2	1
m.	Dr. Donner : Diabetes	NA	5	4	3	2	1
n.	Dr. Brown : Chronic lung disease	NA	5	4	3	2	1
o.	Dr. Nolan : Basic GI, DX, ulcer, liver disease, alcoholism	NA	5	4	3	2	1
p.	Dr. Hutchinson and group : pharmacology, ASHD, angina, chronic lung, etc.	NA	5	4	3	2	1
q.	Dr. Schussler : Thyroid	NA	5	4	3	2	1
r.	Dr. Marine : Arthritis	NA	5	4	3	2	1
s.	CMHC group: Psych disease	NA	5	4	3	2	1
t.	Dr. Cooper : Basic concepts of malignancy	NA	5	4	3	2	1
u.	Dr. Deben : Skin, concepts of infectious diseases	NA	5	4	3	2	1
v.	Preceptors: Work-up of patients on wards	NA	5	4	3	2	1
w.	Dr. Dickson : Episodic illness	NA	5	4	3	2	1

32. Please list any aspects of the Program other than those listed in 31 above which you felt were of considerable value.

33. Please list any criticisms or suggestions you have concerning time allocation for any of the Program activities or sessions.

34. a. Please list any elements that were missing from this Program that you feel would be of value in future programs of this type.

b. What would you suggest sacrificing from the present Program format to make room for new topics or activities?

c. What factors contributed to student motivation in the Program?
If none, what would you suggest?

*means scale change

Program Evaluation Instrument
Designed April 1973 by
Dr. Robert K. Rött
for use in
Buffalo General Hospital