Contents

| 1. Learner Academic Success | 2 |
|--|----|
| Cognitive | 2 |
| 1.1.1 General Education Outcomes | 2 |
| 1.1.2 Nursing Education Outcomes | 3 |
| Practice | 4 |
| 1.2.1 EL Evaluation and Survey Metrics | 4 |
| Everyday Ethical Comportment | 6 |
| 1.3.1 LSS Code of Conduct Report | 6 |
| 1.3.2 Wellness Measures | 7 |
| 2. Serving Diverse Communities | 7 |
| 2.1 Learner Demographics | 7 |
| 2.2 Faculty Demographics | 9 |
| 2.3 Alumni Work Placement Settings | 11 |
| 2.4 Learner Satisfaction | 12 |
| 3. Closing Equity Gaps | 14 |
| 3.1 Persistence to Completion | 14 |
| 3.2 Retention | 15 |
| 3.3 Licensure | 16 |
| 4. Scale and Sustainability | 18 |
| 4.1 Credit Load | 18 |
| 5. Comparison Data | 18 |

1. Learner Academic Success

Cognitive

1.1.1 General Education Outcomes

| Function | Last Update | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| General | | | | | | | | |
| Education | 6/12/2025 | | | | | | | |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics | | | | | | | |
| 70% in all | Benchmark: 70% in all competency frames | | | | | | | |
| Competency | Tactical Code: Implemented a thorough review process for cur | riculum, data points, and meas | surement items | | | | | |
| frames | NWCCU Standard: 1.C.6 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | ∇_2 \square : | | |
| | General Education Outcomes | | | | | ecision Making and Judg | | |
| | 8 66% 38% 38% 38% 19% | 82.23% 82.87% 79.38% 77.38% 76.30% 76.50% | 81.94% 81.94% 83.61% 79.88% 64.78% 77.93% | 78.66% | 80.76% 68.00% 79.57% 80.83% | videnced Based Practice ilobal Perspectives tuman Ideals and Ethics ntentional Learning and Re trantitative Reasoning eamwork and Collaboration Vritten and Verbal Commun | | |
| | 300.0 307+1 307-1 | 2024-2 | 2024-3 | | 2025-1 | | | |
| | GE Outcomes Table | | | | | | | |
| | Avg of Submission Score Percent | Term Code | | | | | | |
| | Outcome Name V | 2024-1 | 2024-2 | 2024-3 | 2025-1 | Grand total | | |
| | Global Perspectives Human Ideals and Ethics | 79.96% | 77.21% | 81.94% 83.61% | 79.58% | 79.67% 83.16% | | |
| | Intentional Learning and Reflection | 81.38% | 80.23% | 79.88% | 80.76% | 80.57% | | |
| | Quantitative Reasoning | 62.44% | 62.87% | 64.78% | 68.00% | 64.50% | | |
| | Teamwork and Collaboration | 81.04% | 79.38% | 77.93% | 79.57% | 79.43% | | |
| | Written and Verbal Communication | 81.19% | 77.38% | 79.35% | 80.83% | 79.86% | | |
| | Grand total | 77.68% | 75.79% | 77.14% | 79.07% | 77.63% | | |
| Sources | Narrative | | | | | | | |
| <u>College MFM</u> <u>Dashboard -</u> <u>Sigma</u> | 2025-1: In 2025, the General Educ marked improvement across all o remains just below the 70% bench framework, is on an upward traje courses supporting Quantitative F declined. This positive shift is larg outreach, and targeted redevelop weekly, strategically engaging lea support especially for those retak learner strategists, has contribute Looking ahead, the action plan fo | utcomes, with th hmark. Encourag ctory. The pass r Reasoning, have rely attributed to oment efforts. Fa rners through Te ing the course. T ed to improved p | ne exception gingly, this ar ates for Mat steadily incre- proactive fa culty have in eams, person This coordina ersistence an | of Quantita ea, long a ch h 100 and M eased, while culty engage creased out alized booki ted effort, a nd learner o | tive Reasonin nallenge with 1ath 220, the withdrawal n ement, inten- reach from o ing links, and long with sup utcomes. | ng, which in the GE two primary rates have tional learner nce to twice one-on-one oport from | | |
| | | ed to improved p r sustaining and Math 220, with N | ersistence a accelerating Math 100 lau | nd learner o this momen nching its re | utcomes. Itum involves evised curricu | the contin Ilum in Fall | | |

| the newly established persistence workgroup, which is committed to addressing the historical trends |
|--|
| of high withdrawal and repeat rates. Particular attention will be given to refining assessment |
| strategies, integrating a more learner-centered pedagogy, and providing real-time data feedback |
| loops to faculty. Moreover, although anecdotal evidence suggests declining enrollment in Math 100, |
| this will be further investigated to determine if adjustments to marketing, advising, or prerequisite |
| structures are warranted. Comprehensive redevelopment and intensified support strategies are |
| expected to continue closing the performance gap in Quantitative Reasoning, ensuring that this key |
| outcome aligns with institutional benchmarks and supports learner success in nursing education. |
| |
| Tactic (If Applicable) |
| Implement a thorough process for curriculum, data points, and measurement items |
| NWCCU Standard Description |
| |
| "Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and |
| bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes |
| and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are |
| not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and |
| quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information |
| literacy." |
| |

1.1.2 Nursing Education Outcomes

| Function | Last Update |
|--------------|--|
| Nursing | |
| Education | 6/12/2025 |
| Benchmark(s | Statistics |
|) | |
| 70% in all 8 | Benchmark: 70% in all 8 competency frames |
| competencies | Tractical Code: Faculty development is a primary focus to ensure faculty are facilitating the curriculum in the most effective intended ways possible. Continual curriculum review and enhancements continue to develop positive learner autcomes NVCCU Standard: SNNUrsing Education Outcomes Output |
| Sources | Narrative |

| <u>College</u> <u>MFM</u> <u>Dashboard -</u> <u>Sigma</u> | 2025-1: All nursing education outcomes have remained consistent or improved for the Spring 2025 semester. Additionally, all outcomes have now exceeded the benchmark of 75%, <i>notably Intentional Learning with Reflection</i> improved from Fall from 66% to now 78%. Continuous efforts are in place by nursing education to support learners with readily available faculty in meeting the learning outcomes. |
|--|--|
| | Positive trends may be attributed to adding a prep prior to learners attempting the BSN HESI. Faculty are also holding more focused webinars and the NCLEX coaching team is intervening earlier in the program as well. Lower plagiarism was reported due to some course redevelopment with Hallmark assignments. On average, HESI scores for third attempt learners have gone up over 300 points from the previous semester. Second attempt scores have also increased. |
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) |
| | Faculty development is a primary focus to ensure faculty are facilitating the curriculum in the most effective ways possible. Continual curriculum review and enhancements continue to develop positive learner outcomes. |
| NWCCU | NWCCU Standard Description |
| Standard | |
| <u>Standards -</u> | Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor |
| <u>NWCCU</u> | level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core |
| 1.C.6 | |
| 1.0.0 | competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, |
| 1.0.0 | competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy. |

Practice

1.2.1 EL Evaluation and Survey Metrics

| Function | Last Update |
|--------------|--|
| Nursing | |
| Education | 6/12/2025 |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics |
| | |
| | Benchmark: 4.6 |
| | Tactic: |
| | NWCCU Standard: |
| | Selected items from the DFC Learner Evaluation Form. Items are scored on a 5-point likert scale (Prompt (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree). |
| | The question items included here are: I developed a better understanding of the connections between course information and the application to clinical practice. |
| | I was able to identify and correlate safe and effective nursing care during DFC activity. |
| | I was challenged to utilize critical thinking and improve my clinical reasoning skills. |
| | I am more confident to practice nursing care in a clinical environment. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | DFC Leaner Evaluation Forr | n Results | | | I developed a better underst I was able to identify and co I was challeneged to utilize I am more confident to pract |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| | 2 1 0 * * * | 2024-1 | 2024-2 | 2024-3 | 2025-1 - |
| | | DFC Learner Evaluation For | | lleneged to utilize criti 👻 🛛 I am n | nore confident to practice nursing care i ~ |
| | 1 2023-3 | 4.62 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.6 |
| | 2 2024-1 | 4.69 | 4.74 | 4.7 | 4.67 |
| | 3 2024-2 | 4.68 | 4.75 | 4.7 | 4.69 |
| | 4 2024-3 5 2025-1 | 4.66 | 4.73 | 4.65 | 4.65 |
| | | | | | |
| Sources College MFM Dashboard - Sigma | conclusion of a lead averaged to deterr | rner's DFC work. Iter nine practice-reading | ns related to thei ess. | r experience with | |
| <u>MFM</u> Dashboard - | The Practice metric conclusion of a lead averaged to detern 2025-1: All four eva enhance clinical ex resources. The Exp despite the challen backed by a strong ongoing to normali | rner's DFC work. Iter nine practice-reading aluation questions sh periences by stream periential Learning (El nge of mixed learner g management struct ize schedules and im | ns related to thei ess. howed improvem lining downtime a L) team is aligning levels, and is inco ure, including on- prove communica | r experience with ent in the spring, activities and ensu these activities w prorating targeter call faculty manag ation. These initia | clinical practice are reflecting faculty efforts to uring access to helpful vith didactic content, d HESI support. Faculty are |
| <u>College</u> <u>MFM</u> Dashboard - | The Practice metric conclusion of a lead averaged to detern 2025-1: All four eva enhance clinical ex resources. The Exp despite the challen backed by a strong ongoing to normali increased faculty a 4.5 survey score. | rner's DFC work. Iter nine practice-reading aluation questions sh periences by stream reriential Learning (El nge of mixed learner management struct ize schedules and im nd learner satisfaction | ns related to thei ess. howed improvem lining downtime a L) team is aligning levels, and is inco ure, including on- prove communica on, with NE earnir | r experience with ent in the spring, activities and ensu- g these activities w prporating targeter- call faculty manag- ation. These initian ng commendation | clinical practice are reflecting faculty efforts to uring access to helpful vith didactic content, d HESI support. Faculty are gers, and efforts are tives have contributed to for achieving an impressiv |
| <u>College</u> <u>MFM</u> <u>Dashboard -</u> <u>Sigma</u> | The Practice metric conclusion of a lead averaged to detern 2025-1: All four eva enhance clinical ex resources. The Exp despite the challen backed by a strong ongoing to normali increased faculty a 4.5 survey score. Tactic (If Applicabl By the end of Q4 o | rner's DFC work. Iter nine practice-reading aluation questions sh periences by stream reriential Learning (El nge of mixed learner management struct ize schedules and im nd learner satisfaction | ns related to thei ess. howed improvem lining downtime a L) team is aligning levels, and is inco ure, including on- prove communica on, with NE earnir | r experience with ent in the spring, activities and ensu- g these activities w orporating targeter- call faculty manag- ation. These initia- ng commendation | clinical practice are reflecting faculty efforts to uring access to helpful vith didactic content, d HESI support. Faculty are gers, and efforts are tives have contributed to |
| <u>College</u> <u>MFM</u> <u>Dashboard -</u> <u>Sigma</u> | The Practice metric conclusion of a lead averaged to detern 2025-1: All four eva enhance clinical ex resources. The Exp despite the challen backed by a strong ongoing to normali increased faculty a 4.5 survey score. Tactic (If Applicabi By the end of Q4 o specific focus to im Review the learner | rner's DFC work. Iter nine practice-reading aluation questions sh periences by stream reriential Learning (El nge of mixed learner management struct ize schedules and im nd learner satisfaction Ie) f 2025, the overall le prove the quality of | ns related to their ess. nowed improvem lining downtime a L) team is aligning levels, and is inco ure, including on- prove communica on, with NE earnin arner satisfaction faculty score to 4 to evaluate the q | r experience with ent in the spring, activities and ensu- g these activities w prporating targeter- call faculty manag- ation. These initian ng commendation | clinical practice are reflecting faculty efforts to uring access to helpful vith didactic content, d HESI support. Faculty are gers, and efforts are tives have contributed to for achieving an impressiv |

| Standards - | The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including |
|-------------|--|
| NWCCU | student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and |
| 1.B.1 | systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, |
| | and improve student learning and achievement. |

Everyday Ethical Comportment

| Function | Last Update | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Nursing | • | | | | | |
| Education | 6/12/2025 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics | | | | | |
| | Code of Conduc | + Violation | ~ | | | |
| | Code of Conduc | | | | | |
| | Submission Type | Fall 2023 S | Spring 2024 | Summer 2024 | Fall 2024 | Spring 2025 |
| | Dispositional/Behavioral | 10 | 19 | 15 | 6 | 16 |
| | Academic | 133 | 163 | 154 | 143 | 224 |
| | Total | 143 | 182 | 169 | 149 | 240 |
| | | | | | | |
| | Detail of Submission Type | Fall 2023 | Spring 2024 | Summer 2024 | Fall 2024 | Spring 2025 |
| | Cheating | | | 15 | 1 | |
| | Exam Violation | | | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| | Plagiarism | | | 62 | 51 | 53 |
| | Self-Plagiarism | | | 19 | 7 | 8 |
| | Unauthorized use of AI | | | 51 | 2 | 143 |
| | Unprofessional Communic | ation | 14 | 11 | 4 | 11 |
| | EL Conduct | | | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| | Unprofessional Behavior (E | L Conduct) | | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| | Unprofessional Benavior (E | L Conducty | | | | |
| | Other | 2 00110000 | | | | 1 |
| | | | | 168 | 80 | 1 234 |
| | Other Total Detail of level | | Spring 2024 | Summer 2024 | Fall 2024 | |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible | Fall 2023 | 11 | Summer 2024 39 | Fall 2024 32 | 234 Spring 2025 22 |
| | Other Total Detail of level | Fall 2023 \$ | 11 110 | Summer 2024 39 81 | Fall 2024 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible | Fall 2023 | 11 | Summer 2024 39 81 | Fall 2024 32 | 234 Spring 2025 22 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 | Fall 2023 \$ | 11 110 23 10 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 | Fall 2024 32 67 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 | Fall 2023 S 101 19 | 11 110 23 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 | Fall 2024 32 67 17 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 | Fall 2023 S 101 19 | 11 110 23 10 1 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 | Fall 2023 S 101 19 | 11 110 23 10 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded | Fall 2023 S 101 19 | 11 110 23 10 1 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 | 11 110 23 10 1 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 |
| Sources | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 | 11 110 23 10 1 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 |
| | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 134 | 11 110 23 10 1 1 11 155 | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 |
| College MFM | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase | Fall 2023 \$ 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz | 11 110 23 10 1 1 11 155 zed Al usage | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 148 are underwa | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the |
| College MFM Dashboard - | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase amount of faculty time specific terms | Fall 2023 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz ent on these iss | 11 110 23 10 1 1 11 155 zed AI usage sues. Alterna | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a te consideration | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 are underwa | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the |
| College MFM Dashboard - | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase amount of faculty time spectors idered, and a small temperature | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz ent on these iss am will be train | 11 110 23 10 10 11 111 155 zed Al usage sues. Alterna ned and calib | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a te consideration rrated to review | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 are underwa is of AI dete AI reporting | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the ction are being g to take some |
| College MFM Dashboard - | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase amount of faculty time spectorsidered, and a small tem burden off the faculty. Coordinates the faculty. | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz ent on these iss am will be train | 11 110 23 10 10 11 111 155 zed Al usage sues. Alterna ned and calib | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a te consideration rrated to review | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 are underwa is of AI dete AI reporting | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the ction are being g to take some |
| Sources College MFM Dashboard - Sigma | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase amount of faculty time spectors idered, and a small temperature | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz ent on these iss am will be train | 11 110 23 10 10 11 111 155 zed Al usage sues. Alterna ned and calib | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a te consideration rrated to review | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 are underwa is of AI dete AI reporting | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the ction are being g to take some |
| College MFM Dashboard - | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase amount of faculty time spectorsidered, and a small tem burden off the faculty. Coordinates the faculty. | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz ent on these iss am will be train | 11 110 23 10 10 11 111 155 zed Al usage sues. Alterna ned and calib | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a te consideration rrated to review | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 are underwa is of AI dete AI reporting | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the ction are being g to take some |
| College MFM Dashboard - Sigma | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase amount of faculty time spectorsidered, and a small tee burden off the faculty. Coord this metric can be set. | Fall 2023 S 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz ent on these iss am will be train | 11 110 23 10 10 11 111 155 zed Al usage sues. Alterna ned and calib | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a te consideration rrated to review | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 are underwa is of AI dete AI reporting | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the ction are being g to take some |
| College MFM Dashboard - Sigma | Other Total Detail of level Learner not Responsible Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Invalid/Rescinded Unknown Total Narrative 2025-1: There is an increase amount of faculty time spectorsidered, and a small tee burden off the faculty. Coord this metric can be set. | Fall 2023 101 19 14 134 se in unauthoriz ent on these iss am will be train ordinated effort | 11 110 23 10 10 11 111 155 zed Al usage sues. Alterna ned and calib | Summer 2024 39 81 35 14 0 169 . Interventions a te consideration rrated to review | Fall 2024 32 67 17 31 1 148 are underwa is of AI dete AI reporting | 234 Spring 2025 22 123 37 58 4 22 266 y to reduce the ction are being g to take some |

1.3.2 Wellness Measures

| Function | Last Update |
|-----------------------------|--|
| General & Nursing Education | This metric is still under development and not currently reportable. |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics |
| | |
| Sources | Narrative |
| | |
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) |
| | |

2. Serving Diverse Communities

2.1 Learner Demographics





| | RUCA | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | 100% 50% 0% | 2024-1 | 2024-2 | 2024-3 | Micropolitan Micropolitan Small Town null |
| | Learner Geography | Ares. | Canada | G | |
| Sources | Narrative | 4 | | 38. | |
| <u>College</u> <u>MFM</u> <u>Dashboard -</u> <u>Sigma</u> | population. Growth & race. Under 30% of the steady. Admissions is that age group. There other states, we may breaking into teams to June 30, 2025. WI, FL Advisors that live in c | by programs is the population I marketing mo is still a large see that metri that target stat , NY metro, an tertain states h | re high school events population under the c increase. Learner ge es and certain areas w | increased diversifica and the male/femal which may attribute \$52,000 range, but a ography may change <i>i</i> thin the states. This grow and offer divers | tion with learners by e statistics is relatively to a slight increase for s marketing increases in with admissions now new initiative begins se learner populations. |
| Tactical Code | Tactic (If Applicable) | | | | |
| NWCCU | NWCCU Standard De | scription | | | |
| <u>Standards -</u> <u>NWCCU</u> 1.C.6 | Consistent with its m institutions, the instit including, but not lim indicators of student socioeconomic status | ission and in th tution establish ited to, persist achievement s s, first generati nelp promote s | ence, completion, retended to a completion, retended to a complete to a | a set of indicators for ention, and postgrad ed by race, ethnicity, d any other institutio | r student achievement uation success. Such age, gender, |

2.2 Faculty Demographics

| Function | Last Update |
|--------------|-------------|
| Collaborator | 6/12/2025 |
| Experience | |



| <u>College</u> <u>MFM</u> <u>Dashboard -</u> <u>Sigma</u> | 2025-1: The college has 376 faculty members, with a balanced gender representation and a racial composition that mirrors the learner population, aligning with national nursing trends. Most faculty are aged 40-49, indicating mid-career transitions into education. Faculty qualifications vary, with bachelor's degree holders primarily teaching in the PN program and being encouraged to pursue MSN degrees, though many are not full-time. All GE faculty hold at least a master's degree, with many at the PhD level. The report combines NE and GE faculty data, and future reports will use the term "doctoral". Faculty distribution is growing in states like Florida, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, with strong representation in western states. |
|--|--|
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) |
| | |
| NWCCU | NWCCU Standard Description |
| Standards - | Consistent with its mission, programs, and services, the institution employs faculty, staff, and |
| <u>NWCCU</u> | administrators sufficient in role, number, and qualifications to achieve its organizational |
| 2.F.3 | responsibilities, educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the |
| | integrity and continuity of its academic programs. |

2.3 Alumni Work Placement Settings

| Function | Last Update | | |
|--------------|--|--|---|
| Learner | 6/12/2025 | | |
| Support | | | |
| Services | | | |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics | | |
| 80% one-year | Drogram | A may al Diagona ant Sta | (22,24) |
| post | Program Program (DN) | Annual Placement Sta | uistics (23-24) |
| graduation | Practical Nursing (PN) | 94% (23-24) | |
| | LPN to ADN | 81% (23-24) | |
| | Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program | 81% (23-24) | |
| | (BSN) | 1000/ (22.24) | |
| | MSNEd | 100% (23-24) | 、 、 |
| | MSNFNP | NA (too soon for data | .) |
| | Benchmark: 80% 1 year post graduation Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.G.6 | ter identify who is in need of placement a | ssistance/verification. Breaki |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. | ter identify who is in need of placement a | ssistance/verification. Breaki |
| | <i>Tactic:</i> Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. <i>NWCCU Standard:</i> 2.G.6 | ter identify who is in need of placement a PN × ASN × | ssistance/verification. Breaki BSN ~ |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.G.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) | | |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.6.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) Grad Cohort | PN ~ ASN ~ | BSN ~ |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.6.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) Grad Cohort ~ 1 Spring 2022 | PN ~ ASN ~ 100.00% | BSN ~ 80.00% |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.6.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) Grad Cohort ~ 1 Spring 2022 2 Summer 2022 | PN ~ ASN ~ 100.00% 100.00% | BSN ~ 80.00% 88.00% |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.6.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) Grad Cohort ~ 1 Spring 2022 2 Summer 2022 3 Fall 2022 | PN → ASN → 100.00% 100.00% 50.00% | BSN ~ 80.00% 88.00% 87.00% |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.6.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) Grad Cohort ~ 1 Spring 2022 2 Summer 2022 3 Fall 2022 4 Spring 2023 | PN ~ ASN ~ 100.00% | BSN ∽ 80.00% 88.00% 87.00% 87.00% |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.6.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) Grad Cohort ~ 1 Spring 2022 2 Summer 2022 3 Fall 2022 4 Spring 2023 5 Summer 2023 | PN × ASN × 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 78.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% | BSN ∨ 80.00% 88.00% 87.00% 84.00% |
| | Tactic: Cleaning and reconfiguring licensure data has helped us to be clearer picture of where all graduates are in the placement process. NWCCU Standard: 2.6.6 Total Placement Rates (includes unverified) Grad Cohort ~ 1 Spring 2022 2 Summer 2022 3 Fall 2022 4 Spring 2023 5 Summer 2023 6 Fall 2023 | PN ~ ASN ~ 100.00% | BSN ∽ 80.00% 88.00% 87.00% 87.00% 84.00% 81.00% |

| Sources | Narrative |
|-----------|---|
| 6/12/2025 | 2025-1 : The data reflects graduate outcomes one-year post-graduation, with the most recent data from spring 2024 showing all programs (BSN, ASN, PN) exceeding the 80% placement benchmark. Placement tracking continues beyond the initial reporting period. An expanded partnership with Equifax will soon enable bulk employment verifications at a lower cost, and all licensed graduates will be verified. Additionally, Live Alumni will be used to gather employment data from public sources like social media, offering a consolidated, searchable report. The report includes details such as rural vs. urban employment and care settings, though this data is not always consistently shared. Future reports will separate FNP and PMHNP statistics, with updated tables reflecting their differing placement timelines. Most MSN graduates are employed upon graduation, and four FNP graduates have passed their certification. |
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) |
| | Facilitate the career placement between 100 graduates in job leads provided and posted by the College by the end of Q4 2025. |
| | Create and execute a plan to expand connections from career services to employers, focusing on areas and sites that are not currently utilized by other functions. |
| | Implement a tracking and reporting system to monitor employment outcomes of graduates one year after completionto include follow-up surveys, data analytics for trends, and a reporting mechanism to refine the "cradle-to-career" strategy and maintain progress toward the 80% placement goal. |
| NWCCU | NWCCU Standard Description |
| | |

2.4 Learner Satisfaction

| Function | Last Update |
|---|----------------------------|
| | 6/12/2025 |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics |
| 4.0 as reflective of Agree on the Likert Scale | Learner Satisfaction Index |

| | Semester ~ | Satisfaction ~ | Loyalty ~ | Perceived Value 1 ~ | Perceived Value 2 ~ | | Quality of Course $$ | Quality of Faculty $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$ |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | 1 Spring 2020 2 Summer 2020 | 3.82 | 4.43 | 4.37 | 3.67 3.17 | 4.14 3.61 | | |
| | 3 Fall 2020 | 3.6 | 4.56 | 3.87 | 3.36 | 3.01 | | |
| | 4 Spring 2021 | 3.61 | 4.46 | 4.45 | 3.43 | 4.19 | 4.03 | 4.26 |
| | 5 Summer 2021 | 3.81 | 4.43 | 4.21 | 3.64 | 4.28 | 4.14 | 4.45 |
| | 6 Fall 2021 7 Spring 2022 | 3.81 3.86 | 4.53 4.52 | 4.33 4.65 | 3.68 3.84 | 4.25 4.32 | 4.24 | 4.43 4.46 |
| | 8 Summer 2022 | 3.55 | 4.53 | 4.02 | 3.42 | 4.21 | 4.21 | 4.40 |
| | 9 Fall 2022 | 3.76 | 4.58 | 3.6 | 3.65 | 4.27 | 4.29 | 4.48 |
| | 10 Spring 2023 | 3.78 | 4.62 | 4.49 | 3.69 | 4.32 | | 4.49 |
| | 11 Summer 2023 | 3.89 | 4.58 | 3.65 | 3.28 | 4.19 | 4.18 | 4.44 |
| | 12 Fall 2023 13 Spring 2024 | 3.87 | 4.63 4.64 | 4.98 4.68 | 3.84 3.92 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.44 |
| | 14 Summer 2024 | 3.9 | 4.53 | 4.89 | 3.92 | 4.12 | 4.11 | 4.23 |
| | 15 Fall 2024 | 3.93 | 4.53 | 4.56 | 3.99 | 4.31 | 4.29 | 4.46 |
| | 16 Spring 2025 17 | 4.04 | 4.65 | 3.19 | 4.14 | 4.43 | 4.41 | 4.54 |
| | 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 | 1.11 1.89 1.91 1.07 1.14 1.19 1.26 1.05 1.11 1.24 1.21 1.34 1.06 1.37 1.4.3 4.2 | | | | | | |
| | Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia 'aculty: Q5.4 o | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun als: Q4.4 on Ec n EoCS+LES | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp pCS+LES | | | otal number o | of new starts). |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia 'aculty: Q5.4 o | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun als: Q4.4 on Ec n EoCS+LES | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp pCS+LES | | | otal number o | of new starts). |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia 'aculty: Q5.4 o | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun als: Q4.4 on Ec n EoCS+LES | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES | | | otal number o | of new starts). |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia 'aculty: Q5.4 o | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun als: Q4.4 on Ec n EoCS+LES | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES | | | otal number o | of new starts). |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia 'aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al | rner Experiend n rate/20 OG(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun Is: Q4.4 on Eo n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res | perience Surve | ey . | | |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention falue 1: 2.5*LC falue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa | rner Experiend on rate/20 OG(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun ols: Q4.4 on Ec n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res | s data calcula | ations, w | vith Perceive | ed Value 1 b |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun ls: Q4.4 on Eo n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ie to its relia | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res report includes ance on self-rep | s data calcula | ations, wals, whic | /ith Perceive | ed Value 1 b with |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun ls: Q4.4 on Eo n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ie to its relia | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res | s data calcula | ations, wals, whic | /ith Perceive | ed Value 1 b with |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d | rner Experiend n rate/20 OG(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun els: Q4.4 on Eco n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ue to its relia ip occurred | ce Survey x=100 * (number o rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res report includes ance on self-rep in spring, affect | s data calcula orted referr | ations, w als, whic | vith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring | ed Value 1 b with ing the |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the composite score sco | n: Q6.1 on Lea rerall retention falue 1: 2.5*LC falue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.0 | rner Experiend n rate/20)G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun ols: Q4.4 on Ec n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ue to its relia ip occurred I, though all | ce Survey x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res report includes ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics re | s data calcula orted referr ing Perceive emain above | ations, w als, whic ed Value e benchn | vith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus | ed Value 1 k with ing the ssions are |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of the most volation of the most score of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of the most volation of | a: Q6.1 on Lea erall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC falue 2: Q7 on a: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.C evise how re | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun els: Q4.4 on Ed n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ue to its relia ip occurred b, though all ferral data i | ce Survey x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res report includes ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics re s calculated, inc | s data calcul orted referr ing Perceive emain above cluding class | ations, w als, whic ed Value e benchn ifying so | /ith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of the most volation of the most score of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of the most volation of | a: Q6.1 on Lea erall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC falue 2: Q7 on a: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.C evise how re | rner Experiend n rate/20 0G(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun els: Q4.4 on Ed n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ue to its relia ip occurred b, though all ferral data i | ce Survey x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res report includes ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics re s calculated, inc | s data calcul orted referr ing Perceive emain above cluding class | ations, w als, whic ed Value e benchn ifying so | /ith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of | a: Q6.1 on Lea erall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on a: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.0 evise how re e survey pla | rner Experiend n rate/20 DG(5*x) where LES. of Course Sun els: Q4.4 on Ed n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ue to its relia ip occurred b, though all ferral data i tform is tran | ce Survey x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res report includes ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics ro s calculated, inc nsitioning from | s data calcula oorted referr ing Perceive emain above cluding class Canvas to Su | ations, w als, whic ed Value e benchn ifying so urvey Mo | vith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc onkey for be | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a etter integra |
| 1 | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of | arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.0 arney pla arner satisfa ile significant d re below 4.0 arise how re e survey pla cy. Quality a | n rate/20 OG (5*x) where LES. of Course Sum of | x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res res ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics ro s calculated, inco nsitioning from ongoing, and the | s data calcula orted referr ing Perceive emain above cluding class Canvas to Su e baseline m | ations, w als, whic ed Value e benchn ifying so urvey Mo nay be ac | /ith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc onkey for be ljusted for r | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a etter integra more consist |
| = | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of | arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.0 arney pla arner satisfa ile significant d re below 4.0 arise how re e survey pla cy. Quality a | n rate/20 OG (5*x) where LES. of Course Sum of | x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res res ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics ro s calculated, inco nsitioning from ongoing, and the | s data calcula orted referr ing Perceive emain above cluding class Canvas to Su e baseline m | ations, w als, whic ed Value e benchn ifying so urvey Mo nay be ac | /ith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc onkey for be ljusted for r | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a etter integra more consist |
| = | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Letthe most volatie enrollment. A second score score underway to resinfluencers. The and accessibility reporting. The | n: Q6.1 on Lea erall retention falue 1: 2.5*LC falue 2: Q7 on n: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.0 evise how re e survey pla cy. Quality a data, repres | rner Experiend on rate/20 OG(5*x) where LES. of Course Sum of Course Sum of Course Sum of Course Sum of Course Sum n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco cation Index ue to its reliation ip occurred of though all ferral data in tform is transsurance is of centing all poly | x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics ro s calculated, inconsitioning from ongoing, and the rograms, shows | s data calcula s data calcula orted referr ing Perceive emain above cluding class Canvas to Su e baseline m s overall posi | ations, w als, whic ed Value e benchn ifying so urvey Mo nay be ac tive satis | /ith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc onkey for be ljusted for r sfaction wit | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a etter integra more consist th around 6,0 |
| = | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of | a: Q6.1 on Lea erall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on a: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.0 evise how re e survey pla cy. Quality a data, represented the second of the second second second course acute the second | rner Experiend n rate/20 OG (5*x) where LES. of Course Sun els: Q4.4 on Ed n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ue to its relia ip occurred though all ferral data i tform is transsurance is o senting all priners expres | x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res report includes ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics ro s calculated, inc nsitioning from ongoing, and the rograms, shows sed concerns ab | s data calcula s data calcula ported referr ting Perceive emain above cluding class Canvas to Su e baseline m s overall posi pout course | ations, w als, whic d Value benchn ifying so urvey Mo nay be ac relevanc | vith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc onkey for be djusted for r sfaction wit e and atten | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a etter integra more consist h around 6,0 |
| | Satisfaction Loyalty: Ov Perceived V Perceived V Expectation Quality of C Quality of F Composite: Narrative 2025-1: The Let the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most volation of the most score of | a: Q6.1 on Lea erall retention 'alue 1: 2.5*LC 'alue 2: Q7 on a: Q4.5 on End course Materia aculty: Q5.4 o Average of al arner Satisfa ile metric du significant d re below 4.0 evise how re e survey pla cy. Quality a data, represented the second of the second second second course acute the second | rner Experiend n rate/20 OG (5*x) where LES. of Course Sun els: Q4.4 on Ed n EoCS+LES I cateogry sco action Index ue to its relia ip occurred though all ferral data i tform is transsurance is o senting all priners expres | x=100 * (number of rvey + Learner Exp oCS+LES res res ance on self-rep in spring, affect other metrics ro s calculated, inconsitioning from ongoing, and the rograms, shows | s data calcula s data calcula ported referr ting Perceive emain above cluding class Canvas to Su e baseline m s overall posi pout course | ations, w als, whic d Value benchn ifying so urvey Mo nay be ac relevanc | vith Perceive h fluctuate 2 and bring nark. Discus urces like sc onkey for be djusted for r sfaction wit e and atten | ed Value 1 b with ing the ssions are ocial media a etter integra more consist h around 6,0 |

| | NE has made efforts in supporting learners with more readily available faculty and an increase in optional webinars to support learning to improve quality of faculty and overall experience scores in the survey. There was an increase in Spring 2025 in quality of faculty from 4.45 to 4.54. |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) |
| | By the end of Q4 of 2025, the overall learner satisfaction survey score will increase as measured by a specific focus to improve the quality of faculty score to 4.35 or greater. |
| | Review the learner satisfaction surveys to evaluate the qualitative comments that are relevant to perception of faculty and create list of items to address. |
| NWCCU | NWCCU Standard Description |
| Standards - <u>NWCCU</u> 1.C.5 | The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs. |

3. Closing Equity Gaps

3.1 Persistence to Completion

| Function | Last Update | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Institutional | 6/12/2025 | | | | | | | |
| Analytics and | | | | | | | | |
| Effectiveness | | | | | | | | |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics | | | | | | | |
| 70% | | | | | | | | |
| | Persistence to Completion is calculate | ted as the % of active and araduated learners | divided by the total number of learn | ers who started in a given cohort by starting semester | | | | |
| MSN-TBD | | | | | | | | |
| | Benchmark: ADN: 70%, BSN: 70%, RI | N-to BSN: 70% MSN: TBD | | | | | | |
| | Tactic: Tactics connected to persiste | ence closely tied to retention and graduation | rates. | | | | | |
| | NWCCU Standard: 1.D.2 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | • . | | | | | | |
| | Recent BSN Pe | ersistence | | | | | | |
| | Recent BSN Pe Semester न्। | ersistence Persisting ~ | N ~ | Persistence Rate V | | | | |
| | | | N ~ 1304 | Persistence Rate ~ 99.23% | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ | Persisting ~ | | | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ 2025-2 | Persisting ∨ 1294 | 1304 | 99.23% | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ 2025-2 2025-1 | Persisting ∨ 1294 1259 | 1304 1411 | 99.23% 89.23% | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ 2025-2 2025-1 2024-3 | Persisting ✓ 1294 1259 1126 | 1304 1411 1382 | 99.23% 89.23% 81.48% | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ 2025-2 2025-1 2024-3 2024-2 | Persisting ~ 1294 1259 1126 842 | 1304 1411 1382 1104 | 99.23% 89.23% 81.48% 76.27% | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ 2025-2 2025-1 2024-3 2024-2 2024-1 | Persisting ~ 1294 1259 1126 842 815 | 1304 1411 1382 1104 1046 | 99.23% 89.23% 81.48% 76.27% 77.92% | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ 2025-2 2025-1 2024-3 2024-2 2024-1 2023-3 | Persisting 1294 1259 1126 842 815 7779 | 1304 1411 1382 1104 1046 1029 | 99.23% 89.23% 81.48% 76.27% 77.92% 75.70% | | | | |
| | Semester ≒↓ 2025-2 2025-1 2024-3 2024-2 2024-1 2023-3 2023-2 | Persisting ~ Image: Constraint of the second s | 1304 1411 1382 1104 1046 1029 813 | 99.23% 89.23% 81.48% 76.27% 77.92% 75.70% 67.28% | | | | |

| | | - | Ŭ | Pivot | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
| | | Program ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ADN | | B | SN | | L | PNASN | | N | ISN | | | MSN-FNF | Р |
| | Semester ~ | Persisting | Ν | Persistence Rate | Persisting | N | Persistence Rate | Persisting | N | Persistence Rate | Persisting | Ν | Persistence F | Rate Pers | sisting |
| | 2023-2 | | | | 779 | 1029 | 75.70% | 14 | 17 | 82.35% | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 00% | 8 |
| | 2024-1 | | | | 815 | 1046 | 77.92% | 12 | 16 | 75.00% | | | | | |
| | 2024-2 2024-3 | | | | 842 1126 | 1104 1382 | 76.27% 81.48% | 14 21 | 21 23 | 66.67% 91.30% | 4 | 7 | 57. | 1 494 | 14 |
| | 2025-1 | | | | 1259 | 1411 | 89.23% | 24 | 23 | 88.89% | | | | 14/0 | |
| | 2025-2 Grand total | 1010 | | 75.00% | 1294 | 1304 | 99.23% | 26 | 32 | 81.25% | 0 | 10 | 56. | | 20 |
| | Grand total | 1010 | 1332 | 75.83% | 10038 | 13720 | 73.16% | 139 | 169 | 82.25% | 8 | 12 | 66. | 67% | 30 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sources | Narrativ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2025-1: | The bend | chma | rk persiste | nce rat | te acr | oss all pro | grams is | 70% | %, with the | current | ove | rall rate | at 73.3 | 32%, |
| | | | | • | | | | • | | enrolled. Ea | | | | | · |
| | - | - | | | | | | | | | • • | | | | ' - d |
| | dicadore | disaggregated, and the persistence rate reflects how many from an admitted cohort have either completed or | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | - | | • | | | | • | | | | | | • | |
| | | - | | • | | | | • | acks | a total per | | | | • | d be |
| | are still | progressi | ing to | oward com | pletion | n. The | e report cur | rrently la | | • | sisting r | ate, | which it | t would | |
| | are still useful to | progressi o add. Pei | ing to rsiste | oward com ence to cor | pletion npletio | n. The on inc | e report cur ludes grad | rrently la uates ar | nd is | required for | sisting r | ate, ditat | which it tion, wh | t would ile the | |
| | are still useful to persistin | progressi o add. Pei ng rate, w | ing to rsiste vhich | oward com ence to cor excludes g | pletion mpletio graduat | n. The on inc :es, is | e report cur ludes grad | rrently la uates ar | nd is | • | sisting r | ate, ditat | which it tion, wh | t would ile the | |
| | are still useful to persistin | progressi o add. Pei ng rate, w | ing to rsiste vhich | oward com ence to cor | pletion mpletio graduat | n. The on inc :es, is | e report cur ludes grad | rrently la uates ar | nd is | required for | sisting r | ate, ditat | which it tion, wh | t would ile the | |
| | are still useful to persistin | progressi o add. Pei ng rate, w | ing to rsiste vhich | oward com ence to cor excludes g | pletion mpletio graduat | n. The on inc :es, is | e report cur ludes grad | rrently la uates ar | nd is | required for | sisting r | ate, ditat | which it tion, wh | t would ile the | |
| | are still useful to persistin | progressi o add. Pei ng rate, w | ing to rsiste vhich | oward com ence to cor excludes g | pletion mpletio graduat | n. The on inc ces, is | e report cur ludes grad | rrently la uates ar | nd is | required for | sisting r | ate, ditat | which it tion, wh | t would ile the | |
| Tactic | are still useful to persistin also beir Tactic (It | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applica | ing to rsiste vhich oped | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki | n. The on inc ces, is ing. | e report cur ludes grad more usef | rrently la uates ar ful for in | nd is tern | required fo | sisting r or accree ons. A ro | ate, ditat Iling | which it tion, wh averag | t would ile the e repoi | rt is |
| Tactic | are still useful to persistin also beir Tactic (It | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applica | ing to rsiste vhich oped | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki | n. The on inc ces, is ing. | e report cur ludes grad more usef | rrently la uates ar ful for in | nd is tern | required for | sisting r or accree ons. A ro | ate, ditat Iling | which it tion, wh averag | t would ile the e repoi | rt is |
| Tactic | are still useful to persistin also beir Tactic (It Collabor | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with | ing to ersiste which oped ble) Facu | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment | n. The on inc ces, is ing. to de | e report cur ludes grad more usef | rrently la uates ar ful for in | nd is tern | required fo | sisting r or accree ons. A ro | ate, ditat Iling | which it tion, wh averag | t would ile the e repoi | rt is |
| Tactic | are still puseful to persistin also bein Tactic (I t Collabor learner f | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with | ing to rrsiste vhich oped ble) Facu | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance ilty Develo n surveys b | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment | n. The on inc ces, is ing. to de | e report cur ludes grad more usef | rrently la uates ar ful for in | nd is tern | required fo | sisting r or accree ons. A ro | ate, ditat Iling | which it tion, wh averag | t would ile the e repoi | rt is |
| | are still useful to persistin also beir Tactic (If Collabor learner f | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with feedback CU Stanc | ing to ersiste vhich oped ble) Facu fron dard | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance ilty Develo n surveys b | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment py Q3 20 | n. The on inc ces, is ing. to de 025. | e report cur ludes grad more usef | rrently la uates ar ful for in aining n | eeds | required for al operations s that could | sisting r or accreations. A ro | ate, ditat Iling | which it tion, wh averag | t would ile the e report | rt is |
| NWCCU Standard Standards - | are still puseful to persistin also bein to the second sec | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with feedback CU Stance ent with it | ing to ersiste vhich oped ble) Facu <u>c fron</u> dard its mi | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance ilty Develo n surveys b ission and i | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment by Q3 20 | to de 025. | e report cur ludes grad more usef etermine tr | aining n | eeds | required for aal operation s that could n, with regi | sisting r or accrea ons. A ro d be imp | ate, ditat Illing Ilem | which in tion, wh average ented to tional po | t would ile the e report o addre | rt is |
| NWCCU Standard | are still puseful to persistin also bein to the second sec | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with feedback CU Stance ent with it | ing to ersiste vhich oped ble) Facu <u>c fron</u> dard its mi | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance ilty Develo n surveys b ission and i | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment by Q3 20 | to de 025. | e report cur ludes grad more usef etermine tr | aining n | eeds | required for al operations s that could | sisting r or accrea ons. A ro d be imp | ate, ditat Illing Ilem | which in tion, wh average ented to tional po | t would ile the e report o addre | rt is |
| NWCCU Standard Standards - | are still j useful to persistin also beir Tactic (It Collabor learner f NWCC Consiste institutio | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with feedback CU Stance ent with it ons, the i | ing to rsiste vhich oped ble) Facu c fron dard its mi instit | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance Ilty Develo n surveys b I ission and i ution estab | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment by Q3 20 in the c blishes | to de 025. | e report cur ludes grad more usef etermine tr etermine tr shares wide | aining n compa | risor of ir | required for aal operation s that could n, with regi | sisting r or accreo ons. A ro d be imp d be imp onal and or stude | ate, ditat Illing Dem d na nt ad | which in tion, wh average ented to tional pro- chievem | t would ile the e report o addre eer eer | ess |
| NWCCU Standard Standards - <u>NWCCU</u> | are still j useful to persistin also beir Tactic (In Collabor learner f NWCC Consiste institutio | progressi o add. Per ng rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with feedback CU Stance ent with it ons, the in g, but not | ing to rsiste vhich oped ble) Facu c fron dard its mi instit ot lim | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance Ilty Develo n surveys b ission and i ution estab ited to, per | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment by Q3 20 in the c olishes rsistenc | to de 025. | e report cur ludes grad more usef etermine tr etermine tr shares wide ompletion, | aining n compa ely a set | risor of ir | s that could n, with regindicators for | sisting r or accreations. A ro ons. A ro d be imp onal and or stude duation | ate, , ditat Illing Ilem d na nt ac succ | which in tion, wh average ented to tional po chievem cess. Suc | t would ile the e report o addre eer tent ch indic | ess |
| NWCCU Standard Standards - <u>NWCCU</u> | are still useful to persistin also bein Tactic (If Collabor learner f NWCC Consiste institutio including of stude | progressi o add. Per og rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with feedback CU Stance ent with it ons, the i g, but not ent achiev | ing to rsiste vhich oped ble) Facu c fron dard its mi instit ot lim veme | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance ilty Develo n surveys b i ssion and i ution estat ited to, per ent should l | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment oy Q3 20 in the c blishes rsistenc be disa | to de 025. | e report cur ludes grad more usef etermine tr st of and in shares wide ompletion, gated by ra | aining n compa ely a set ce, ethr | risor of ir n, an icity | n, with regindicators for | sisting r pr accreations. A ro ons. A ro d be imp onal and pr stude duation ler, socio | ate, ditat illing olem d na nt ac succ oecc | which in tion, wh average ented to tional po- chievem cess. Suc- ponomic s | t would ile the e report o addre eer eent ch indic status, | ess |
| NWCCU Standard Standards - <u>NWCCU</u> | are still j useful to persistin also bein Tactic (I Collabor learner f NWCC Consiste institutio including of stude generati | progressi o add. Per og rate, w ng develo f Applical rate with feedback CU Stance ent with it ons, the it g, but not ent achiev ion colleg | ing to rsiste which oped ble) Facu ts mi instit ot lim veme ge stu | oward com ence to cor excludes g to enhance ilty Develo n surveys b ission and i ution estat ited to, per ent should l udent, and | pletion mpletio graduat e tracki pment by Q3 20 in the c blishes rsistenc be disa any otl | to de 025. | e report cur ludes grad more usef etermine tr shares wide ompletion, gated by ra astitutional | aining n compa ely a set retentio ce, ethr | risor of ir n, an icity | s that could n, with regindicators for | sisting r pr accree ons. A ro d be imp d be imp onal and pr stude duation ler, socie es that r | ate, ditat illing blem d na nt ac succ oecc may | which in tion, wh average ented to tional per chievem cess. Suc phelp pro- | t would ile the e report o addre eer eent ch indic status, | ess |

3.2 Retention

| Function | Last Update |
|---------------|-------------|
| Institutional | 6/12/2025 |
| Analytics and | |
| Effectiveness | |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics |
| 80% | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | Retention Rate by Program F | all 2024 | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Program Code ~ | N =↓ | Retention Rate 🗸 | | | | | |
| | - BSN | 5385 | 91.49% | | | | | |
| | - PN | 90 | 82.22% | | | | | |
| | - LPNASN | 53 | 94.34% | | | | | |
| | - MSN-FNP | 29 | 86.21% | | | | | |
| | - MSNPMHNP | 10 | 80.00% | | | | | |
| | - MSN | 8 | 62.50% | | | | | |
| | - RNT | 4 | 100.00% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Sources | Narrative | | | | | | | |
| College MFM | 2025-1: Retention is measured semest | er over semester, from | post add/drop to the next term's | | | | | |
| <u>Dashboard -</u> | post add/drop, with all programs meet | - | • | | | | | |
| <u>Sigma</u> | program is still at benchmark, it experi | | | | | | | |
| | caused by delays in decision-making. C | | | | | | | |
| | The MSNEd program is noted with low | | • | | | | | |
| | what, if anything, is needed to make th | | | | | | | |
| | cap has also been placed on MSNEd re | | ion of learners to enter this program | | | | | |
| | in order to run a cohort in the next cycle. | | | | | | | |
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) | | | | | | | |
| | Develop and implement a continuous monitoring and evaluation framework to track the | | | | | | | |
| | effectiveness of the specialized services. The framework will include key performance indicators | | | | | | | |
| | (KPIs) related to learner satisfaction, academic performance, and retention. | | | | | | | |
| NWCCU | NWCCU Standard Description | | | | | | | |
| Standard | | | | | | | | |
| 1.D.2 | Consistent with its mission and in the o | | | | | | | |
| | institutions, the institution establishes | | | | | | | |
| | achievement including, but not limited | | | | | | | |
| | success. Such indicators of student ach | nevement should be dis | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 11 1 11 11 | | | | | |
| | gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic | | | | | | | |
| | | - | | | | | | |

3.3 Licensure

| Function | Last Update |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Institutional | 1/21/2025 |
| Analytics and | |
| Effectiveness | |
| Benchmark(s) | Statistics |
| 3-year overall | |
| pass rate – 80% | |
| | |
| | |
| *Program Pass | |
| Rates – Aligns | |
| with | |

| programmatic accreditation standards | Benchmark: 3-year Overall Pass Rate: 80% Tactic: Using NURSYS and state boards of nurs additional support. Learners will be made away NWCCU Standard: 1.C.1 BSN NCLEX Pass Rates The number of graduates who have passed the N Type ~ Licensu 1 Overall 2 3 Year Overall 2 rows - 2 columns | are of resources available throug | h NCLEX coaches throughout their ten | ure, with emphasis brought just prior | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | *Program Pass Rates as re | eported to Accred | liting Boards: | | |
| | PN - Annual Rates V 202 | | | ─ 2025 Y | |
| | 1st Time | 75.00% | 61.54% | 96.43% | 85.71% |
| | 1st+2nd | 75.00% | 92.31% | 96.43% | 85.71% |
| | Overall | 100.00% | 100.00% | 96.43% | 85.71% |
| | | | | | |
| | ASN - Annual Rates | 2023 | ~ 2024 | ~ 2025 | YTD 🖂 |
| | 1st Time | | 83.33% | 85.00% | 85.71% |
| | 1st+2nd | | 83.33% | 95.00% | 85.71% |
| | Overall | | 83.33% | 100.00% | 85.71% |
| | BSN 3 year rolling Av | | | | |
| | AANP and ANCC Results Combined | | | | |
| | Certification Exam Specialty Calendar | Year Number of testers Nu 2024 3 | nber First time pass Repeat par | ss Percentage certification pas | s rate overall 33% |
| | FNP | 2025 5 | 2 2[DS1] [DS2] | 80% [DS3] | |
| | Programmatic Accreditation Guide CCNE - the pass rate for each camp recent calendar years. CNEA - The program achieves a min recent three-year calendar time pe producing graduates eligible to see pass rate of second-time takers wh | elines: ous/site and track is 80% nimum graduate licensu riod, for each pre-licens ek licensure. (Provide sep | re pass rate of 80 percent an ure program (practical/voca parately - The program may a | nong first-time takers, avera tional, diploma, associate, a also provide evidence of the | ged over the most nd bachelor's) graduate licensure |
| Sources | Narrative | | | | |
| College MFM | 2025-1: The report includ | | | | |
| <u>Dashboard -</u> | bottom showing licensure | | - | | |
| <u>Sigma</u> | benchmark. MSNEd gradu graduates one-year post- | | | | |
| | averages, allowing second | • | • | | - |
| | first-time pass rates, as re | | | | |
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) | | | | |

| | Implement solution for NCLEX tracking and reporting. |
|-------------------|--|
| NWCCU Standard | |
| 1.D.2 | Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison, with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps). |

4. Scale and Sustainability

4.1 Credit Load

| Average creditLoad:BSN-11.85LPNASN – 11MSNEd – 8MSNFNP – 8MSNPMHNP-8PN – 11RNBSN-82025-1 | calculated as t <i>he average cr</i> verage Credit Load: BSN: 11.0 ard: Credit Load | | | 3, PN: 11, RNBSN: 8 |
|--|---|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| EffectivenessBenchmark(s)StatisticsAverage Credit Load: BSN-11.85 LPNASN – 11 MSNEd – 8 MSNFNP – 8 MSNPMHNP-8 PN – 11 RNBSN-8Credit Load is Benchmark: Au | verage Credit Load: BSN: 11.0 | | , MSN-FNP: 8, MSNPMHNP: 8 | 3, PN: 11, RNBSN: 8 |
| EffectivenessBenchmark(s)StatisticsAverage Credit Load: BSN-11.85 LPNASN – 11 MSNEd – 8 MSNFNP – 8 PN – 11 RNBSN-8Credit Load is Benchmark: Au Tactic: NWCCU Standa Semester 2025-1Semester 2025-12025-1Average C Program v | verage Credit Load: BSN: 11.0 | | , MSN-FNP: 8, MSNPMHNP: 8 | 3, PN: 11, RNBSN: 8 |
| Benchmark(s)StatisticsAverage Credit Load: BSN-11.85 LPNASN – 11 MSNEd – 8 MSNFNP – 8 PN – 11 RNBSN-8Credit Load is Benchmark: Au Tactic: NWCCU Standa Semester 2025-1Benchmark: Au Tactic: NWCCU Standa Semester 2025-1Average C Program v | verage Credit Load: BSN: 11.0 | | , MSN-FNP: 8, MSNPMHNP: 8 | 3, PN: 11, RNBSN: 8 |
| Average creditLoad:BSN-11.85LPNASN – 11MSNEd – 8MSNFNP – 8MSNPMHNP-8PN – 11RNBSN-8Semester2025-1Average OProgram ~ | verage Credit Load: BSN: 11.0 | | , MSN-FNP: 8, MSNPMHNP: 8 | 3, PN: 11, RNBSN: 8 |
| | | | | |
| BSN | Population ~ | Total Credits ~ | Average Credit Load \vee | |
| | 6413 | 76151 | 11.87 | |
| LPNASN | 77 | 872 | 11.32 | |
| MSN | 5 | 38 | 7.60 | |
| MSN-FNP | 25 | 213 | 8.52 | |
| MSNPMHNP | 8 | 72 | 9.00 | |
| NDS | 390 | 0 | 0.00 | |
| PN | 139 | 1597 | 11.49 | |
| RNBSN | 4 | 47 | 11.75 | |
| RNT | 6 | 59 | 9.83 | |

| Sources | Narrative |
|-------------------|--|
| | 2025-1: The report shows average credit load by program, with all meeting benchmarks except MSNEd, which is under redevelopment. This data reflects learner—not faculty—credit loads, with 12 credits considered full-time for undergraduates and 6 for graduate students (though most graduate plans average 9 credits per term). Variations in credit load are due to part-time status, SAP issues, or course retakes. The PN program has dropped below benchmark, largely due to course sequencing requirements and a high number of repeats, especially in PN 106, 145, and 165. These courses have been redeveloped, and improvements are expected. A PN task force is reviewing assessments and workload, and data accuracy for the PN program is under review due to potential reporting issues. |
| Tactic | Tactic (If applicable) |
| | Initiate a semesterly meeting with FMs, SMs, ADON, DON to determine staffing needs, assignments, hiring, and plans to adequately staff nursing courses for subsequent semester by Q1 2025. |
| NWCCU Standard | NWCCU Standard Description |

5. Comparison Data

| Functio n | Last Upda | ted | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Accredit | 6/12/2025 | 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| ation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Benchm | Statistics | | Link | to Data: | Detailed | Peer Cor | mparison | Data_Ml | FM.xlsx | | |
| ark(s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Nightingale College | St. John's College of Nursing, Springfield, IL | West Coast University (Texas) | Denver College of Nursing (Denver) | Bon Secours Memorial College of Nursing | Saint Francis Medical Center College of Nursing | Blessing-Rieman College of Nursing | Joyce University of Nursing & Health Sciences | Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions | The Christ College of Nursing & Health Sciences |
| | Data Points Categories | College Navigator - Nightingale, College | John's College, Springfield, IL (hshs.org) https://nces.ed.gov/college navigator/?g=St.+John%27s | edu/wp- content/uploads/2024/06/ WCU FORM StudentRightTo Know-TX 06212024v2.pdf | College Navigator - Deriver College of Nursing (ed.gov) https://www.derivercollegeo fnursing.edu/about- | Program Effectiveness Data 1 Bon Secours (bsmcon.edu) https://nces.ed.gow/collegen avigator/?g=Bon+Secours+M | sfmccon/about/consumer- information/ https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavi | https://nces.ed.gov/college navigator/?g=Blessing- Rieman&s=all&id=143297 #programs | https://nces.ed.gov/college navigator/?g=Joyce+Univer sity+of+Nursing&s=all&id= 447263 | College Navigator - Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions https://rm.edu/consumer- | Consumer Information: Data Privacy, Accreditation, and More https://nces.ed.gov/collestenavig ator/?g=The+Christ+College&s= |
| | Consumer Information Links Accreditation | https://nightingale.edu/disclosure s/college-performance-data.html NWCCU | +College&s=all&id=148593 #enrolmt HLC | https://westcoastuniversity. edu/wp- WASC | data.html HLC | emorial&s=all&id=233356#p rograms ABHES | eator/?o=Saint+Francis+Medica <u> +Center+College&s=all&id=14</u> HLC | https://www.brcn.edu/abo ut-us/program-outcomes- HLC | https://www.joyce.edu/ab out/student-outcomes/ NWCCU | information/ | all&id=201821 HLC |
| | Enrollment (IPEDS Data) | CNEA, CCNE 2023 4,265 | ACEN 2022 94 | 2022 | ACEN, CCNE | ACEN, CCNE 481 | ACEN, CCNE 607 | ACEN, CCNE | ACEN, AOTA, CCNE 2,304 | CCNE, APTA, ASHA 1,610 | CCNE, CAAHEP 765 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 21 | 12 | 493 | 50 | 0 | 275 | 14 | 126 | 1,610 | 0 |
| | | 4,244 | 82 | 975 | 1,034 | 481 | 332 | 153 | 2,178 | 0% | 765 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 991 | 44 | 119 | 170 | 136 | | 14 | 379 | 0% | 118 |
| | | 66% | 79% | 64% | 100% | 79% | 80% | 79% | 61% | 0% | 69% |
| | | 5% | 100% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 7%e | 096 | 00 ⁰ |
| | | 95% 34% | 0% 21% | 84% 36% | 100% 0% | 0% 21% | 0% 20% | 0% | 93% 39% | 100% 0% | 0% 31% |
| | | 0207 | 0# | 8.494 | 100% | 007 | 00P | 014 | 0.387 | 100% | UPP |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Image: second | | | | 100% | | 270 | 070 | 970 | 100% | 100% | 150 | 0% | 010 |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Image: Second | | Retention (Website Data) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| International intervention Intervention <th< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>91.49%, MSN-FNP 86.21%, MSN PMHNP 80%, MSN Ed 62.50%</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th<> | | | 91.49%, MSN-FNP 86.21%, MSN PMHNP 80%, MSN Ed 62.50% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Image: Second | | Placement Rate (Website Data) | (Fall 2024) | Not Available | 75% (20 | 22-2023) 75 | 5%, MSN 92% (2023) | (2022-2023) | MSN 71%, DNP 100% (2023) | Not Available | Not Available | Not Available | 64% (2023) |
| Image: Second | | racement nate (website bata) | PN-94% LPN to ASN - 81% | RN - 100% | RNtoB | N - 80% | Not Published | RNtoBSN - 85% | | BSN -100% | | | RN-BSN - 100% BSN - 97% |
| Interview Interview <t< td=""><th></th><td></td><td>BSN-81%</td><td>FNP-100%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>MSN100%</td><td>RC - 100%</td><td>RNtoBSN - 73.8%</td><td>Overall - 97% -2024</td><td>Accelerated BSN - 929</td></t<> | | | BSN-81% | FNP-100% | | | | | MSN100% | RC - 100% | RNtoBSN - 73.8% | Overall - 97% -2024 | Accelerated BSN - 929 |
| Intercent intervent | | | | | | | | (2022-2023) | | MedLab - 100% | | | Sonography - 100% |
| Image: second | | H Licensure Rate (Website Data) | BSN-89%, ASN-95%, PN-96.43% | E | | - | a | n | | J | N. | L. | M |
| Image: College of Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark | | Financial Aid (IPEDS Data) | 2024 - PN-96.43%, ASN-85% | 2022 - RN 84%, FNP | 67% | 202 | 23-BSN 92.81%, ADN 100% | 2023- RN 96.03% | N 94%, Graduate Student Certifica | Medical Laboratory Science | | | 2024 BSN-91.92% |
| Image: Strate in the state of the strate in the state of the strate in the st | | | 2020-0% | 2020-0% | 20 | 20-0% | 2020-0% | 2020-0% | 2020-0% | 2020-0% | 2020-0% | 2020-0% | 2020-0% |
| Image: All the second | | Program-Level Data (Website Data) | PN | | LV | I to BSN | ASN | | LPN-BSN | lincal/Medical Lab Science | A OTA AS | | |
| Image: Second | | | | | | BSN | BSN | | BSN | BSN | ASN | | RNBSN |
| Image: The second sec | | | MSN Ed | MSN Nurse Administr | | | MSN | | BSN-DNP | Radiologic Science., BS | MSN | MSN | BSN |
| Image: The second sec | | | MSN FP | DNP | | | | | MSN | Respiratory Care Therapist, | BS MI | MSc, MOT, MS MedSLP, MS Couns | MACC |
| Image: State in the s | | | | | | DNP | | | Post-Master's DNP | | | DMSc DNP/FNP | Sonography |
| Image: Second | | | | | | | | | | | | OTD, pOTD, OD, PhD, SLPD, tDP | 1 |
| Image: Second | | | X | x | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | Х |
| Limit of the second s | | Program Delivery Modalities | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ethnicity Ightingale Celleg St. John's West Coast Origing of Synophic St. Solution Deriver Immediation Saint Francis Medical Center Number (Stepper) Bitesing: College of Number (Stepper) Jopcer Musing Musing L Rocky Musing L The Child Musing L American Indian or Ataskan Nati Atian 11% 4/4 13% 7/% 0/ | | | x | | | | | | Xgraduate | Xgraduate | x | x | |
| Ethnichy Ightingale Colleg St. John's West Coast Origing of Synaptics Derver University Biols Security Hedical Conter P Jopic College of College of Nursing Jopic Hearing Recity Recity Phothist Hearing American Indian er Alaskan Nati Alain 13% 2% 14 15% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 1% 5% 4% Alain 13% 4% 13% 7% 7% 3% 2% 4% 5% 4% Block or African American 12% 0% 2% 1% 0% 0% 0% 1% 0% 0% 1% 1% 0% 0% 1% 0% 0% 1% 1% 0% 0% 1% 1% 0% | | | | | | | | | x | | | | х |
| American Indian or Alaskan Nati Alasian | | | | X | _ | X | х | X | | Xundergraduate | | х | |
| American main 15% 2% 1% 1% 0% | | Ethnicity | lightingale | Co | llege of ursing, | University | y College o Nursing | f Memorial College of | Medical Center College of | r Rieman College of | University of Nursing & | Mountain University of | College of Nursing & |
| Asian 19% 4% 13% 7% 7% 3% 2% 4% 5% 4% Native Vandian American 17% 28% 13% 22% 3% 2% 8% 17% 3% | | Amoricon Indian or Ala | akan Nati 104 | | 204 | 104 | 104 | 006 | 006 | 006 | | | |
| Black or Affician American17% 12%2% 0% 29%2% 29%13% 29%2% 1% 2%2% 0% 1%2% 0%2% 0% 0%2% 0% 0%2% 0% 0%2% 0%2% 0% 0%2% | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | |
| HispanicAution21% 290% 9529% 95%0% 95% </td <th></th> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | - | | | | | _ | | | | | | |
| Native Hawaina or Other Pacific2%1%0%0%0%0%1%1%1%0%0%Two or More Races0%20%6%5%6%14%1%2%7%72%Two or More Races0%2%6%5%6%14%1%2%4%0%Race/Ethiculy unknown12%1%0%0%0%0%0%0%0%J& Roce/Ethiculy unknown12%1%0%0%0%0%0%0%Jandower15%7%12%13%8%85%86%84%0.710J25 and over15%7%12%13%8%15%12%19%0%VarativeMpc2025-11Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement me | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Import More Races 0% 2% 6% 9% 6% 14% 1% 1% 0% 0% Recent Ethnicity Unkown 12% 1% 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Race/Ethnicity Unixove 12% 1% 0% 3% 0% | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| US Norresident 0% 0% 3% 0% 0% 1% 0% | | Two or More Races | 0% | | 2% | 6% | 5% | 6% | 14% | 1% | 2% | 4% | 0% |
| Age A | | Race/Ethnicity Unkow | n 12% |) | 1% | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 6% | 3% | 4% |
| 24 and under 85% 93% 88% 67% 92% 65% 68% 64% 0.71 0 25 and over 15% 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 0.29 0 Gender Enale 85% 93% 88% 87% 92% 85% 88% 7% 91% Mate 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 16% 0.29 0 Mate 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 9% 9% Mile 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 9% 9% Mile 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 9% 9% Mile 2025-1: Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics0.00000000000000000000000000000000000 | | US Nonresident | 0% | | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 24 and under 85% 93% 88% 67% 92% 85% 88% 84% 0.71 0 25 and over 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 0.29 0 Gender Enale 85% 93% 88% 87% 92% 65% 88% 84% 0.29 0 Hermale 85% 93% 88% 87% 92% 65% 88% 84% 71% 91% Mele 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 16% 9% 9% More struct Sector Sector Sector Sector Sector 9% 9% 9% M P 2025-1: Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Z25 and over. 15% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 16% 0.29 0 Gender Female 85% 93% 88% 87% 92% 85% 88% 84% 71% 91% Mreale 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 16% 29% 9% Mreale 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 16% 91% Mreale 15% 7% 12% 13% 8% 15% 12% 16% 29% 9% Mreal 2025-1: Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are sm | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender Bit Male < | | Age | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Female85%93%88%87%92%85%88%84%71%91%Male15%15%7%12%13%8%15%16%29%9%IncesNarrativeM_P2025-1: Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a compariso group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | | 24 and under | | | | | _ | _ | | - | | | |
| Male15%7%12%13%8%15%12%16%29%9%IncesNarrativeM P2025-1: Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a compariso group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | | 24 and under | | | | | _ | _ | | - | | | |
| Narrative 2025-1: Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | | 24 and under 25 and over Gender | 15% | | 7% | 12% | 13% | 8% | 15% | 12% | 16% | 0.29 | 0 |
| 2025-1: Nightingale College benchmarks its performance against nine (9) peer institutions using meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female | 85% |)) | 7% 93% | 12% 88% | 87% | 92% | 15% 85% | 88% | 16% | 0.29 | 91% |
| meaningful datasets collected from institutional websites and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female | 85% |)) | 7% 93% | 12% 88% | 87% | 92% | 15% 85% | 88% | 16% | 0.29 | 91% |
| (NCES). Peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner population, and published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | rces | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male | 85% |)) | 7% 93% | 12% 88% | 87% | 92% | 15% 85% | 88% | 16% | 0.29 | 91% |
| published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Nigh | 15% | ege ben | 93% 7% | 12% 88% 12% | 87% 13% | 92% 8% 8% ance aga | 15% 85% 15% | 12% 88% 12% 9) peer i | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio | 0.29 71% 29% | 91% 9% |
| published metrics have been carefully selected. Because Nightingale College has a primarily distance delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Nigh | 15% | ege ben | 93% 7% | 12% 88% 12% | 87% 13% | 92% 8% 8% ance aga | 15% 85% 15% | 12% 88% 12% 9) peer i | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio | 0.29 71% 29% | 91% 9% |
| delivery model that is exclusive to nursing education, and offers education to learners throughout the country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a comparise group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M_P</u> | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Mate Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d | tingale Colle | ege ben ected fr | 93% 7% rchma rom in | 12% 88% 12% | 13% 87% 13% perform onal web | 92% 8% 8% ance aga osites and | 15% 85% 15% inst nine (d the Natio | 9) peer i | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Eo | 0.29 71% 29% ns using ducation S | 91% 9% |
| country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a compariso group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>VI_P</u> | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Nigh meaningful d (NCES). Peer | tingale Colle atasets colle | ege ben ected fr that sh | 93% 7% ochma rom in are co | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutio | perform onal wel | ance aga osites and | 15% 85% 15% inst nine (d the Natio | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree | 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec | 0.29 71% 29% ons using ducation S er populat | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and |
| country, finding comparable institutions is challenging. Selected peer institutions are reported on the annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a compariso group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distance education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M_P</u> npari | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published me | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b | ege ben ected fr that sh peen ca | 93% 7% com in are co refully | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutic mmon select | perform onal wel progratice ed. Becc | ance aga osites and ms, delive | inst nine (d the Natio ery model | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Eo es, learne s a prima | 0.29 71% 29% ns using ducation S er populat arily distar | 91% 9% Statistics cion, and nce |
| annual report and identified within the Mission Fulfillment Measure (MFM) Report. Although a compariso group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distanc education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M_P</u> npari | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published meaningful d | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b | ege ben ected fr that sh been ca | 93% 7% com in are co refully | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutic mmon select | perform onal wel progratice ed. Becc | ance aga osites and ms, delive | inst nine (d the Natio ery model | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Eo es, learne s a prima | 0.29 71% 29% ns using ducation S er populat arily distar | 91% 9% Statistics cion, and nce |
| a M group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distanc education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M_P</u> npari ailed | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Mate Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published mean delivery mod | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive | 93% 7% com in are co refully to nur | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitution mmon select sing ec | perform onal wel progra ced. Beca | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bilege ha tion to le | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners t | 0.29 71% 29% ducation S er populat arily distan | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and nce t the |
| a M group is identified within the IPEDS Data Feedback Report, the College has identified alternate peer institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distanc education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M_P</u> npari ailed <u>r</u> | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published mean delivery mod country, findi | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins | 93% 7% rom in are co refully to nur titutio | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutio mmon select sing ec ns is cl | perform onal well progra ced. Beca ducatior hallengi | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bllege ha tion to le | 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners the | 0.29 71% 29% ons using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout | 91% 9% Statistics Stat |
| a M institutions that are smaller in learner population, have nursing as a primary program focus, offer distanc education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M_P</u> npari ailed <u>r</u> | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published mean delivery mod country, findi | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins | 93% 7% rom in are co refully to nur titutio | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutio mmon select sing ec ns is cl | perform onal well progra ced. Beca ducatior hallengi | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bllege ha tion to le | 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners the | 0.29 71% 29% ons using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout | 91% 9% Statistics Stat |
| education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M_P</u> npari ailed <u>r</u> | 24 and under 25 and over 25 and over Gender Female Mate Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published mea delivery mod country, findia annual report | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins fied wit | 93% 7% ochma rom in are co refully to nur titutio hin th | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutio mmon select sing eo ns is cl e Miss | perform onal well progration ducation hallengini ion Fulfi | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (N | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bilege ha tion to le nstitution | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Eo es, learne s a prima earners the s are re- port. Alth | 0.29 71% 29% ns using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co | 91% 9% Statistics cion, and nce t the the pmparise |
| education, and provide more current outcome metrics on their website. Comparable data supports Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M P</u> npari ailed r npari | 24 and under 25 and over 25 and over Gender Female Mate Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published meaningful d delivery mod country, findiannual report group is identification | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi tified withir | ege ben ected fr that sh peen car clusive able ins fied wit | 7% 93% 7% com in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitution select sing econs is cl e Miss ata Fee | perform onal wel prograt ced. Becc ducation hallengin ion Fulfi | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M Report, th | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (No | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bllege ha tion to le nstitution 1FM) Rep has iden | 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners th s are re port. Alth tified alt | 0.29 71% 29% ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and to the the the ompariso er |
| Nightingale College's student achievement measures including metrics for enrollment, retention, placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M P</u> npari ailed <u>r</u> npari | 24 and under 25 and over 25 and over Gender Female Mate Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published meaningful d delivery mod country, findiannual report group is identification | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi tified withir | ege ben ected fr that sh peen car clusive able ins fied wit | 7% 93% 7% com in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitution select sing econs is cl e Miss ata Fee | perform onal wel prograt ced. Becc ducation hallengin ion Fulfi | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M Report, th | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (No | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bllege ha tion to le nstitution 1FM) Rep has iden | 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners th s are re port. Alth tified alt | 0.29 71% 29% ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and to the the the ompariso er |
| placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M P</u> npari ailed <u>r</u> npari | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Male Narrative 2025-1: Nightime aningful d (NCES). Peer published meaningful d delivery mod country, findia annual report group is identiinstitutions the | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi tified withir hat are sma | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins fied wit the IPf ller in le | 93% 7% 7% rom in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da earner | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitution mmon select sing eo ns is cl e Miss ata Fee popul | perform onal wel progra ced. Beca ducatior hallengin ion Fulfi edback F ation, ha | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh ng. Select Ilment M Report, th ave nursi | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (N he College ng as a pri | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bllege ha tion to le hastitution 1FM) Rep has iden | 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners the s are re port. Althe tified alt | 0.29 71% 29% ons using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co cernate pe ocus, offer | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and nce t the the ompariso er distanc |
| placement, pass rates, degrees, programs, and delivery modalities. Disaggregated data includes age, | <u>M P</u> npari ailed r npari | 24 and under 25 and over 25 and over Gender Female Mate Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published mea delivery mod country, findia annual report group is identiinstitutions the education, ar | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi tified withir hat are sma nd provide r | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins fied wit the IPF ller in le nore cu | 93% 7% 7% rom in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da earner rrent | 12% 88% 12% rks its s stitution mmon select sing econs is cl e Miss ata Fee popul popul poutcor | perform onal well oprogram ced. Beca ducation hallengin ion Fulfi edback F ation, ha | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M Report, th ave nursi ics on the | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (N ne College ng as a pri eir website | 9) peer i 29) peer i 29) peer i 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20 | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Eo es, learno s a prima earners th ns are rep port. Alth tified alt ogram fo arable da | 0.29 71% 29% ons using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co cernate pe ocus, offer ita suppor | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and nce t the the ompariso er distanc |
| | <u>M_P</u> npari ailed r npari a_M | 24 and under 25 and over 25 and over Gender Female Mate Narrative 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published mea delivery mod country, findia annual report group is identiinstitutions the education, ar | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi tified withir hat are sma nd provide r | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins fied wit the IPF ller in le nore cu | 93% 7% 7% rom in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da earner rrent | 12% 88% 12% rks its s stitution mmon select sing econs is cl e Miss ata Fee popul popul poutcor | perform onal well oprogram ced. Beca ducation hallengin ion Fulfi edback F ation, ha | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M Report, th ave nursi ics on the | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (N ne College ng as a pri eir website | 9) peer i 29) peer i 29) peer i 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20 | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Eo es, learno s a prima earners th ns are rep port. Alth tified alt ogram fo arable da | 0.29 71% 29% ons using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co cernate pe ocus, offer ita suppor | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and nce t the the ompariso er distanc |
| ethnicity, and gender. Data is collected from institutional websites and the College Navigator. | <u>M_P</u> npari ailed r npari a_M | 24 and under 25 and over 25 and over Gender Female Mate 2025-1: Nightime aningful didition (NCES). Peer published meed delivery modicountry, findia annual reporting group is identiinstitutions the education, ar Nightingale C | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi- tified withir hat are sma nd provide r College's stu | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins fied wit the IPf ller in le nore cu dent ac | 7% 93% 7% rom in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da earner rrent chieve | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutions select sing econs is cl e Miss ata Fee popul outcorn ment n | perform onal wel prograt ced. Beca ducation hallengin ion Fulfi edback F lation, ha me metr measure | ance aga 92% 8% ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M Report, th ave nursi ics on the s includir | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (No ne College ng as a pri eir website ng metrics | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree bllege ha tion to le hastitution IFM) Rep has iden mary pro- | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners th ns are re port. Alth tified alt ogram fo arable da illment, r | 0.29 71% 29% ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co cernate pe ocus, offer ita suppor retention, | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and the the the ompariso er distance ts |
| | <u>M P</u> npari ailed r npari | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Mate 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published meaningful d country, findia annual report group is ident institutions the education, ar Nightingale C placement, p | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi- tified withir hat are sma nd provide r College's stu ass rates, de | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins fied wit the IPF ller in le nore cu dent ac egrees, | 7% 93% 7% ochma rom in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da earner rrent hievel progr | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutio mmon select sing ec ns is cl e Miss ata Fee popul outcon ment n ams, a | perform onal wel prograd ced. Becc ducation hallengin edback F ation, hi me metr measure nd deliv | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M Report, th ave nursi ics on the s includir ery moda | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (No ne College ng as a pri eir website ng metrics alities. Disa | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree ollege ha tion to le hastitution 1FM) Rep has iden mary pro- e. Compa for enro aggregat | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners the sare report. Althe tified alt ogram fo arable da illment, r | 0.29 71% 29% ans using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co cernate pe ocus, offer ita suppor retention, includes a | 91% 9% Statistics ion, and the the the ompariso er distance ts |
| | <u>M P</u> npari ailed r npari | 24 and under 25 and over Gender Female Mate 2025-1: Night meaningful d (NCES). Peer published meaningful d country, findia annual report group is ident institutions the education, ar Nightingale C placement, p | tingale Colle atasets colle institutions etrics have b el that is ex ing compara t and identi- tified withir hat are sma nd provide r College's stu ass rates, de | ege ben ected fr that sh been car clusive able ins fied wit the IPF ller in le nore cu dent ac egrees, | 7% 93% 7% ochma rom in are co refully to nur titutio hin th EDS Da earner rrent hievel progr | 12% 88% 12% rks its stitutio mmon select sing ec ns is cl e Miss ata Fee popul outcon ment n ams, a | perform onal wel prograd ced. Becc ducation hallengin edback F ation, hi me metr measure nd deliv | ance aga osites and ms, delive ause Nigh n, and offi ng. Select Ilment M Report, th ave nursi ics on the s includir ery moda | inst nine (d the Natio ery model ntingale Co ers educat ted peer in leasure (No ne College ng as a pri eir website ng metrics alities. Disa | 9) peer i onal Cen s, degree ollege ha tion to le hastitution 1FM) Rep has iden mary pro- e. Compa for enro aggregat | 16% 84% 16% nstitutio ter for Ec es, learne s a prima earners the sare report. Althe tified alt ogram fo arable da illment, r | 0.29 71% 29% ans using ducation S er populat arily distan hroughout ported on nough a co cernate pe ocus, offer ita suppor retention, includes a | 91% 9% Statistics cion, and to the the ompariso er distanc ts |

| | Nightingale College's BSN enrollment is significantly higher than that of peer institutions, however, the selected institutions are "regionally" accredited and do have a significant nursing program focus. We are |
|----------------|---|
| | still looking for more comparable institutions with PN and MSN PMHNP programs. Overall, our data looks |
| | to be consistent with the selected peer institutions. |
| | |
| | Disaggregated data is represented, and the most notable difference is that Nightingale College enrolls a |
| | more balanced diverse student population. Age and gender is consistent with peer institutions. |
| Tactic | Tactic (If Applicable) |
| | Continue to identify peer institutions that share common programs, delivery models, degrees, learner |
| | population, and published metrics to develop a stronger comparison group for benchmarking. |
| | |
| | Continue to develop the data-sharing/peer comparison consortium initiative to share data (Q1), and create |
| | a dashboard (Q2), and utilize data to enhance institutional effectiveness. |
| NWCCU | NWCCU Standard Description |
| Standar | |
| d | |
| <u>Standar</u> | Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer |
| <u>ds -</u> | institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement |
| <u>NWCC</u> | including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such |
| <u>U</u> | indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic |
| 1.D.2 | status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help |
| | promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps). |