

Proposal to the Graduate Council of the University of Utah

**A Pilot Project for a
Distance-Based Option for the Ph.D. in Nursing**

March 2002

College of Nursing Contact
Kathi Mooney RN, Ph.D. FAAN
Professor
Telephone: 585-9645
E-mail: kathi.mooney@nurs.utah.edu

The Request

We are requesting approval of a pilot project that would allow us to systematically evaluate the value of adding a distance education option to the existing Ph.D. in Nursing. The distance option would allow us to overcome existing barriers to doctoral education that currently exist for master's prepared nurses working in clinical settings who seek research training and doctoral study. The pilot would consist of the admission, progression and graduation of 2 cohorts of doctoral students (maximum of 10 students in each cohort) utilizing distance technology as the delivery method. For the purposes of the pilot, we are focusing specifically on oncology nurses who seek doctoral preparation and research training in cancer prevention and control research.

A rigorous program evaluation will assist us to evaluate the strengths and limitations of distance technology as a delivery format for doctoral study.

The **specific aims** of the pilot are:

- 1) to deliver the Ph.D. nursing program to a national oncology nursing cohort through distance technology;
- 2) to evaluate the distance education format and outcomes as a method to provide high quality Ph.D. education in nursing

Program Description

The Ph.D. program in the College of Nursing is a mature program that began in 1979 and emphasizes development as a researcher and nurse scientist. As an established and approved doctoral program we will not focus on the curriculum in this proposal but instead describe how distance technology will be utilized to deliver the curriculum.

Distance technology is an educational delivery approach that vastly broadens access to higher education programs. With continued advances in technology, distance education is an emerging force in higher education. Findings from national surveys on the penetration of distance education in Universities and Colleges underscore the rapid adoption of distance learning outreach by Universities. While the evaluation research base for distance education is not extensive, what has been done consistently demonstrates equivalent outcomes with traditional on campus classroom learning.

We propose to use a combination of real-time; internet-based, desktop, videoconferencing supported by Web-CT course resources for our distance outreach. All classes will be conducted through live videoconferencing where the faculty and students see and hear each other in real time. Students will access the classroom from their work or home computers through a broadband connection (T1 line, DSL, broadband cable or satellite access). We have partnered with the University's Technology Assisted Curriculum Center (TAC) to provide all technical support for the program. In addition, they will work with prospective students to assess computer capabilities and broadband specifications so that all students at the time of admission will have a high quality connection to the classroom. Specifically we will be using the VICON ViGO CuSeeMe videoconferencing technology system (computer requirements include a P90 or faster processor with Windows 95 or above operating system, 32 MG RAM, 15 MB free hard disk space, VGA/SVGA monitor with 16 bit color, and a LAN/WAN or IP connection). The TAC Center has experience supporting this system. It has been used extensively in higher education including distance programs at Ohio State, Penn State, Virginia Tech and the Medical University of South Carolina. The TAC Center has found the system to be highly reliable and stable. In addition we will have a back-up mechanism to videotape and maintain a virtual library of our classes. All students will be expected to attend each live class session but in the event of illness or technical difficulties, past classes can be seen at the program website through videostreaming. More importantly, the videostreaming capability will allow students the opportunity to revisit a class at their convince, for example, to review a particularly difficult

statistical concept. Our capability to videotape and videostream content also will allow us to prepare supplemental materials or tape an on-campus visiting professor lecture or special seminar that students can access later.

The live interactive VICON ViGO system will also serve as the method for faculty to interact with students individually during “office hours”. Advisement including dissertation advisement will be conducted live in this manner. Students will be encouraged to use the videoconferencing system to form study groups and to interact and support each other during non-class times. In other words, whatever occurs face-to-face with a student in traditional, place-bound Ph.D. education, will occur through videoconferencing in this program. The curriculum will be provided over 9 contiguous semesters (includes summers). The 9-semester progression facilitates systematic progress of students through the program while allowing students to maintain family obligations and some level of work commitment. The curriculum is designed such that 6 to 7 hours of videoconferencing would be required weekly during the first 7 semesters and only 2 to 3 hours per week during the last 2 semesters.

The classroom component of a doctoral course is supported by the course syllabus, assignments, reading and educational resources that complement in-class activities. In our distance program these resources will be available to students, at the program website, 24 hours a day 7 days a week. They are available from any computer with students using a personal identification number to enter the site. Using the multiple capabilities of Web-CT, faculty will build courses materials and resources that include such components as the course syllabus, course objectives, class schedule, description of assignments, reading assignments, individual access to course progress and grades, communication tools providing quick e-mail links among faculty and students, a bulletin board where weekly discussion questions or assignments can be posted allowing students to converse on topics prior to class, access to the videostream library of previous classes and special lectures and quick links to important internet sites pertinent to the course content. In addition, individual journal articles can be scanned and uploaded to the site allowing access to required readings without going to the library but still conforming to appropriate copyright standards. All of these features join to take students from the passive role in the traditional classroom lecture-format to active learners utilizing the faculty, classmates, national/international interdisciplinary experts and informational resources. This creates a learning environment with enormous opportunity for exchange and collaborative team building.

For the Ph.D. in nursing, research experience and training beyond classroom instruction, comes through practicum courses as well as the dissertation experience. Nursing research is clinically based with research designs involving human participants in community, home, clinic or hospital settings. Rarely does nursing research involve traditional basic science lab activities. Therefore practicum experiences can be provided at a distance, and in fact, utilizing multiple settings for learning may enrich the experience. For the research practicum and professional practicum courses in the program, faculty and individual students will assess opportunities to meet course objectives both through projects available in the student’s home community and also through distance activities with the Utah faculty. If home community projects are utilized, a local mentor will be identified who can support the student with issues related to access and support. Students will also have the opportunity to work with individual Utah faculty on their research in a variety of clinical settings. This is possible given the multisite nature of much of the Utah oncology faculty’s research. Depending on interest and access, study start up and study implementation activities, including data collection, could be possible for students if they opened a recruitment site for a particular faculty-sponsored study in their home community. This would give them a first hand experience with issues in multisite research. Faculty studies at the point of data analysis are not placed bound either, and, with appropriate confidentiality safeguards and approvals, students could participate with the faculty in analyzing data and developing publications remotely. Thus we believe that we will be able to provide a variety of research experiences that will enrich student learning and skill development.

We also will provide a rich interdisciplinary experience for students. Just as in traditional, on-campus programs, University faculty from other departments will join dissertation committees and participate as guest faculty in selected classes. In addition, because of the videoconferencing capabilities, we will be able to involve national (even international) experts in selected classes as guest faculty. We will be able to courier a laptop computer, with the videoconferencing software attached, to guest faculty, allowing them to join and participate in a class along with course faculty and students. (Letters of support are on file and available from 7 Huntsman Cancer Institute Investigators and 5 national cancer prevention and control experts as examples of the interdisciplinary and national support we have for participation in the program). Students may also engage national experts who are qualified and willing to participate in the dissertation process, once again, by using a laptop computer outfitted with the videoconferencing software.

We do plan annual, intensive weeklong visits for each class group to campus, which will augment the videoconference format for classes. The visits also are intended to provide the opportunity for student orientation and role socialization, attendance at campus seminars and meetings with faculty across campus and in-person interaction time with classmates. For example we will arrange for students to come to campus at the beginning of the first semester in the student's first year. Students will meet faculty and classmates and complete the first 1 credit course on distance technology. This course will be an additional course to the doctoral program and will assist students with socialization and skill in being a distance learner. Students will have social gatherings and rich opportunities to meet with the traditional, on-campus doctoral students and for the faculty and staff that support the doctoral program to develop rapport and establish a working relationship. In addition, the oncology doctoral faculty and each student cohort as a group will attend a professional, scientific meeting together once a year. This will allow socialization into networking within the cancer scientific community and modeling for students the process of exchange and scientific dissemination. Students initially will see faculty submit abstracts and present their work and then in succeeding years, students will be facilitated to submit their work and take active roles in the meetings. We will plan group attendance at selected sessions so that these sessions can be the focus of further group discussion and enrichment to class content. Meeting attendance will also provide the opportunity for social gatherings. Since the two cohorts of students overlap in at least one year when meetings are occurring, there will be an opportunity for the two cohorts to meet in-person as a group.

The Need

Need for Cancer Prevention and Control Clinical Researchers

For over twenty years, there has been concern about the decline in the number of health care providers—physicians, nurses as well as other clinicians who chose to become both clinician and scientist. This decline is occurring at the same time there are significant advances in basic science discoveries that require translational science to bring direct benefit to health care. In addition to translational science there also is a greater recognition that to successfully prevent disease and improve quality of life for those experiencing disease, there must be a stronger emphasis on behavioral, psychosocial and supportive care research. Cancer has not escaped the growing pressure and need for more clinical scientists. Cancer policy and research groups have called for more qualified clinical researchers to address major gaps in knowledge related to cancer prevention and the delivery of quality cancer care. The conclusion reached by cancer policy groups is consistent. All recognize the significant knowledge gaps and the need for stronger programs of research in psychosocial, behavioral and symptom management throughout the continuum of the cancer experience. All emphasize the role of clinical investigation. All of them recognize the need for innovative methods to recruit and train the next generation of scientists to carry out these investigations.

Oncology Nursing as a Resource for Expanding the Number of Cancer Clinical Scientists

Oncology nursing began as a specialty in the late 1960's into the 1970's in concert with expanding treatment modalities for cancer. The specialty was formalized in 1975 with the establishment of the nursing specialty organization, the Oncology Nursing Society. Twenty-five years later, oncology nursing is a mature specialty and the Oncology Nursing Society is a sophisticated organization with 29,000 members.

Specialization in a clinical area of nursing takes place through graduate education at the master's level. While the first oncology courses at the master's level were offered in 1947, the development of programs of study in oncology nursing at the master's level began in the late 1960's. These master's prepared nurses serve as key members in both cancer centers and community cancer centers. They are prime candidates for research training as oncology nurse scientists and have the potential to collaborate as investigators with interdisciplinary research teams. They are seasoned clinicians and potentially strong students, having already obtained one graduate degree. Clearly they have an important stake in closing knowledge gaps and practicing from a constantly updated evidence base. The Oncology Nursing Society reports that 4,421 (15%) of their 29,000 members hold Master's degrees in nursing as their highest educational degree. This is the potential pool for recruitment into doctoral study and cancer research training as a clinical scientist.

Barriers to Quality Ph.D. Programs

Unfortunately, significant barriers exist for master's prepared oncology nurses to access high quality Ph.D. programs that provide a strong grounding in cancer prevention and control research. These barriers can be categorized as obstacles related to characteristics of the doctoral programs and barriers related to the nurse's life situation.

A high quality program in cancer prevention and control requires that the institution and school have a strong commitment to research, that there be a cadre of senior oncology faculty to guide students, that the faculty have active programs of cancer prevention and control research and that there is a good fit between student interest and faculty expertise. When this criteria is applied to the 73 doctoral programs in nursing, less than a third are likely to meet the criteria. Of the 73 programs, only 53 were identified on the National Institutes of Health (NIH) website as having at least one research grant funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in 1999 (<http://silk.nih.gov/public/cbz2zoz.www.nur.total.fy99.dsnc>). In seeking a research-intensive environment for doctoral study, schools would be expected to have several grants, nonetheless, only 33 of the 53 schools had more than two NIH funded research grants in 1999. Regrettably, it is not possible to tell which of the grants relate to cancer prevention and control. Based on the membership of the ONS Advance Nurse Research Special Interest Group and other nurses known to publish research findings regularly in cancer journals only 21 schools could be identified as research intensive and having at least one Ph.D. prepared oncology faculty member. Thus nurses have a limited number of nursing school available to them from which to seek Ph.D. preparation as an oncology nurse scientist.

The University of Utah is one of the few universities in the country that has a strong cadre of oncology faculty in their College of Nursing with a rich base in funded research. Currently the College of Nursing has 7 faculty with a research focus in cancer prevention and control. These seven faculty have 14 extramurally funded cancer prevention and control research grants. The environment is rich for students who seek professional development and research training in cancer prevention and control.

Besides the limited availability of qualified programs, nurses also experience significant career and personal obstacles to obtaining doctoral preparation and scientific training. Access to programs, especially ones where oncology nurse scientists are on the faculty, often requires relocation. Frequently this is not possible for reasons related to family responsibilities (two-career families or single mother, head of

household responsibilities) and loss of income from mid-level positions and career placement. This also negatively impacts health care settings such as cancer centers, since key advanced practice nurses who have contributed to the quality of cancer care at the center are lost as they move to obtain further education- research training that would actually benefit and add value to the cancer center mission. Even nurses finding suitable Ph.D. nursing programs in their local communities are challenged to maintain work and family obligations while commuting to campus three to five times a week. Most doctoral programs do not offer a schedule of part time study that systematically moves students at a slower but systematic way through their coursework once again increasing the burden of seeking research training. These factors further limit the number of nurses available to seek doctoral study and contribute to the scientific base of cancer care.

The combination of a distance-based Ph.D. program and the strong cadre of oncology faculty at the University of Utah provides an innovative response to address the current educational barriers for nurses. To ascertain interest in our program, we sent a questionnaire to a sample of 700 ONS members who are master's prepared. Questionnaires were sent through the U.S. mail with no follow-up or reminder. We received responses from 140 nurses, a return rate of 20%. While we would have preferred a higher response rate, the rate was probably consistent with a one time mailing during the holiday month of December. However the response of those who returned the questionnaire assures that we are likely to have a strong applicant pool for the 20 students we would accept for the pilot. Seventy-two respondents indicated a '1' that they were very interested (n=52) or a '2' that they were interested (n=20) in pursuing doctoral education through a specialized program targeted for master's prepared oncology nurses and offered through distance technology. In the final question of the survey, respondents were asked more specifically, "if we were to provide a distance doctoral program in nursing, what is the likelihood you would apply in the next three years?". Fifty-eight respondents indicated a '1'-very interested (n=29) or a '2'- interested (n=29). Handwritten comments provided for the open-ended question were extremely positive. Comments underscored the importance of study that could accommodate continued work in their current setting, limited time away from their families and the need for financial assistance. Our sample was approximately 16% of the total pool of potential applicants. Conservatively, if we extrapolate responses of only the most enthusiastic '1', very interested respondents to the total pool of eligible ONS members (rounding the sample to represent 20% of the potential pool and computing 52 applicants for the first question and 29 applicants for the second questions) survey results suggest we could anticipate at least 145 to 260 applicants.

The overwhelming majority of respondents (96%) indicated that they had access to a Pentium computer at home or work and that they had access to a medical/health sciences library (95%). It was encouraging to learn that the majority of respondents (62%) have access to T-1 lines, DSL or broadband cable internet access. Another 28% responded that they did not know if they had access to broadband technology and only 10% indicated that they did not have access. Respondents who indicated that they were very interested in the program had similar responses to this question as the total group (64%- yes, don't know-28%, 8%-no). Based on the survey results we are confident that sufficient applicants have or can obtain the basic computer equipment and access to appropriate transmission lines. Respondents also indicated that the most attractive features of the proposed program were access to a national faculty of oncology researchers while remaining in their home communities, on-line resources and financial assistance with stipends for tuition and travel.

Program and Student Evaluation

Evaluation is a primary focus of this initiative. We want to carefully evaluate distance education delivery and the student and program outcomes achieved before we make the distance option an ongoing component of our doctoral program. Therefore we have planned both a formative and summative evaluation (see table below). Within the context of formative and summative evaluation there are three

specific components to evaluate: process evaluation; outcome evaluation (i.e. the immediate outcome at graduation); and impact evaluation (i.e. student achievements, over time, after graduation).

Table 1 Evaluation Plan

Focus of Evaluation	Process (pre- or during PhD study)	Frequency Of Measurement	Source
Student	Admission characteristics (GPA, GRE, goal statement)	On admission	Student records
	Course grades	Each semester	Student records
	Number semesters to graduation	At graduation	Student records
	Grants/scholarships applied for	At graduation	Student records
	Grant/scholarships awarded	At graduation	Student records
	Awards	At graduation	Student records
Faculty	Dissertation topic (specific aim, design, population)	At graduation	Student records
Faculty	Student evaluations of faculty teaching effectiveness	Each semester	SETE forms
Course	Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness—course	Each semester	SETE forms
Technology	Student evaluation of technology—Flashlight Project	Each semester	Flashlight toolkit
	Faculty process evaluation—course/dissertation	Each semester	Faculty Evaluation Form
	Guest faculty process evaluation	Semester of participation	Visiting Faculty Evaluation Form
Focus of Evaluation	Outcome (at graduation)	Frequency of Measurement	Source
Student	GPA for doctoral study	At graduation	Student records
	Graduation rate of student's class	After 9 semesters; annually thereafter	Office of Acad. Affairs records
Program	Student exit interview	At graduation or withdrawal	Student Exit Interview
Focus of Evaluation	Impact (outcome over time)	Frequency of Measurement (after graduation)	Source
Student	Position of employment	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
	Months from graduation to publication of dissertation findings	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
	Other publications	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
	Months from graduation to presentation of dissertation findings	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
	Other presentations	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
	Leadership positions	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
	Policy activities	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
	Research grants applied for	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey
Research grants awarded	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey	
	Research activities (role, specific aims, design population, disciplines involved, multisite or single site)	6mo, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5yr	Alumni Survey

The process evaluation will document the admission characteristics and activities/accomplishments of students during their Ph.D. program. We also will evaluate the delivery process through evaluation of each course by students, faculty and guest faculty. This evaluation will include teaching effectiveness, course content, and distance technology effectiveness. We will use a variety of tools. A sample of these tools is provided in the Appendix. The standard University Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) will be used for course and teaching effectiveness. This will permit comparison with scores obtained in traditional, on-campus teaching of the courses. We will also be able to compare the admission characteristics and accomplishments of our students with the traditional, on campus doctoral cohort. Evaluation of the distance technology will be carefully and systematically evaluated. We are planning to purchase an extensive educational technology evaluation question bank, known as the Flashlight Project Toolbox, that was developed by the Teaching Learning and Technology Group affiliated with the American Association of Higher Education. This resource of questions used for student and faculty

evaluation of distance technology has been beta tested and validated with over 4200 students at five institutions of higher education. Questions are designed to assess the degree to which the distance technology supports or hinders such educational components as active learning, collaborative learning, facilitation of different learning styles, student camaraderie, productive use of time, and quality of faculty–student interaction and feedback. Provided as a question bank rather than a single instrument, the Flashlight Project Toolkit will allow us to select from the questions and develop a customized tool. While we do not have the question-bank yet, an example of a few of the questions in the toolkit can be found in the Appendix with the other evaluation tools. We also have constructed evaluation tools for course faculty, guest faculty and members of the student’s supervisory committee to comment on the quality of the experience and the degree to which the distance technology supported or hindered the process.

We will track both student and program outcomes. These will be determined at the time of student graduation. We will document final GPA and the graduation rate for both cohorts of students. In addition we will conduct exit interviews with each student so that we have a summative evaluation of their experience. Many of the items are similar to our standard exit interview used with traditional, on-campus doctoral students so we will have a basis to compare their experiences.

Finally we will track post graduation careers of the students at 6 months and then annually for 5 years. This is more frequent but similar in content to our Doctoral Alumni Impact Survey done routinely in the College of Nursing. Once again this will allow for comparison.

Finances

In order to pilot the distance option, we have sought federal training grant support through submission of a R25 Training Grant application to the National Cancer Institute. This proposal is currently under review with the Study Section review occurring during the first 2 weeks of March 2002. This proposal requests \$1,480,520 (total direct costs) over a five-year period. The funds will support the cost of the distance technology equipment; TAC staff to support the project; faculty salaries to adapt (i.e. prepare materials for Web-CT support if not already adapted) and teach the initial courses; Project Director’s time; College staff support; consultants; student stipends (\$2,500 for the 1st semester, then \$1500 for the next 8 semesters of didactic course work plus up to \$1000 per year for travel to campus); some faculty travel to conferences; and educational and evaluation supplies. This support would enable us to have dedicated equipment and protected time to carefully implement and evaluate the initiative. In addition to grant support, there will be income to the University from credit hour generation and to the College in tuition differential for graduate education credits. The College also has made a commitment to seek development funds to support student travel costs to the annual professional meeting that the group will attend.

Time Line

Assuming the grant is funded for June 2002, we will begin recruitment immediately and admit the first cohort of 10 students for Spring semester 2003. Coursework occurs over 9 contiguous (summers included) semesters, with graduation of the first cohort beginning in the Spring of 2006. The second cohort of 10 students will be recruited during 2003 and admitted for Summer semester of 2004. Their graduation will begin in the Summer of 2007. By the Fall of 2006 we would be able to give the Graduate Council a report on the first cohort’s process and outcome evaluation and by Fall of 2007, we would be able to give the Graduate Council a report on the impact evaluation of the first cohort and the process and outcome evaluation of the second cohort.

Appendix

Tool for Evaluation of Courses and Supervisory Committees in Distance PhD
Program
Process Evaluation by Faculty

Please complete this questionnaire within 1 month of completing your course or dissertation supervision.

Course Number _____ or Dissertation Student's Name _____

Semester _____ Fall _____ Spring _____ Summer

1. Please rate your experience overall in teaching this course or supervising this dissertation using distance technology on a 0 to 10 scale with 0 being a "very negative experience" to 10 being a "very positive experience". _____

2. Please identify the positive aspects of your experience, i.e., what worked well?

3. Please detail any technical difficulties that you encountered and the frequency of their occurrence?

4. Were the problems resolved?

_____ Yes, please describe how:

_____ No, do you have any suggestions for addressing these problems?

5. To what degree were you satisfied with the technical assistance provided? Please rate from 0 being “not at all satisfied” to 10 being “totally satisfied”. _____
6. Please identify any other assistance that would have been helpful.
7. Please identify any other types of problems that you encountered, i.e., what went wrong?
8. Do you have any suggestions for addressing these problems?
9. Please rate how helpful each aspect of Web CT was in supporting your course on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being “not helpful at all” to 5 being “totally helpful.” If you did not utilize this aspect, circle not used.

course syllabus	1	2	3	4	5	not used
calendar of events	1	2	3	4	5	not used
course content	1	2	3	4	5	not used
bulletin board	1	2	3	4	5	not used
student email	1	2	3	4	5	not used
online quizzes	1	2	3	4	5	not used
online grading	1	2	3	4	5	not used
links to internet sites	1	2	3	4	5	not used
course materials and readings	1	2	3	4	5	not used

10. Did you have any guest faculty? _____ yes _____ no

If yes, please answer questions 10a-d; if no, skip to question 11.

- a. Please identify how many guest faculty you included from each place and identify them by name:

The College of Nursing _____ List:

Huntsman Cancer Institute _____ List:

University of Utah _____ List:

National faculty _____ List:

b. Please describe the advantages of including these faculty in your course.

c. Please describe any problems encountered.

d. How might we eliminate these problems in the future.

11. Were there any problems related to student attendance?

_____ yes (please describe the problem and how you handled it) _____ no

12. Your teaching assignment for this course was budgeted at ___% . Please comment on the degree to which this accurately reflects the effort expended.

13. Please reflect upon your teaching experience in this course in comparison to traditional classroom teaching of the course, Please comment on the level of student discourse, quality of learning, and ability to meet course objectives.

14. If you were to teach this course again, what would you do differently?

Any additional comments:

Thank you for you time in completing this evaluation.

Tool for Evaluation of Courses and Supervisory Committees in Distance PhD Program
Exit interview: Students

1. Please rate your experience overall in the oncology doctoral program using distance technology on a 0 to 10 scale with 0 being a “very negative experience” to 10 being a “very positive experience”. _____

2. Please identify the positive aspects of your experience, i.e., what worked well?

3. Please detail any technical difficulties that you encountered and the frequency of their occurrence?

4. Were the problems resolved?

_____ Yes, please describe how:

_____ No, do you have any suggestions for addressing these problems?

5. To what degree were you satisfied with the technical assistance provided. Please rate from 0 being “not at all satisfied” to 10 being “totally satisfied”. _____

6. Please identify any other assistance that would have been helpful.
7. Please identify any other types of problems that you encountered, i.e., what went wrong?
8. Do you have any suggestions for addressing these problems?
9. Please rate how helpful each aspect of Web CT was in supporting your learning on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being “not helpful at all” to 5 being “totally helpful”. If you did not utilize this aspect, circle not used.

course syllabus	1	2	3	4	5	not used
calendar of events	1	2	3	4	5	not used
course content	1	2	3	4	5	not used
bulletin board	1	2	3	4	5	not used
student email	1	2	3	4	5	not used
online quizzes	1	2	3	4	5	not used
online grading	1	2	3	4	5	not used
links to internet sites	1	2	3	4	5	not used
course materials and readings	1	2	3	4	5	not used

The next set of questions refers to the use of guest faculty during your program.

- a. Please describe the advantages of including these faculty in your courses or supervisory committee.
- b. Please describe any problems encountered.

c. How might we eliminate these problems in the future.

10. How clear were you about your area of study upon entering the program?

10a. Did your focus of study influence your decision to attend the University of Utah?

10b. Did your focus of study change after you were enrolled?

11. To what extent did your course work prepare you for your dissertation research? Please rate on a 0-5 scale from 0 being “not at all” to 5 being “totally”. _____

12. Please indicate whether each of these served as a Barrier or Facilitator to your ability to successfully complete your doctoral education. Circle either B or F and then rate the importance of each. On a 0 to 5 scale with 0 being “not at all important” to 5 being “totally important.”.

Cost of tuition and fees	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Cost of travel	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Year-round scheduling	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Part-time credit load	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
On-campus experiences	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Use of interactive video-technology	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Use of WebCT	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Bond with classmates	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Self-motivation	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Oncology faculty	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5
Visiting Faculty	B or F	0	1	2	3	4	5

Please comment on any of the above or add any others.

13. Please comment on the strengths of the doctoral program.

14. Please identify areas for improvement.

15. Would you recommend this program to another oncology nurse? _____yes _____no

16. If you were to complete this program of study again, what would you do differently?

Any additional comments:

Thank you for you time in completing this evaluation.

Tool for Evaluation of Courses and Supervisory Committees in Distance PhD
Program
Process Evaluation by Visiting Faculty

Please complete this questionnaire within 1 month of completing your guest lecture or dissertation supervision.

Course Number _____ or Dissertation Student's Name _____

Semester _____ Fall _____ Spring _____ Summer

Are you from:

_____ The College of Nursing

_____ Huntsman Cancer Institute

_____ University of Utah

_____ Other institution Please specify: _____

1. Please rate your experience overall in teaching this lecture or supervising this dissertation using distance technology on a 0 to 10 scale with 0 being a "very negative experience" to 10 being a "very positive experience". _____
2. Please identify the positive aspects of your experience, i.e., what worked well?
3. Please detail any technical difficulties that you encountered and the frequency of their occurrence?
4. Were the problems resolved?

_____ Yes, please describe how:

_____ No, do you have any suggestions for addressing these problems?

5. To what degree were you satisfied with the technical assistance provided. Please rate from 0 being “not at all satisfied” to 10 being “totally satisfied”. _____
6. Please identify any other assistance that would have been helpful.
7. Please identify any other types of problems that you encountered, i.e., what went wrong?
8. Do you have any suggestions for addressing these problems?
9. If you were to teach this lecture or participate on a committee again, what would you do differently?

Any additional comments:

Thank you for you time in completing this evaluation.

University of Utah College of Nursing

Oncology Doctoral Program Alumni Impact Survey

We are continuing our follow-up of graduates of our Oncology Distance Technology Doctoral Program. Please check the appropriate responses or fill-in-the blanks where indicated

Now that you are out of doctoral education to what do you believe the program prepared you to:	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>not</u>				<u>a great deal</u>
1. Critically analyze cancer care issues?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Critically evaluate theories pertinent to cancer?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Critically analyze research from a variety of disciplines, including nursing?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Utilize critical evaluations of nursing research and relevant literature?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Construct conceptual models and theories that have relevance to nursing science?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Select research designs appropriate to a specific Cancer prevention or cancer control problem?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Apply research methods appropriate to a specific cancer care problem?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Develop and utilize reliable and valid measurement tools?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Select, apply, and interpret appropriate statistical methods?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Utilize research and theory for the purpose of advancing nursing knowledge and improving nursing practice?	1	2	3	4	5
12. Communicate effectively in public to facilitate the incorporation of research findings into the formulation of health policy?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Collaborate with other disciplines in research endeavors?	1	2	3	4	5
14. Study systematically and thoroughly a cancer research area of interest?	1	2	3	4	5
15. Demonstrate a commitment to advance nursing knowledge and practice through research?	1	2	3	4	5
16. Since you graduated, have you pursued post-doctoral study? Yes ____ No ____					

If Yes,

Formal post-doctoral fellowship

Additional classes (type: _____)

Location of post-doctoral study _____

Focus of post-doctoral work _____

17. Since your doctorate, in which of the following activities have you engaged?

Submitted articles from dissertation

Title:

Journal:

Date submitted:

Title:

Journal:

Date submitted:

Article acceptance from dissertation

Title:

Journal:

Citation:

Title:

Journal:

Citation:

Articles other than dissertation submitted

Title:

Journal:

Date submitted:

Articles other than dissertation accepted

Title:

Journal:

Citation:

Title:

Journal:

Date submitted:

Title:

Journal:

Citation:

Major Presentations of dissertation

Conference:

Sponsor:

Title:

Major Presentations other than dissertation

Conference:

Sponsor:

Title:

Conference:

Sponsor:

Title:

Conference:

Sponsor:

Title:

Research proposals submitted

PI:

Grant Sponsor:

Award type:

Title:

Design:

Study population:

Research proposals awarded

PI:

Grant sponsor:

Award type:

Title:

Design:

Study population:

PI:

Grant Sponsor:

Award type:

Title:

Design:

Study population:

PI:

Grant sponsor:

Award type:

Title:

Design:

Study population:

18. Describe current research activities (funded or not) and accomplishments since our last survey. Include title, design, population, specific aims, research team composition and single or multisite
19. Describe specific leadership and health policy activities you have accomplished since our last survey.
20. Describe your current activities with professional organizations—include memberships and role
21. Describe your current employment position. Is it different since our last survey? ___Yes ___No
22. What skills and knowledge gained in the doctoral program are required and used the most in your position?

Thanks very much! We like to keep in touch. Let us know if you move and please contact us to share good news or if we can be of assistance. We will contact you again in one year.

Oncology Doctoral Program
College of Nursing University of Utah
10 South 2000 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112