

---

# California Board of Registered Nursing

## 2013-2014 Annual School Report

---

Data Summary for Pre-Licensure Nursing Programs

June 17, 2015

Prepared by:  
Renaë Waneka, MPH  
Timothy Bates, MPP  
Joanne Spetz, PhD  
University of California, San Francisco  
3333 California Street, Suite 265  
San Francisco, CA 94118

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Nursing Education Survey Background .....	3
Organization of Report .....	3
Availability of Data .....	3
Value of the Survey .....	3
Survey Participation .....	4
<b>DATA SUMMARY – Pre-Licensure Programs</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Number of California Nursing Programs .....	5
Applications to California Nursing Programs .....	5
Number of Students who Enrolled in California Nursing Programs .....	6
Nursing Student Admission Spaces Supported by Donor Partners and Grants .....	6
Newly Enrolled Nursing Students .....	7
Currently Enrolled Nursing Students .....	9
Students who Completed a Nursing Program .....	12
Faculty Data .....	20
Nursing Program Data .....	27
School Data .....	41
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>51</b>
APPENDIX A – List of Survey Respondents by Degree Program .....	51
APPENDIX B – Definition List .....	53
APPENDIX C – BRN Education Issues Workgroup Members .....	56

## PREFACE

---

### *Nursing Education Survey Background*

---

Development of the 2013-2014 Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) School Survey was the work of the Board's Education Issues Workgroup, which consists of nursing education stakeholders from across California. A list of workgroup members is included in the Appendices. The University of California, San Francisco was commissioned by the BRN to develop the online survey instrument, administer the survey, and report data collected from the survey.

Funding for this project was provided by the California Board of Registered Nursing.

### *Organization of Report*

---

The survey collects data about nursing programs and their students and faculty from August 1 through July 31. Annual data presented in this report represent August 1, 2013 through July 31, 2014. Demographic information and census data were requested for October 15, 2014.

Data from pre- and post-licensure nursing education programs are presented in separate reports and will be available on the BRN website. Data are presented in aggregate form and describe overall trends in the areas and over the times specified and, therefore, may not be applicable to individual nursing education programs.

Statistics for enrollments and completions represent two separate student populations. Therefore, it is not possible to directly compare enrollment and completion data.

### *Availability of Data*

---

The BRN Annual School Survey was designed to meet the data needs of the BRN as well as other interested organizations and agencies. A database with aggregate data derived from the last ten years of BRN School Surveys will be available for public access on the BRN website. Parties interested in accessing data not available on the website should contact Julie Campbell-Warnock at the BRN at [Julie.Campbell-Warnock@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Julie.Campbell-Warnock@dca.ca.gov).

### *Value of the Survey*

---

This survey has been developed to support nursing, nursing education and workforce planning in California. The Board of Registered Nursing believes that the results of this survey will provide data-driven evidence to influence policy at the local, state, federal and institutional levels.

The BRN extends appreciation to the Education Issues Workgroup and all survey respondents. Your participation has been vital to the success of this project.

## Survey Participation<sup>1</sup>

---

All California nursing schools were invited to participate in the survey. In 2013-2014, 131 nursing schools offering 141 pre-licensure programs approved by the BRN to enroll students responded to the survey. A list of the participating nursing schools is provided in the Appendix.

**Table 1. RN Program Response Rate**

Program Type	# Programs Responded	Total # Programs	Response Rate
<b>ADN</b>	82	82	100%
<b>LVN to ADN</b>	7	7	100%
<b>BSN</b>	36	36	100%
<b>ELM</b>	16	16	100%
<b>Total Programs</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100%</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> In this 2014 report there are 131 schools in California that offer a pre-licensure nursing program. Some nursing schools offer more than one program, which is why the number of programs (n=141) is greater than the number of schools. In addition, some schools offer their programs at more than one campus. In the 2013-2014 survey, 131 nursing schools reported data for 141 pre-licensure programs at 162 different locations.

## DATA SUMMARY – Pre-Licensure Programs

### Number of California Nursing Programs<sup>2</sup>

- 63% of California pre-licensure nursing programs that reported data are ADN programs.

**Table 2. Number of California RN Programs by Program Type**

	#	%
<b>ADN</b>	82	58.2%
<b>LVN to ADN</b>	7	5.0%
<b>BSN</b>	36	25.5%
<b>ELM</b>	16	11.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Applications to California Nursing Programs

- 42% of the 31,575 qualified applications to pre-licensure nursing education programs received in 2013-2014 were accepted. Since these data represent applications – and an individual can apply to multiple nursing programs – the number of applications is presumably greater than the number of individuals applying for admission to nursing programs in California.
- ADN programs had the highest percentage of qualified applications *not* accepted.

**Table 3. Applications\* for Admission by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Total Applications Received</b>	25,765	843	23,651	3,714	53,973
<b>Screened</b>	21,155	693	19,685	3,348	44,881
<b>Qualified</b>	16,242	422	12,695	2,198	31,575
<b>Accepted</b>	6,516	296	5,529	982	13,323
<b>% Qualified Applications Accepted</b>	<b>40.1%</b>	<b>70.1%</b>	<b>43.6%</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>42.2%</b>

\*Since the data represent applications and not individual applicants, the number of applications is presumably greater than the number of individuals applying to nursing school.

<sup>2</sup> In this 2014 report there are 131 schools in California that offer a pre-licensure nursing program. Some nursing schools offer more than one program, which is why the number of programs (n=141) is greater than the number of schools. In addition, some schools offer their programs at more than one campus. In the 2013-2014 survey, 131 nursing schools reported data for 141 pre-licensure programs at 162 different locations.

### Number of Students who Enrolled in California Nursing Programs

- Of the total number of applications accepted to RN programs, an average of 99% of students enrolled. ELM programs had the lowest share of students enroll into programs for which they were accepted (82%), while both ADN and LVN to ADN programs enrolled more students than they accepted. Some ADN and LVN to ADN programs reported that they enrolled students who had applied in a previous application cycle and were still on the waitlist prior to accepting additional applications for admission. Other schools reported accepting new applications during this enrollment cycle but offered enrollment to students on the waitlist prior to those who applied more recently.
- As in recent years pre-licensure nursing programs enrolled more students in 2013-2014, overall, than the number of admission spaces that were available.
- 42% (n=59) of pre-licensure programs reported that they filled more admission spaces than were available.
- The most frequently reported reason for over enrolling was to account for attrition.

**Table 4.1. Share of Accepted Applications that Enrolled by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Applications Accepted	6,516	296	5,529	982	13,323
New Student Enrollments	6,834	301	5,284	807	13,226
% Accepted Applications that Enrolled	104.9%	101.7%	95.6%	82.2%	99.3%

**Table 4.2. Share of Admission Spaces Filled with New Student Enrollments by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Spaces Available	6,566	334	4,641	853	12,394
New Student Enrollments	6,834	301	5,284	807	13,226
% Spaced Filled with New Students Enrollments	104.1%	90.1%	113.9%	94.6%	106.7%

### Nursing Student Admission Spaces Supported by Donor Partners and Grants

- Approximately 11% of admission spaces (n=1,269) to pre-licensure nursing programs were supported by either donor partners or grants.
- In general, grant funding plays a bigger role in supporting admission space compared with donor support, particularly in ADN programs. In 2013-2014, 16% (n=1,023) of total admission spaces in generic ADN programs were supported by either donor partners or grants, but 85% of these 1,023 supported spaces were the result of grant funding.

**Table 5. Donor Partner and Grant Support for Admission Spaces by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Spaces Available	6,566	334	4,641	853	12,394
% Supported by Donor Partners	2.3%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	2.2%
% Supported by Grants	13.3%	21.6%	1.1%	0.0%	8.0%

## Newly Enrolled Nursing Students

### *Ethnic Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students*

- 61% of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program for the first time were ethnic minorities.
- ADN programs enrolled the greatest share of Hispanic students (25%).

**Table 6. Ethnic Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Native American</b>	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	1.4%	0.6%
<b>Asian</b>	13.0%	8.8%	22.2%	24.7%	17.3%
<b>Asian Indian</b>	1.2%	9.6%	2.6%	0.7%	1.9%
<b>Filipino</b>	8.6%	13.1%	9.3%	2.1%	8.6%
<b>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</b>	1.3%	8.1%	3.1%	1.1%	2.1%
<b>African American</b>	5.6%	6.5%	3.8%	1.8%	5.1%
<b>Hispanic</b>	25.3%	9.6%	13.8%	19.6%	19.8%
<b>Multi-race</b>	2.2%	0.4%	4.1%	8.1%	3.3%
<b>Other</b>	2.9%	3.5%	1.5%	0.1%	0.6%
<b>White</b>	39.3%	39.6%	39.3%	40.3%	39.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,270</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>5,016</b>	<b>713</b>	<b>12,315</b>
<b>Ethnic Minorities*</b>	60.7%	60.4%	60.7%	59.7%	60.9%
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	564	41	268	94	911

\*Ethnic minorities include all reported non-White racial and ethnic groups, including "Other" and "Multi-race".

### *Gender Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students*

- 19% of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure program for the first time were male.
- Generic ADN and BSN programs have greater shares of men enrolling in their programs for the first time than LVN to ADN or ELM programs.

**Table 7. Gender Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Male</b>	20.6%	12.5%	18.8%	15.9%	19.4%
<b>Female</b>	79.4%	87.5%	81.2%	84.1%	80.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,713</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>5,264</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>13,063</b>
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	121	22	20	0	163

### Age Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students

- 68% of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program were younger than 31 years of age when starting the program.

**Table 8. Age Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>17 – 20 years</b>	2.0%	0.0%	16.2%	0.0%	7.4%
<b>21 – 25 years</b>	26.8%	19.3%	45.8%	32.1%	34.9%
<b>26 – 30 years</b>	28.7%	31.9%	21.3%	30.7%	26.5%
<b>31 – 40 years</b>	26.7%	25.9%	12.2%	20.3%	21.0%
<b>41 – 50 years</b>	10.9%	11.3%	4.0%	6.8%	8.1%
<b>51 – 60 years</b>	2.7%	3.3%	0.5%	1.6%	1.8%
<b>61 years and older</b>	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,698</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>5,013</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>12,727</b>
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	136	24	271	68	499

### Newly Enrolled Students by Degree Type

- The majority (52%) of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program for the first time continue to be generic ADN students.

**Table 9. Newly Enrolled Students by Degree Type**

	% Enrollment
<b>ADN</b>	51.7%
<b>LVN to ADN</b>	2.3%
<b>BSN</b>	40.0%
<b>ELM</b>	6.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,226</b>

### Newly Enrolled Students by Program Track

- 80% of all newly enrolled nursing students are in the generic program track.
- 14% of BSN students are enrolled in an accelerated track.

**Table 10. Newly Enrolled Students by Program Track**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN*	ELM*	Total
<b>Generic</b>	83.4%	0.0%	78.4%	100.0%	80.4%
<b>Advanced Placement</b>	13.2%	99.7%	5.6%	0.0%	11.4%
<b>Transfer</b>	0.6%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.1%
<b>30-Unit Option</b>	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Accelerated</b>	2.6%	0.0%	14.1%	0.0%	7.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,834</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>5,276</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>13,163</b>
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	0	0	8	55	63

\*The program track was not reported for all students in BSN and ELM programs.



### *Newly Enrolled Students Concurrently Enrolled in an ADN to BSN Program*

---

- 22 programs reported enrolling a total of 268 students in an ADN to BSN program in which students are concurrently enrolled in both programs.

**Table 11. New Students Enrolling in ADN to BSN Programs**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	Total
<b># Students Concurrently Enrolled</b>	204	8	56	268
<b># Programs</b>	19	1	2	22

### **Currently Enrolled Nursing Students**

---

#### *Nursing Student Census Data*

---

- On October 15, 2014, a total of 24,983 nursing students were enrolled in a California nursing program that leads to RN licensure.
- Generic ADN programs had the greatest share of students enrolled, at 45% of all nursing students enrolled on October 15, 2014.

**Table 12. Nursing Student Census Data by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Total Nursing Students</b>	11,174	328	12,008	1,473	24,983

### *Ethnic Distribution of Nursing Student Census Data*

- Overall, 62% of students enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program as of October 15, 2014 represented an ethnic minority group.
- The share of ethnic minority nursing students was greatest at the LVN to ADN level (63% of all students enrolled in a LVN to ADN program).
- Generic ADN programs had the greatest share of Hispanic students (26%).

**Table 13. Ethnic Distribution of Nursing Student Census Data by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Native American</b>	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%
<b>Asian</b>	12.2%	6.9%	24.0%	24.4%	18.5%
<b>Asian Indian</b>	1.3%	11.1%	1.7%	0.7%	1.6%
<b>Filipino</b>	8.5%	11.5%	8.1%	1.5%	8.0%
<b>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</b>	1.0%	3.1%	3.1%	1.2%	2.0%
<b>African American</b>	5.1%	4.9%	3.5%	8.8%	4.6%
<b>Hispanic</b>	25.7%	16.7%	16.6%	18.1%	20.8%
<b>Multi-race</b>	2.9%	4.5%	3.4%	6.3%	3.4%
<b>Other</b>	2.8%	3.5%	1.8%	0.5%	2.2%
<b>White</b>	39.9%	37.2%	37.1%	37.6%	38.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,511</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>11,302</b>	<b>1,378</b>	<b>23,479</b>
<b>Ethnic Minorities*</b>	60.1%	62.8%	62.9%	62.4%	61.7%
<b># Unknown/unreported</b>	663	40	706	95	1,504

\*Ethnic minorities include all reported non-White racial and ethnic groups, including "Other" and "Multi-race".

### *Gender Distribution of Nursing Student Census Data*

- Men represented 19% of all students enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program as of October 15, 2014.
- Generic ADN programs had the greatest share of men enrolled.

**Table 14. Gender Distribution of Nursing Student Census Data by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Male</b>	19.7%	15.7%	18.2%	16.5%	18.7%
<b>Female</b>	80.3%	84.3%	81.8%	83.5%	81.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,986</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>11,985</b>	<b>1,457</b>	<b>24,734</b>
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	188	22	23	16	249

*Age Distribution of Nursing Student Census Data*

- 71% of students enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program as of October 15, 2014 were younger than 31 years old.

**Table 15. Age Distribution of Nursing Student Census Data by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>17 – 20 years</b>	1.1%	0.0%	16.9%	0.0%	8.6%
<b>21 – 25 years</b>	27.6%	23.4%	48.4%	28.3%	37.5%
<b>26 – 30 years</b>	29.3%	28.9%	18.5%	39.3%	24.7%
<b>31 – 40 years</b>	28.1%	28.9%	11.7%	23.5%	20.0%
<b>41 – 50 years</b>	11.5%	14.1%	3.6%	7.4%	7.5%
<b>51 – 60 years</b>	2.3%	3.8%	0.7%	1.4%	1.5%
<b>61 years and older</b>	0.1%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,813</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>11,488</b>	<b>1,396</b>	<b>23,988</b>
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	361	37	520	77	995

### *Declared Disabilities among Students Enrolled in Nursing Programs*

- Nursing programs that have access to student disability data reported that 1,029 students enrolled in their programs on October 15, 2014 had declared a disability. Since only 32 schools reported that they would be able to get access to and report aggregate student disability data as part of this survey, the number of students with disabilities and those who have received accommodations may be underreported here.
- For 35% of those 1,029 students, the specific disability declared by the student was unknown to the nursing program. Of those students for whom the declared disability was known, general learning disabilities (19%) and psychiatric disabilities (11%) were the most commonly reported.

**Table 16. Declared Disabilities among Students Enrolled in Nursing Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Autism/Asperger's Spectrum</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%
<b>ADD/ADHD</b>	5.1%	0.0%	15.1%	34.2%	8.9%
<b>Blind or Visually Impaired</b>	0.7%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.6%
<b>Brain Injuries</b>	0.6%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%
<b>Deaf/Hard-of Hearing</b>	1.9%	0.0%	2.8%	5.3%	2.2%
<b>Intellectual Disabilities</b>	4.6%	0.0%	8.8%	10.5%	5.9%
<b>Learning Disabilities</b>	25.3%	0.0%	4.2%	21.1%	19.1%
<b>Medical Disabilities/ Chronic Illness</b>	1.4%	0.0%	2.8%	2.6%	1.8%
<b>Physical Disabilities</b>	1.1%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	2.1%
<b>Psychiatric Disabilities</b>	7.1%	0.0%	18.3%	26.3%	10.9%
<b>Communication/Speech and Language Disabilities</b>	2.7%	14.3%	0.7%	7.9%	2.4%
<b>Test Anxiety</b>	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
<b>Other</b>	36.7%	0.0%	26.8%	23.7%	33.2%
<b>Unknown</b>	42.1%	85.7%	21.5%	0.0%	35.2%
<b>Total</b>	700	7	284	38	1,029

- 949 students were provided accommodations for a declared disability. Exam accommodations (82.1%) are the most frequently reported accommodations nursing program provide students with disabilities. Academic counseling and advising is provided for almost half (46.7%) of students with disabilities for whom accommodations were provided.

**Table 17. Accommodations Provided for Students with Disabilities Enrolled in Nursing Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Academic Counseling/Advising</b>	61.2%	100.0%	20.4%	2.6%	46.7%
<b>Disability-Related Counseling/Referral</b>	22.0%	100.0%	4.2%	2.6%	16.3%
<b>Adaptive Equipment/Physical Space/Facilities</b>	11.9%	0.0%	2.1%	2.6%	8.4%
<b>Interpreter and Captioning Services</b>	1.1%	0.0%	0.3%	2.6%	0.9%
<b>Exam Accommodations (Modified/Extended Time/Distracted Reduced Space)</b>	91.0%	100.0%	61.6%	89.7%	82.1%
<b>Assistive Technology/Alternative Format</b>	8.0%	0.0%	7.6%	5.1%	7.7%
<b>Note-Taking Services/Reader/Audio Recording/Smart Pen</b>	24.4%	0.0%	3.5%	33.3%	18.2%
<b>Priority Registration</b>	17.4%	85.7%	3.5%	0.0%	13.0%
<b>Reduced Courseload</b>	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>Transportation/Mobility Assistance and Services/Parking</b>	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.4%
<b>Other</b>	9.6%	85.7%	21.1%	7.7%	13.6%
<b>Unknown</b>	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
<b>Total</b>	614	7	289	39	949

## Students who Completed a Nursing Program

### *Student Completions by Degree Earned*

- In 2013-2014, a total of 10,683 students completed a nursing program in a California.
- Generic ADN programs graduated the greatest number of students (50%, n=5,648), followed by BSN program (41%, n=4,606).

**Table 18. Nursing Student Completions by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Total Nursing Students</b>	5,648	268	4,606	769	11,291

### *Ethnic Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program in California*

- Overall, 60% of students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program were ethnic minorities.
- ELM programs have the greatest share of ethnic minorities (64%) among students who completed a nursing program.
- Generic ADN programs have the greatest share of Hispanics (23%) who completed nursing programs.

**Table 19. Ethnic Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Native American</b>	0.8%	0.0%	0.3%	1.0%	0.6%
<b>Asian</b>	12.7%	6.8%	22.9%	26.4%	17.6%
<b>Asian Indian</b>	0.9%	11.9%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%
<b>Filipino</b>	7.7%	13.1%	10.5%	2.8%	8.6%
<b>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</b>	1.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%
<b>African American</b>	4.9%	4.2%	3.2%	10.0%	4.6%
<b>Hispanic</b>	23.0%	14.8%	15.6%	13.9%	19.2%
<b>Multi-race</b>	6.0%	6.4%	3.3%	7.1%	5.0%
<b>Other</b>	1.7%	5.1%	1.4%	0.1%	1.6%
<b>White</b>	41.2%	37.7%	40.5%	36.1%	40.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,286</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>4,177</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>10,416</b>
<b>Ethnic Minorities</b>	58.8%	62.3%	59.5%	63.9%	59.5%
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	362	32	429	52	875

\*Ethnic minorities include all reported non-White racial and ethnic groups, including "Other" and "Multi-race".

### Gender Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program

- 19% of all students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program were male.
- BSN programs had the larger share of males graduates (20%).

**Table 20. Gender Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Male</b>	18.9%	13.4%	20.2%	17.7%	19.2%
<b>Female</b>	81.1%	86.6%	79.8%	82.3%	80.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,439</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>4,443</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>10,898</b>
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	209	21	163	0	393

### Age Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program

- 63% of students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program in 2013-2014 were younger than 31 years of age when they completed the program.
- The largest share of students who were at least 41 years of age completed an LVN to ADN (21%), or an ADN program (16%).

**Table 21. Age Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>17 – 20 years</b>	0.8%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	1.4%
<b>21 – 25 years</b>	19.9%	20.8%	49.4%	24.8%	32.2%
<b>26 – 30 years</b>	30.2%	26.7%	26.6%	41.0%	29.4%
<b>31 – 40 years</b>	32.9%	31.7%	15.7%	23.6%	25.2%
<b>41 – 50 years</b>	12.9%	16.3%	4.5%	9.3%	9.3%
<b>51 – 60 years</b>	3.2%	3.8%	1.4%	1.3%	2.3%
<b>61 years and older</b>	0.2%	0.8%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,308</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>4,281</b>	<b>713</b>	<b>10,542</b>
<b># Unknown/ unreported</b>	340	28	325	56	749

### Student Completions by Degree Type

- ADN programs are the largest segment of pre-licensure nursing programs and generic ADN graduates represented 50% of all students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program in 2013-2014.

**Table 22. Student Completions by Degree Type**

Program Type	%
<b>ADN</b>	50.0%
<b>LVN to ADN</b>	2.4%
<b>BSN</b>	40.8%
<b>ELM</b>	6.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,291</b>

### *Student Completions by Program Track*

- 77% of nursing students completed nursing programs in the generic program track.
- BSN programs had the highest share of students (16%) complete the program in an accelerated track.
- ADN programs had the highest share of readmitted students.

**Table 23. Student Completions by Program Track**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Generic</b>	78.2%	0.0%	76.9%	99.7%	77.3%
<b>Advanced Placement</b>	14.3%	98.9%	4.0%	0.0%	11.1%
<b>Transfer</b>	0.6%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	1.6%
<b>30-Unit Option</b>	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Readmitted</b>	6.2%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	3.3%
<b>Accelerated</b>	0.6%	0.0%	15.7%	0.0%	6.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,648</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>4,606</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>11,291</b>



### *Declared Disabilities among Students who Completed Nursing Programs*

- Nursing programs reported that 475 students who completed their programs in 2013-2014 had declared a disability. Since only 32 schools reported that they would be able to get access to and report aggregate student disability data as part of this survey, the number of students with disabilities and those who have received accommodations may be underreported here.
- For 42% of those 475 students, the specific disability declared by the student was unknown to the nursing program. Of those students for whom the declared disability was known, general learning disabilities (17%) and ADD/ADHD (12%) were the most commonly reported.

**Table 24. Declared Disabilities among Students who Completed Nursing Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Autism/Asperger's Spectrum</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>ADD/ADHD</b>	12.1%	0.0%	13.5%	11.1%	12.4%
<b>Blind or Visually Impaired</b>	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%
<b>Brain Injuries</b>	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
<b>Deaf/Hard-of Hearing</b>	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.8%
<b>Intellectual Disabilities</b>	5.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	4.0%
<b>Learning Disabilities</b>	19.8%	0.0%	8.7%	22.2%	16.8%
<b>Medical Disabilities/ Chronic Illness</b>	1.5%	0.0%	7.9%	22.2%	3.6%
<b>Physical Disabilities</b>	0.9%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.1%
<b>Psychiatric Disabilities</b>	7.4%	0.0%	6.3%	11.1%	7.2%
<b>Communication/Speech and Language Disabilities</b>	1.2%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
<b>Test Anxiety</b>	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
<b>Other</b>	4.7%	50.0%	5.6%	0.0%	5.1%
<b>Unknown</b>	32.5%	50.0%	69.0%	22.2%	42.1%
<b>Total</b>	338	2	126	9	475

- 475 students that completed a nursing program in 2013-2014 received at least one accommodation for a declared disability. Exam accommodations (82%) are the most frequently reported accommodations nursing program provide students with disabilities. Academic counseling and advising was provided for 28% of completing students with disabilities for whom accommodations were provided.

**Table 25. Accommodations Provided for Students with Disabilities who Completed Nursing Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Academic Counseling/Advising</b>	35.5%	100.0%	8.5%	0.0%	28.4%
<b>Disability-Related Counseling/Referral</b>	22.5%	50.0%	2.5%	0.0%	17.3%
<b>Adaptive Equipment/Physical Space/Facilities</b>	10.4%	0.0%	0.8%	11.1%	8.0%
<b>Interpreter and Captioning Services</b>	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	1.3%
<b>Exam Accommodations (Modified/Extended Time/Distracted Reduced Space)</b>	92.8%	100.0%	48.3%	88.9%	81.7%
<b>Assistive Technology/Alternative Format</b>	8.7%	0.0%	3.4%	11.1%	7.4%
<b>Note-Taking Services/Reader/Audio Recording/Smart Pen</b>	15.3%	0.0%	5.1%	22.2%	12.8%
<b>Priority Registration</b>	16.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%
<b>Reduced Courseload</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Transportation/Mobility Assistance and Services/Parking</b>	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
<b>Other</b>	4.3%	0.0%	52.5%	22.2%	16.6%
<b>Total</b>	346	2	118	9	475

### *Completion, Retention and Attrition Data*

- The overall attrition rate for pre-licensure nursing education programs in California was 13.7% in 2013-2014.

**Table 26. Completion, Retention and Attrition Data by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Students Scheduled to Complete the Program</b>	5,579	292	3,609	831	10,366
<b>Completed On-time</b>	4,251	236	2,576	682	7,745
<b>Still Enrolled</b>	447	37	474	110	1,203
<b>Dropped Out</b>	881	19	479	39	1,418
<b>Completed Late</b>	342	3	659	9	1,013
<b>Retention Rate*</b>	76.2%	80.8%	71.4%	82.1%	74.7%
<b>Attrition Rate**</b>	15.8%	6.5%	13.3%	4.7%	13.7%

\*Retention rate = (students who completed the program on-time) / (students scheduled to complete the program)

\*\*Attrition rate = (students who dropped or were disqualified who were scheduled to complete) / (students scheduled to complete the program)

- The attrition rate for accelerated tracks within ADN nursing programs was 15.4% in 2013-2014.
- Accelerated BSN programs had a comparatively low attrition rate at 8.7%.

**Table 27. Completion, Retention and Attrition Data for Accelerated Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	BSN	Total
<b>Students Scheduled to Complete the Program</b>	227	819	1,049
<b>Completed On-time</b>	188	731	919
<b>Still Enrolled</b>	4	21	39
<b>Dropped Out</b>	35	56	91
<b>Completed Late</b>	10	51	61
<b>Retention Rate*</b>	82.8%	89.3%	87.6%
<b>Attrition Rate**</b>	15.4%	6.8%	8.7%

\*Retention rate = (students who completed the program on-time) / (students scheduled to complete the program)

\*\*Attrition rate = (students who dropped or were disqualified who were scheduled to complete) / (students scheduled to complete the program)

### *Employment of Recent Nursing Program Graduates<sup>3</sup>*

- On average, 56% of recent RN graduates employed in nursing in October 2014 were working in hospitals.
- Graduates of BSN programs were the most likely to work in hospitals (72%), while graduates of ADN programs were the least likely (48%).
- Statewide, 14% of nursing students were unable to find employment by October 2014, with ELM programs reporting the highest share of recent graduates (16%) unable to find employment.
- Nursing schools reported that 69% of their recent RN graduates employed in nursing were employed in California.

**Table 28. Employment of Recent Nursing Program Graduates**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
<b>Hospital</b>	47.7%	54.6%	72.0%	57.2%	56.0%
<b>Long-term care facility</b>	9.7%	17.3%	2.2%	2.1%	7.1%
<b>Community/Public Health Facility</b>	3.2%	5.2%	4.8%	3.6%	3.7%
<b>Other Healthcare Facility</b>	7.1%	8.0%	2.8%	8.3%	6.0%
<b>Pursuing additional nursing education</b>	14.9%	6.8%	1.6%	12.3%	10.5%
<b>Other setting</b>	4.4%	0.8%	2.9%	0.4%	3.4%
<b>Unable to find employment</b>	13.6%	7.4%	14.0%	16.1%	13.7%

<sup>3</sup> Graduates whose employment setting was reported as “unknown” have been excluded from this table. In 2013-2014, on average, the employment setting was unknown for 29% (n=3,060) of recent graduates.

## Faculty Data

Analysis of faculty data by degree type is not available because the faculty data are reported by school, not by degree type.

### *Full-time and Part-time Faculty Data*

- On October 15, 2014, there were 4,181 nursing faculty<sup>4</sup>. The majority are part-time faculty (63%, n=2,614).
- The faculty vacancy rate in pre-licensure nursing programs is 9.4% (432 vacant positions).

**Table 29. Total Faculty and Faculty Vacancies**

	# of Faculty*	# of Vacancies	Vacancy Rate
<b>Total Faculty</b>	4,181	432	9.4%
<b>Full-time Faculty</b>	1,498	203	11.9%
<b>Part-time Faculty</b>	2,614	229	8.1%

\*The sum of full- and part-time faculty did not equal the total faculty reported.

- Nearly all full-time and most part-time faculty are budgeted positions funded by the school's general fund. However, a greater share of part-time faculty is paid with external funding.

**Table 30. Funding of Faculty Positions**

	% Full-time Faculty	% Part-time Faculty
<b>Budgeted positions</b>	90.7%	82.4%
<b>100% external funding</b>	1.5%	7.3%
<b>Combination of the above</b>	2.3%	5.1%
<b>Total Faculty</b>	<b>1,490</b>	<b>2,608</b>
<b>Unknown</b>	8	6

- The majority of full-time faculty (79%) teach both clinical and didactic courses, while the majority of part-time faculty (74%) teach clinical courses only.

**Table 31. Faculty Teaching Assignments**

	% Full-time Faculty	% Part-time Faculty
<b>Clinical courses only</b>	9.5%	74.2%
<b>Didactic courses only</b>	11.9%	6.8%
<b>Clinical &amp; didactic courses</b>	79.2%	20.4%
<b>Total Faculty</b>	<b>1,490</b>	<b>2,608</b>
<b>Unknown</b>	8	6

<sup>4</sup> Since faculty may work at more than one school, the number of faculty reported may be greater than the actual number of individuals who serve as faculty in nursing schools.

### Faculty for Next Year

- 39% of schools reported that their externally funded positions will continue to be funded for the 2014-2015 academic year. If these positions are not funded, schools reported that they would be able to enroll a total of only 9,051 students across all pre-licensure RN programs in 2014-2015, which would be a 37% decrease in new enrollments compared to the 12,365 new students that enrolled in RN programs in 2013-2014.

**Table 32. External Funding for Faculty Next Year**

	% Schools
<b>Will continue</b>	39.1%
<b>Will not continue</b>	2.3%
<b>Unknown</b>	13.3%
<b>Not applicable</b>	45.3%
<b>Number of schools reporting</b>	<b>128</b>

### Faculty Demographic Data

- Nursing faculty remain predominately white (62%) and female (90%), and 23% of faculty are between 41 and 50 years of age. More than a third (37%) of faculty are over 56 years of age.

**Table 33. Faculty Ethnicity**

Race/Ethnicity	% Faculty
Native American	0.5%
Asian	8.7%
Asian Indian	0.7%
Filipino	6.3%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.6%
African American	9.3%
Hispanic	9.2%
Multi-race	1.6%
Other	1.2%
White	61.8%
Number of faculty	3,940
Ethnic Minorities*	38.2%
Unknown/unreported	241

**Table 34. Faculty Gender and Age**

Gender	% Faculty
<b>Men</b>	10.4%
<b>Women</b>	89.6%
<b>Number of faculty</b>	4,075
<b>Unknown/unreported</b>	106
Age	% Faculty
<b>30 years or younger</b>	4.8%
<b>31 – 40 years</b>	18.1%
<b>41 – 50 years</b>	23.2%
<b>51 – 55 years</b>	17.4%
<b>56 – 60 years</b>	18.1%
<b>61 – 65 years</b>	12.6%
<b>66 – 70 years</b>	4.4%
<b>71 years and older</b>	1.5%
<b>Number of faculty</b>	3,941
<b>Unknown/unreported</b>	240

*Education*

- On October 15, 2014, almost all full-time faculty (97%) held a master's or doctoral degree, while only 64% of part-time faculty held either of those degrees.
- 9% of all active faculty (n=386) were reported as pursuing an advanced degree as of October 15, 2014.

**Table 35. Highest Level of Education of Faculty**

	% Full-time Faculty	% Part-time Faculty
<b>Associate degree in nursing (ADN)</b>	0.3%	5.0%
<b>Baccalaureate degree in nursing (BSN)</b>	1.6%	29.4%
<b>Non-nursing baccalaureate</b>	1.0%	1.2%
<b>Master's degree in nursing (MSN)</b>	62.8%	53.7%
<b>Non-nursing master's degree</b>	5.0%	4.0%
<b>PhD in nursing</b>	15.8%	2.7%
<b>Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP)</b>	7.0%	2.0%
<b>Other doctorate in nursing</b>	1.4%	0.6%
<b>Non-nursing doctorate</b>	5.0%	1.3%
<b>Number of faculty</b>	<b>1,477</b>	<b>2,582</b>
<b>Unknown/unreported</b>	21	32

### Methods Used to Prepare Part-time Faculty to Teach

- Program policies and faculty orientations were the most frequently reported methods used to prepare part-time faculty to teach.
- Mentoring programs, specific orientation programs, curriculum review, and administrative policies were also frequently reported methods.

**Table 36. Methods Used to Prepare Part-time Faculty to Teach**

	% Schools
<b>Program policies</b>	93.7%
<b>Faculty orientation</b>	92.1%
<b>Mentoring program</b>	81.1%
<b>Specific orientation program</b>	73.2%
<b>Curriculum review</b>	66.1%
<b>Administrative policies</b>	63.0%
<b>Teaching strategies</b>	59.8%
<b>External training program</b>	8.7%
<b>Other</b>	12.6%
<b>None</b>	0.0%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>127</b>

### Faculty Attrition

- Nursing schools reported a total of 174 full-time and 251 part-time faculty members as having retired or left the program in 2013-2014.
- Programs reported an additional 155 faculty members (81 full-time and 74 part-time) are expected to retire or leave the school in 2014-2015.
- The most frequently cited reason for having a faculty member leave the program in 2013-2014 was retirement.

**Table 37. Reasons Faculty Leave Their Positions**

	% Schools
<b>Retirement</b>	56.7%
<b>Termination (or requested resignation)</b>	22.7%
<b>Resigned</b>	21.6%
<b>Relocation of spouse or other family obligation</b>	18.6%
<b>Career advancement</b>	15.5%
<b>Return to clinical practice</b>	15.5%
<b>Salary/Benefits</b>	11.3%
<b>Workload</b>	7.2%
<b>Layoffs (for budgetary reasons)</b>	1.0%
<b>Other</b>	22.7%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Number of schools that gave no reason</b>	<b>0</b>

## Faculty Hiring

- 103 schools reported hiring a total of 681 faculty members (165 full-time and 516 part-time) between August 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014.
- 37% (n=252) of these newly hired faculty had less than one year of teaching experience before they took the faculty position.
- The majority of schools (75%) that hired a faculty person in the last year reported that their newly hired faculty had prior experience as a nurse educator in a clinical setting, and 65% had experience teaching at another nursing school.
- 43% of schools that hired a new faculty member last year reported that the new hire had no previous teaching experience.
- 10 schools reported they were under a hiring freeze for active faculty at some point between August 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014, and 70% of these schools reported that the hiring freeze prevented them from hiring all the faculty they needed during the academic year.

**Table 38. Characteristics of Newly Hired Faculty**

	% Schools
Experience teaching as a nurse educator in a clinical setting	74.8%
Experience teaching at another nursing school	65.0%
Completed a graduate degree program in last two years	60.2%
No teaching experience	42.7%
Experience student teaching while in graduate school	37.9%
Experience teaching in a setting outside of nursing	30.1%
Other	6.8%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>103</b>

- The most frequently reported reason for hiring faculty was to replace faculty that had retired or left the program (85%).
- 18% of the schools that hired faculty reported that the hiring was due to program expansion.

**Table 39. Reasons for Hiring Faculty**

	% Schools
To replace faculty that retired or left the program	84.5%
To fill longstanding faculty vacancies (positions vacant for more than one year)	26.2%
To reduce faculty workload	23.3%
Due to program expansion	17.5%
Other	14.6%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>103</b>



### *Barriers to Recruiting Faculty*

- An insufficient number of faculty applicants with the required credentials and non-competitive salaries and were the most frequently reported barriers to faculty recruitment.
- 39% of schools reported that the workload responsibilities of being faculty were a barrier to recruitment.
- Only 10% of schools felt that an overall RN shortage was a barrier to recruiting faculty.

**Table 40. Barriers to Recruiting Faculty**

	% Schools
<b>Insufficient number of faculty applicants with required credentials</b>	83.5%
<b>Non-competitive salaries</b>	74.8%
<b>Workload (not wanting faculty responsibilities)</b>	39.4%
<b>BRN rules and regulations</b>	32.3%
<b>Private, state university or community college laws, rules or policies</b>	20.5%
<b>Overall shortage of RNs</b>	10.2%
<b>Other</b>	7.1%
<b>No barriers</b>	5.5%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>127</b>

### *Difficult to Hire Clinical Areas*

- Pediatrics (60%) and Psych/Mental Health (47%) were the clinical areas in which schools had the most difficulty recruiting new faculty.
- 14% of schools reported they had no difficulty recruiting faculty for any clinical specialty area.

**Table 41. Difficult to Hire Clinical Areas**

	% Schools
<b>Pediatrics</b>	59.8%
<b>Psych/Mental Health</b>	47.2%
<b>Obstetrics/Gynecology</b>	40.9%
<b>Medical-surgical</b>	29.1%
<b>Geriatrics</b>	12.6%
<b>Critical Care</b>	11.0%
<b>Community Health</b>	7.1%
<b>Other</b>	0.8%
<b>No clinical areas</b>	14.2%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>127</b>

### Schools that Hired Adjunct or Part-time Clinical Faculty Over 67% Time

- The “67% Rule” that was part of Senate Bill 1309 allowed nursing schools to hire adjunct or part-time clinical nursing faculty over 67% time. 27 schools hired faculty per the 67% Rule, while 98 schools did not.
- For those schools that didn’t use the 67% Rule when hiring faculty, the majority (58%, n=57) reported that they had no need to hire part-time faculty more than 67% time and 39% (n=38) of schools reported that their schools did not allow them to hire over 67% time.

**Table 42. Nursing School Use of the 67% Rule**

	# Schools
<b>Hired Faculty per 67% Rule</b>	27
<b>Did not Hire Faculty per 67% Rule</b>	98
<b>No need to hire &gt;67%</b>	57
<b>Not allowed to hire &gt;67%</b>	38
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>125</b>

- 27 nursing schools reported that they hired a total of 295 faculty per the 67% Rule since 2010-2011. 74% (n=20) of the schools that hired faculty per the 67% Rule did so to provide consistent faculty within clinical courses, and 44% (n=12) did so to have fewer part-time faculty. Two schools reported that they hired faculty under this rule since full-time positions were not budgeted.

**Table 43. Faculty Hired per 67% Rule by Year Hired**

	# Faculty
<b>2013-14</b>	78
<b>2012-13</b>	77
<b>2011-12</b>	71
<b>2010-11</b>	69
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>27</b>

- The majority of schools that hired faculty per the 67% Rule offer ADN programs.

**Table 44. Faculty Hired per 67% Rule**

Degree Program Offered*	# Schools
<b>ADN</b>	21
<b>BSN</b>	5
<b>ELM</b>	4
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>27</b>

\*Some schools offer more than one degree program. Therefore, the sum of the number of schools by degree type does not equal the total number of schools that reported.

## Faculty Salaries

- On average, full-time faculty with doctoral degrees earn more than those with master's degrees.

**Table 45. Average Annual Salary Paid for Full-Time Faculty by Highest Degree Earned & Length of Academic Appointment**

	Master's Degree		Doctoral Degree	
	Average Low	Average High	Average Low	Average High
9 months	\$66,069	\$87,143	\$76,521	\$103,509
10 months	\$62,258	\$87,901	\$76,291	\$97,798
11 months	\$79,888	\$92,987	\$89,588	\$113,496
12 months	\$75,109	\$96,843	\$83,056	\$113,588

## Nursing Program Data

### Program Offerings

- Overall, most nursing programs (88%, n=119) offered a traditional nursing program in 2013-2014.
- Accelerated programs were the most commonly reported non-traditional programs offered at nursing schools.
- One of the 25 programs that reported an accelerated track offers it via distance education.

**Table 46. Program Offerings by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Traditional Program	97.5%	71.4%	82.9%	50.0%	88.1%
Accelerated Track	7.4%	0.0%	31.4%	66.7%	18.5%
Collaborative/Shared Education	9.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Evening Program	4.9%	14.3%	5.7%	0.0%	5.2%
Extended Campus	3.7%	0.0%	2.9%	16.7%	4.4%
Weekend Program	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%
Distance Education	1.2%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	3.0%
Part-time Program	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Contract Education	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	4.9%	28.6%	8.6%	0.0%	6.7%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>135</b>

*Frequency of Student Admission*

- Most LVN to ADN and ELM programs admit students once per year, while most generic ADN programs admit students twice per year. Admitting students once or twice per year is common for BSN programs.

**Table 47. Frequency of Student Admission by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Once per year	27.5%	71.4%	44.4%	100%	36.5%
Twice per year	65.0%	0%	38.9%	0%	52.4%
Three times per year	5.0%	28.6%	5.6%	0%	6.4%
Other	2.5%	0%	11.1%	0%	4.8%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>126</b>

### Admission Criteria

- Overall, completion of prerequisite courses, minimum/cumulative grade point average (GPA), and minimum grade level in prerequisite courses were the most common criteria used to determine if an applicant was qualified for admission to the nursing program.
- Score on a pre-enrollment exam was also an important criterion for ADN, LVN to ADN, and BSN programs.
- A personal statement from the applicant was a factor in admission for many BSN and ELM programs.

**Table 48. Admission Criteria by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Completion of prerequisite courses	82.7%	100.0%	80.6%	86.7%	83.5%
Minimum/Cumulative GPA	74.1%	85.7%	83.3%	80.0%	77.7%
Minimum grade level in prerequisite	64.2%	71.4%	83.3%	73.3%	70.5%
Score on pre-enrollment exam	71.6%	85.7%	72.2%	26.7%	67.6%
Repetition of prerequisite science courses	50.6%	57.1%	41.7%	13.3%	44.6%
Validated prerequisites	63.0%	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%	41.0%
Health-related work/volunteer experience	35.8%	28.6%	50.0%	53.3%	41.0%
Recent completion of prerequisite courses	25.9%	42.9%	27.8%	26.7%	27.3%
Personal statement	7.4%	14.3%	41.7%	80.0%	24.5%
Criteria as defined in California Assembly Bill 1559	37.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	22.3%
Community Colleges' Nursing Prerequisite Validation Study Composite Score	30.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%
Geographic location	1.2%	0.0%	25.0%	13.3%	8.6%
Other	13.6%	57.1%	52.8%	53.3%	30.2%
None	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.7%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>139</b>

### Selection Process for Qualified Applications

- Overall, ranking by specific criteria was the most common method for selecting students for admission to nursing programs.
- Random selection was also used frequently by generic ADN and LVN to ADN programs but was not used by any BSN or ELM programs.
- ELM programs frequently reported using the interview as a selection criterion, and ELM programs were more likely than other programs to consider an applicant's goal statement.

**Table 49. Selection Criteria for Qualified Applications by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Ranking by specific criteria	46.3%	71.4%	85.7%	92.9%	62.5%
Random selection	35.0%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	22.8%
Interviews	7.5%	14.3%	28.6%	64.3%	19.1%
Goal statement	3.8%	14.3%	17.1%	57.1%	13.2%
Modified random selection	17.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%
First come, first served from the waiting list	12.5%	0.0%	2.9%	7.1%	8.8%
Rolling admissions (based on application date for the quarter/semester)	2.5%	14.3%	5.7%	0.0%	3.7%
Other	6.3%	14.3%	17.1%	21.4%	11.0%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>136</b>

### Waiting List

- 40 programs reported having students on waiting list. Of these programs, 48% keep students on the waiting list until they are admitted and 13% keep students on the waiting list until the subsequent application cycle is complete and all spaces are filled.
- 3,969 applicants<sup>5</sup> to pre-licensure nursing programs were placed on a waiting list in 2013-2014. It took an average of 3.8 quarters/semesters for a student to enroll after being placed on the waiting list.

**Table 50. Waiting Lists by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Qualified applicants on a waiting list	3,770	60	129	10	3,969
Average number of quarters/semesters to enroll after being placed on the waiting list	4.25	4.7	NA	1.0	3.8

<sup>5</sup> Since applicants can apply to multiple nursing programs within the same application cycle, some applicants may be placed on multiple waiting lists. Therefore, the number of applicants on waiting lists may not represent an equal number of individuals.

### Capacity of Program Expansion

- Overall, nursing programs expect their new student enrollment to decrease next year and then remain at that level in 2015-2016.
- Over the next two years, generic ADN and ELM programs expect to see slight declines in enrollment, while LVN to ADN programs expect to see some enrollment growth. BSN programs show a decline in enrollment over the next year. However, this decline is likely due to missing data from two BSN programs that enrolled a total of 861 students in 2013-2014 and did not report expected student enrollment for 2014-2015 or 2015-2016.

**Table 51. Current and Projected New Student Enrollment by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN*	ELM	Total
2013-2014 new student enrollment	6,834	301	5,284	807	13,226
Expected new student enrollment given <u>current</u> resources					
2014-2015	6,302	371	4,726	763	12,162
2015-2016	6,244	411	4,777	745	12,177

\*Two BSN programs that enrolled a total of 861 students in 2013-2014 did not report expected new student enrollments for either 2014-2015 or 2015-2016. Therefore, the decline in new students in BSN programs may be less than shown here.

### Barriers to Program Expansion

- The principal barrier to program expansion for all program types remains an insufficient number of clinical sites (reported by 79% of all programs).
- Non-competitive faculty salaries was also a frequently reported barrier to expansion.
- Of the 139 programs that responded, only one program reported no barriers to expansion.

**Table 52. Barriers to Program Expansion by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Insufficient number of clinical sites	84.0%	85.7%	75.0%	60.0%	79.1%
Faculty salaries not competitive	60.5%	57.1%	36.1%	13.3%	48.9%
Insufficient number of qualified classroom faculty	49.4%	57.1%	41.7%	26.7%	45.3%
Insufficient number of qualified clinical faculty	46.9%	28.6%	38.9%	40.0%	43.2%
Insufficient funding for faculty salaries	45.7%	71.4%	33.3%	20.0%	41.0%
Insufficient number of physical facilities and space for skills labs	27.2%	28.6%	16.7%	33.3%	25.2%
Insufficient funding for program support (e.g. clerical, travel, supplies, equipment)	21.0%	71.4%	19.4%	20.0%	23.0%
Insufficient number of physical facilities and space for classrooms	23.5%	14.3%	19.4%	13.3%	20.9%
Insufficient support for nursing school by college or university	16.0%	14.3%	13.9%	0.0%	13.7%
Insufficient number of allocated spaces for the nursing program	12.3%	0.0%	16.7%	6.7%	12.2%
Insufficient financial support for students	8.6%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	6.5%
Other	11.1%	14.3%	19.4%	33.3%	15.8%

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
No barriers to program expansion	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.7%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>139</b>



### Program Expansion Strategies

- 97% (n=107) of the 110 programs that reported a lack of clinical sites as a barrier to program expansion reported at least one strategy to help mitigate this barrier.
- The most frequently reported strategies were use of human patient simulators, twelve-hour shifts, community based/ambulatory care centers, and evening and weekend shifts.
- The use of regional computerized clinical placement systems was frequently reported by ELM programs.

**Table 53. Program Expansion Strategies by Program Type\***

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Human patient simulators	75.8%	66.7%	77.8%	37.5%	72.9%
Twelve-hour shifts	71.2%	33.3%	70.4%	75.0%	69.2%
Community-based /ambulatory care (e.g. homeless shelters, nurse managed clinics, community health centers)	60.6%	83.3%	85.2%	62.5%	68.2%
Evening shifts	68.2%	100.0%	59.3%	50.0%	66.4%
Weekend shifts	62.1%	66.7%	63.0%	75.0%	63.6%
Innovative skills lab experiences	59.1%	83.3%	59.3%	50.0%	59.8%
Preceptorships	40.9%	33.3%	59.3%	25.0%	43.9%
Regional computerized clinical placement system	39.4%	50.0%	40.7%	75.0%	43.0%
Non-traditional clinical sites (e.g. correctional facilities)	24.2%	16.7%	29.6%	12.5%	24.3%
Night shifts	15.2%	0.0%	22.2%	25.0%	16.8%
Other	6.1%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	6.5%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>107</b>

### Denial of Clinical Space and Access to Alternative Clinical Sites

- In 2013-2014, a total of 81 programs reported that they were denied access to a clinical placement, unit, or shift.
- 43% of programs (n=61) that reported data indicated they were denied access to clinical placements, while 40% (n=57) were denied access to clinical units and 24% (n=34) were denied access to a clinical shift during the 2013-2014 academic year.
- 25% (n=15) of programs denied clinical placement were offered an alternative, compared to 47% (n=27) of programs denied a clinical unit, and 74% (n=25) of programs denied a clinical shift.
- The lack of access to clinical space resulted in a loss of 293 clinical placements, 118 units and 89 shifts, which affected 2,195 students.

**Table 54. RN Programs Denied Clinical Space by Program Type**

	LVN to				Total
	ADN	ADN	BSN	ELM	
<b>Programs Denied Clinical Placement</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>61</b>
Programs Offered Alternative by Site	8	0	4	3	15
Placements Lost	162	12	108	11	293
Number of programs that reported	82	7	36	16	141
<b>Programs Denied Clinical Unit</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>57</b>
Programs Offered Alternative by Site	17	0	9	1	27
Units Lost	48	7	45	18	118
Number of programs that reported	82	7	36	16	141
<b>Programs Denied Clinical Shift</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>
Programs Offered Alternative by Site	15	0	7	3	25
Shifts Lost	33	3	48	5	89
Number of programs that reported	82	7	36	16	141
<b>Total number of students affected</b>	<b>1,389</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>2,195</b>

- Programs most frequently reported lost placement sites in Medical/Surgical clinical areas.

**Table 55. Clinical Area that Lost Placements, Shifts or Units by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to	BSN	ELM	Total
		ADN			
Medical/Surgical	76.9%	75.0%	89.5%	50.0%	77.8%
Obstetrics	23.1%	25.0%	31.6%	83.3%	29.6%
Pediatrics	23.1%	50.0%	31.6%	66.7%	29.6%
Psychiatry/Mental Health	21.2%	25.0%	31.6%	33.3%	24.7%
Critical Care	15.4%	0.0%	31.6%	50.0%	21.0%
Geriatrics	19.2%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	16.0%
Community Health	11.5%	0.0%	21.1%	16.7%	13.6%
Other	1.9%	0.0%	10.5%	16.7%	4.9%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>81</b>

### *Reasons for Clinical Space Being Unavailable*

- Overall, competition for space arising from an increase in the number of nursing students was the most frequently reported reason why programs were denied clinical space
- No longer accepting ADN students was the most common reason LVN to ADN programs reported for clinical space being unavailable. Being displaced by another program was reported more frequently by ADN programs compared to other programs. Staff nurse overload or insufficient qualified staff was the most common reason among ELM programs.
- While 4.9% (n=4) of nursing programs reported that the facility began charging a fee for clinical placements, only one nursing program reported paying a fee for a clinical placement. That program was asked by the facility to do so. Another program offered to pay a fee but did not need to pay.

**Table 56. Reasons for Clinical Space Being Unavailable by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Competition for clinical space due to increase in number of nursing students in region	46.2%	50.0%	47.4%	50.0%	46.9%
Staff nurse overload or insufficient qualified staff	44.2%	50.0%	42.1%	66.7%	45.7%
Displaced by another program	48.1%	25.0%	42.1%	16.7%	43.2%
Decrease in patient census	21.2%	25.0%	42.1%	50.0%	28.4%
Closure, or partial closure, of clinical facility	23.1%	0.0%	31.6%	50.0%	25.9%
No longer accepting ADN students	30.8%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.5%
Implementation of Electronic Health Records system	17.3%	0.0%	31.6%	50.0%	22.2%
Visit from Joint Commission or other accrediting agency	21.2%	0.0%	15.8%	50.0%	21.0%
Nurse residency programs	15.4%	25.0%	26.3%	16.7%	18.5%
Change in facility ownership/management	11.5%	0.0%	26.3%	16.7%	14.8%
Clinical facility seeking magnet status	17.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
Facility moving to a new location	13.5%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	6.2%
The facility began charging a fee (or other RN program offered to pay a fee) for the placement and the RN program would not pay	5.8%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	4.9%
Other	1.9%	0.0%	10.5%	16.7%	11.1%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>81</b>

- Most programs reported that the lost site was replaced at another clinical site – either at a different site currently being used by the program (67%) or at a new clinical site (57%).

**Table 57. Strategy to Address Lost Clinical Space by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Replaced lost space at different site currently used by nursing program	67.3%	75.0%	57.9%	83.3%	66.7%
Added/replaced lost space with new site	53.8%	75.0%	63.2%	50.0%	56.8%
Replaced lost space at same clinical site	44.2%	25.0%	47.4%	66.7%	45.7%
Clinical simulation	32.7%	0.0%	36.8%	33.3%	32.1%
Reduced student admissions	5.8%	0.0%	10.5%	16.7%	7.4%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	1.2%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>81</b>

### *Alternative Clinical Sites*

- 41 programs reported an increase in out-of-hospital clinical placements in 2013-2014.
- Public health agencies were reported as the most frequently used alternative clinical placement sites overall and in ELM programs. Outpatient mental health facilities were used more frequently by generic ADN and LVN to ADN programs, while school health services were the most frequently used by BSN programs.

**Table 58. Alternative Clinical Sites by Program**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Public health or community health agency	45.0%	33.3%	61.5%	80.0%	53.7%
Skilled nursing/rehabilitation facility	50.0%	33.3%	46.2%	20.0%	43.9%
Outpatient mental health/substance abuse	55.0%	66.7%	23.1%	0.0%	39.0%
School health service (K-12 or college)	20.0%	0.0%	69.2%	60.0%	39.0%
Medical practice, clinic, physician office	35.0%	33.3%	38.5%	20.0%	34.1%
Home health agency/home health service	30.0%	33.3%	30.8%	20.0%	29.3%
Hospice	30.0%	0.0%	38.5%	20.0%	29.3%
Surgery center/ambulatory care center	15.0%	0.0%	30.8%	20.0%	19.5%
Case management/disease management	15.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	12.2%
Urgent care, not hospital-based	15.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%
Correctional facility, prison or jail	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	7.3%
Renal dialysis unit	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%
Occupational health or employee health service	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
Other	15.0%	0.0%	7.7%	20.0%	12.2%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>41</b>

### LVN to RN Education

- Seven nursing programs exclusively offer LVN to ADN education.
- Of the 82 generic ADN programs, 26% (n=21) reported having a separate track for LVNs and 82% (n=67) admit LVNs to the generic ADN program on a space available basis.
- 28 of the generic ADN programs reported having a separate waiting list for LVNs.
- On October 15, 2014 there were a total of 626 LVNs on an ADN program waitlist. These programs reported that on average, it takes 2.8 quarters/semesters for an LVN student to enroll in the first nursing course after being placed on the waiting list.
- Overall, the most commonly reported mechanisms that facilitate a seamless progression from LVN to RN education are a bridge course and a skills lab course to document competencies.

**Table 59. LVN to RN Articulation by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	Total
Bridge course	76.9%	57.1%	25.0%	65.7%
Use of skills lab course to document competencies	57.7%	57.1%	40.0%	54.3%
Direct articulation of LVN coursework	35.9%	57.1%	30.0%	36.2%
Credit granted for LVN coursework following successful completion of a specific ADN course(s)	37.2%	42.9%	20.0%	34.3%
Use of tests (such as NLN achievement tests or challenge exams to award credit)	29.5%	28.6%	20.0%	27.6%
Specific program advisor	14.1%	57.1%	25.0%	19.0%
Other	11.5%	14.3%	40.0%	17.1%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>105</b>

### LVN to BSN Education

- 13 BSN programs reported LVN to BSN tracks that exclusively admit LVN students or differ significantly from the generic BSN program offered at the school. Only 11 of these programs reported criteria for admission to these programs.
  - These programs received 185 qualified applications for 190 admission spaces available for LVN to BSN students. None of these spaces were supported by grant or donor funding.
  - The most common criteria for admission to an LVN to BSN program were minimum/cumulative GPA and minimum grade level in prerequisite courses, followed closely by completion of prerequisite courses.

**Table 60. LVN to BSN Admission Criteria**

	# LVN to BSN Programs
Minimum/Cumulative GPA	6
Minimum grade level in prerequisite	6
Completion of prerequisite courses	5
Score on pre-enrollment test	4
Repetition of prerequisite science courses	3
Health-related work experience	2
Geographic location	1
Recent completion of prerequisite courses	2
Personal statement	2
Other	2
None	0
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>11</b>

- Ranking by specific criteria and interviews were the most commonly reported methods for selecting students for admission to LVN to BSN programs.

**Table 61. LVN to BSN Selection Criteria**

	# LVN to BSN Programs
Ranking by specific criteria	5
Interviews	3
Rolling admissions (based on application date for the quarter/semester)	0
Goal statement	0
First come, first served from the waiting list	0
Other	1
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>7</b>

### Partnerships

- 67 nursing programs participate in collaborative or shared programs with another nursing program leading to a higher degree. ADN programs have the greatest number of collaborative programs.

**Table 62. Number of RN Programs that Partner with Other Nursing Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Collaborative/shared programs leading to higher degree	57	3	7	0	67
Formal collaboration	30	3	2	-	35
Informal collaboration	41	0	5	-	46

### Professional Accreditation

- None of the LVN to ADN programs and fewer than half (33%) of ADN programs reported having ACEN accreditation. CCNE does not accredit LVN to ADN or ADN programs.
- 97% of BSN programs and 94% of ELM programs have CCNE accreditation.

**Table 63. Professional Accreditation for Eligible Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM
ACEN (formerly NLNAC)	32.9%	0%	2.8%	0%
CCNE	NA*	NA*	97.2%	93.8%
Not accredited by ACEN or CCNE	0%	0%	2.8%	6.3%
<b>Number of programs that reported</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>

\* NA – Not Applicable, CCNE does not accredit ADN programs.

### First Time NCLEX Pass Rates

- In 2013-2014, 82.7% (n=8,109) of nursing students who took the NCLEX for the first time passed the exam.
- The NCLEX pass rate was highest for students who graduated from ADN programs.

**Table 64. First Time NCLEX Pass Rates by Program Type**

	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
First Time NCLEX* Pass Rate	83.4%	75.5%	82.3%	81.9%	82.7%
# Students that took the NCLEX	5,268	229	3,738	569	9,804
# Students that passed the NCLEX	4,395	173	3,075	466	8,109

\*These data represent nursing students who took the NCLEX for the first time in 2013-14.

- Overall, pass rates in accelerated programs were slightly lower than those in traditional programs; 80.9% (n=1,155) of nursing students in an accelerated track who took the NCLEX for the first time in 2013-2014 passed the exam.
- In 2013-2014, accelerated ADN programs had a lower average pass rate than their traditional counterparts, while the rate for accelerated BSN programs was higher than that of traditional BSN programs.

**Table 65. NCLEX Pass Rates for Accelerated Programs by Program Type**

	ADN	BSN	Total
First Time NCLEX* Pass Rate	68.8%	82.0%	80.9%
# Students that took the NCLEX	112	1,315	1,427
# Students that passed the NCLEX	77	1,078	1,155

\*These data represent nursing students who took the NCLEX for the first time in 2013-14.

\*\* No LVN to ADN or ELM programs reported data in this area.



## School Data

Data in this section represent all schools with pre-licensure nursing programs. Data were not requested by degree type. As a result, this breakdown is not available.

### Nursing Program Directors

- On average, directors spend 42.4 hours per week administering the RN program(s).
- Directors also spend time on staffing (8%), administration of other programs (7%), and counseling (7%).

**Table 66. Nursing Program Director's Time**

	% of Time Spent
RN program administration	47.0%
Staffing	7.7%
Administration of other programs	7.2%
Counseling	7.0%
Curriculum development	5.9%
Budget	5.6%
Teaching	5.2%
Development (fundraising, grant writing, etc.)	5.1%
Service	2.8%
Scholarship	2.0%
Research	1.6%
Coordination of preceptors/nurse residency programs	1.0%
Other	2.9%
<b>Number of Schools that Reported</b>	<b>130</b>

- CNA, LVN and graduate programs were the most commonly reported programs also administered by the RN program director.

**Table 67. Other Programs Administered by the RN Program Director**

Other Programs Administered by the RN Program Director	Number of Schools
CNA	23
LVN	23
Graduate programs	17
EMT	14
HHA	14
Health sciences	13
Technician (i.e. psychiatric, radiologic, etc.)	10
Health professions	5
Paramedic	4
Respiratory therapy	4
Medical Assistant program	4
RN to BSN programs	1
Other	13
<b>Number of Schools that Reported</b>	<b>68</b>

### Other Program Administration

- The majority of nursing programs (64%) have one assistant director. On average, assistant directors have 13 hours allocated to administering the nursing program and spend 14 hours of their time actually administering it.
- Nursing programs have an average of 2.4 individuals working as clerical staff. Each clerical staff person works an average of 36 hours per week.

**Table 68. Number of Assistant Directors**

	%
0	2.3%
1	63.9%
2	26.2%
3	5.4%
More than 3	2.3%
<b>Number of Schools that Reported</b>	<b>130</b>

### Factors Impacting Student Attrition

- Academic failure and personal reasons continue to be reported as the factors with the greatest impact on student attrition.
- 49% (n=60) of the 123 nursing schools that reported factors impacting student attrition reported that academic failure had the greatest impact on student attrition, while 31% (n=38) of schools reported that personal reasons had the greatest impact on student attrition.

**Table 69. Factors Impacting Student Attrition**

	Average Rank*
Academic failure	1.8
Personal reasons(e.g. home, job, health, family)	2.1
Clinical failure	3.0
Financial need	3.1
Change of major or career interest	3.6
Transfer to another school	3.9
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>123</b>

\*The lower the ranking, the greater the impact on attrition (1 has the greatest impact on attrition, while 8 has the least impact).

### *Methods Used to Increase Student Retention*

- Student success strategies such as mentoring, remediation, tutoring, and personal counseling were reported as the most common methods used to increase student retention.

**Table 70. Methods Used to Increase Student Retention**

	% Schools
Student success strategies (e.g. mentoring, remediation, tutoring)	97.7%
Personal counseling	86.8%
Program revisions (e.g. curriculum revisions)	51.9%
New admission policies instituted	40.3%
Increased financial aid, including scholarships	33.3%
Coordinator	5.4%
Early alert system	3.1%
Scholarship	3.1%
Increased child care	1.6%
Other	14.0%
None	1.6%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>129</b>

### *Innovations Used to Expand the Nursing Program*

- Simulation training, use of adjunct faculty, and grants were reported as the most common methods used to expand the nursing program.

**Table 71. Innovations Used to Expand the Nursing Program**

	% Schools
Simulation training	66.4%
Use of adjunct faculty	66.4%
Grants	53.1%
Weekend schedule	31.3%
Evening schedule	25.8%
Distance Education (e.g. online, interactive video)	16.4%
Accelerated/ year-round program	15.6%
Shared faculty	10.2%
Extended campuses	8.6%
Part-time program	3.9%
Other	5.5%
None	16.4%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>128</b>

### Access to Prerequisite Courses

- 55 nursing schools (42% of the 130 that reported these data) reported that access to prerequisite science and general education courses is a problem for their pre-licensure nursing students. Of these 55 schools, 53 reported strategies used to address access to prerequisite courses.
- Adding science course sections, offering additional prerequisite courses on weekends, evenings and in the summer, and agreements with other schools for prerequisite courses, were reported as the most common methods used to increase access to prerequisite courses for these students.

**Table 72. Access to Prerequisite Courses**

	% Schools
Adding science course sections	69.8%
Offering additional prerequisite courses on weekends, evenings, and summers	50.9%
Agreements with other schools for prerequisite courses	43.4%
Accepting online courses from other institutions	35.8%
Providing online courses	30.2%
Transferable high school courses to achieve prerequisites	11.3%
Prerequisite courses in adult education	1.9%
Other	13.2%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>53</b>

### Restricting Student Access to Clinical Practice

- 93 nursing schools reported that pre-licensure students in their programs had encountered restrictions to clinical practice imposed on them by clinical facilities.
- The most common types of restricted access students faced were to the clinical site itself, due to a visit from the Joint Commission or another accrediting agency, access to bar coding medication administration, and electronic medical records.
- Schools reported that the least common types of restrictions students faced were direct communication with health care team members, alternative setting due to liability, automated medical supply cabinets, and IV medication administration.

**Table 73. Share of Schools with Restricted Access in the Clinical Setting for RN Students**

	Very Uncommon	Uncommon	Common	Very Common	N/A	# Schools
Clinical site due to visit from accrediting agency (Joint Commission)	2.2%	19.8%	40.7%	34.1%	3.3%	91
Bar coding medication administration	10.3%	21.8%	44.8%	17.2%	5.8%	87
Electronic Medical Records	5.6%	22.2%	45.6%	23.3%	3.3%	90
Student health and safety requirements	21.1%	30.0%	21.1%	23.3%	4.4%	90
Glucometers	21.1%	35.6%	23.3%	12.2%	7.8%	90
Automated medical supply cabinets	21.6%	47.7%	15.9%	9.1%	5.7%	88
IV medication administration	21.6%	47.7%	15.9%	9.1%	5.7%	88
Some patients due to staff workload	7.8%	45.6%	31.1%	12.2%	3.3%	90
Direct communication with health team	36.0%	41.6%	7.9%	3.4%	11.2%	89
Alternative setting due to liability	19.5%	37.9%	12.6%	6.9%	23.0%	87

- The majority of schools reported that student access was restricted to electronic medical records due to insufficient time to train students (63%) and staff still learning the system (62%).
- Schools reported that students were restricted from using medication administration systems due to liability (67%) and limited time to train students (46%).

**Table 74. Share of Schools Reporting Reasons for Restricting Student Access to Electronic Medical Records and Medication Administration**

	Electronic Medical Records	Medication Administration
Insufficient time to train students	63.1%	45.5%
Staff still learning and unable to assure documentation standards are being met	61.9%	36.4%
Liability	42.9%	66.7%
Staff fatigue/burnout	32.1%	37.9%
Cost for training	29.8%	24.2%
Patient confidentiality	28.6%	18.2%
Other	14.3%	18.2%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>66</b>

- Schools compensate for training in areas of restricted student access by providing training in simulation lab (81%) and in the classroom (61%) and ensuring that all students have access to sites that train them in the area of restricted access (54%).

**Table 75. How the Nursing Program Compensates for Training in Areas of Restricted Access**

	% Schools
Training students in the simulation lab	80.6%
Training students in the classroom	61.3%
Ensuring all students have access to sites that train them in this area	53.8%
Purchase practice software, such as SIM Chart	39.8%
Training students in skills lab	4.3%
Other	9.7%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>93</b>

- The most common clinical practice areas in which students faced restrictions were Medical/Surgical, Pediatrics, and Obstetrics.

**Table 76. Clinical Area in which Restricted Access Occurs**

	% Schools
Medical/Surgical	89.2%
Pediatrics	86.0%
Obstetrics	77.4%
Psychiatry/Mental Health	65.6%
Critical Care	64.5%
Geriatrics	46.2%
Community Health	21.5%
Other Department	4.3%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>93</b>

### *Collection of Student Disability Data*

- Of the 129 nursing schools that reported how they collect disability data for their students, 20% (n=26) reported that they collect student disability data as part of the admissions process, 70% (n=90) of schools do not collect these data during admissions, and 10% (n=13) do not know if disability data are collected.
- 32 schools reported that they would be able to get access to and report aggregate student disability data as part of this survey. Of the 26 schools that collect student disability data during admission, 46% (n=12) can get aggregate data on students with disabilities to report with this survey.
- Nursing schools were asked how they collect disability data. Of the 104 schools that reported how these data are collected, 76% (n=79) collect these data when a student discloses the disability for an accommodation. Many nursing programs (25%) reported that they do not collect these data themselves but have a centralized office that collects the data so that student confidentiality regarding their specific disability can be maintained.

**Table 77. How Schools with RN Programs Collect Student Disability Data**

	% Schools
Upon student disclosure	76.0%
Centralized office collects these data (i.e. Disabled students and program service center)	25.0%
Upon admission	20.2%
Data not collected by nursing program	8.7%
Ongoing throughout program	7.7%
When requested by program	1.9%
On admission – as it relates to meeting essential functions	1.9%
Other	2.9%
Unknown	1.0%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>104</b>

*Funding of Nursing Program*

- On average, schools reported that 81% of funding for their nursing programs comes from the operating budget of their college or university, while 14% of funding comes from government sources.

**Table 78. Funding of Nursing Programs**

	% Schools
Your college/university operating budget	81.1%
Government (i.e. federal grants, state grants, Chancellor's Office, Federal Workforce Investment Act)	13.9%
Industry (i.e. hospitals, health systems)	2.3%
Foundations, private donors	1.3%
Other	1.5%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>129</b>

*RN Refresher Course*

- In 2013-2014, seven nursing schools offered an RN refresher course, and 126 students completed one of these courses.

*Clinical Simulation Center*

- 126 of 131 nursing schools (96%) reported using a clinical simulation center in 2013-2014.
- Of the 126 schools that used clinical simulation centers in 2013-2014, 55% (n=69) plan to expand the center.
- Clinical scenarios, debriefing and dialoguing, hi-fidelity mannequins, students in uniform, and a student preparation phase are all very common educational techniques used as part of the clinical simulation experience.

**Table 79. Educational Techniques of Clinical Simulation**

	% Schools
Clinical scenarios	100.0%
Debriefing as part of the simulation experience	96.8%
Hi-fidelity mannequin	94.4%
Students in uniforms	93.5%
A student preparation phase as part of the simulation experience	88.7%
Enclosed simulation room replicating the clinical environment with observation window(s)	72.6%
Videotaping	68.5%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>124</b>

## Location

---

- 98% of schools that use a clinical simulation have facilities on campus at the nursing school.

**Table 80. Location of Clinical Simulation**

	% Schools
On campus at the nursing school	97.6%
Through arrangement at another facility (i.e. clinical affiliate, nursing program)	3.3%
Other	3.3%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>123</b>

## Staffing

---

- Schools most frequently staff clinical simulation with full-time or part-time staff or a clinical simulation coordinator.

**Table 81. Staffing Clinical Simulation**

	% Schools
Full-time or part-time staff	71.0%
RN clinical simulation coordinator (in addition to RN course faculty)	58.9%
Clinical simulation technician	42.7%
Other	16.1%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>124</b>



### Reasons for Using Simulation

- The most frequently reported reasons for using a clinical simulation center were to reinforce didactic and clinical training and clinical decision making (86%), to provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting (81%), to standardize clinical experiences (75%), and to check clinical competencies (70%).

**Table 82. Reasons for Using a Clinical Simulation Center**

	% Schools
To reinforce didactic and clinical training and clinical decision making	85.7%
To provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting	81.0%
To standardize clinical experiences	75.4%
To check clinical competencies	69.8%
To make up for clinical experiences	63.5%
To provide interprofessional experiences	52.4%
To provide remediation	44.4%
To increase capacity in your nursing program	13.5%
To provide faculty development	13.5%
To provide collaborative experiences between hospital staff and students	8.7%
Other	0.8%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>126</b>

### Scenario Development

- Most hi-fidelity scenarios used in California nursing schools are developed by faculty, purchased, or modified from purchased scenarios.
- 32% of hi-fidelity scenarios are developed through participation in regional or statewide alliances.

**Table 83. Development of Hi-Fidelity Scenarios**

	% Schools
By faculty	78.2%
Modified from purchased scenarios	74.2%
Purchased	66.1%
Regional or statewide alliance	32.3%
Shared with another nursing program	9.7%
Other	3.2%
<b>Number of schools that reported</b>	<b>124</b>

### Content Areas Taught in Simulation

- Medical/Surgical and fundamentals are the most common areas in which schools use clinical simulation.
- On average, nursing schools use clinical simulation centers for 30 hours of clinical time in medical/surgical, 12 hours in fundamentals, and 7 hours in both pediatrics and obstetrics.

**Table 84. Average Hours Spent in Clinical Training by Content Area\***

Content Area	Direct Patient Care	Non-Direct Patient Care (excluding simulation)	Clinical Simulation	Total Clinical Hours
<b>Medical/Surgical</b>	165.2	29.7	29.9	224.8
<b>Fundamentals</b>	80.3	48.5	11.5	140.3
<b>Pediatrics</b>	66.2	7.4	7.2	80.8
<b>Obstetrics</b>	69.8	6.5	6.8	83.1
<b>Psychiatry/Mental Health</b>	78.9	4.6	4.2	87.7
<b>Geriatrics</b>	67.1	3.8	4.1	75.0
<b>Leadership/Management</b>	61.5	5.3	2.8	8.1
<b>Other</b>	18.8	1.0	1.0	20.8

## APPENDICES

---

### APPENDIX A – List of Survey Respondents by Degree Program

---

#### *ADN Programs (82)*

American River College	Los Angeles Valley College
Antelope Valley College	Los Medanos College
Bakersfield College	Mendocino College
Butte Community College	Merced College
Cabrillo College	Merritt College
Cerritos College	Mira Costa College
Chabot College	†Modesto Junior College
Chaffey College	Monterey Peninsula College
Citrus College	Moorpark College
City College of San Francisco	Mount Saint Mary's University
CNI College	Mount San Antonio College
College of Marin	Mount San Jacinto College
College of San Mateo	Napa Valley College
College of the Canyons	Ohlone College
College of the Desert	†Pacific Union College
College of the Redwoods	Palomar College
College of the Sequoias	Pasadena City College
Contra Costa College	Pierce College
Copper Mountain College	Porterville College
Cuesta College	Rio Hondo College
Cypress College	Riverside City College
De Anza College	Sacramento City College
East Los Angeles College	Saddleback College
El Camino College - Compton Education Center	San Bernardino Valley College
El Camino College	San Diego City College
Everest College	San Joaquin Delta College
Evergreen Valley College	San Joaquin Valley College
Fresno City College	Santa Ana College
Glendale Community College	Santa Barbara City College
Golden West College	Santa Monica College
Grossmont College	Santa Rosa Junior College
Hartnell College	Shasta College
Imperial Valley College	Shepherd University
ITT Technical Institute	Sierra College
Kaplan College	Solano Community College
Long Beach City College	Southwestern College
Los Angeles City College	*Stanbridge College
Los Angeles County College of Nursing & Allied Health	Ventura College
Los Angeles Harbor College	Victor Valley College
Los Angeles Southwest College	West Hills College Lemoore
Los Angeles Trade-Tech College	†Yuba College

*LVN to ADN Programs Only (7)*

Allan Hancock College  
 Carrington College  
 College of the Siskiyous  
 Gavilan College

Mission College  
 Reedley College at Madera Community  
 College Center  
 Unitek College

*BSN Programs (36)<sup>†</sup>*

American University of Health Sciences  
 †Azusa Pacific University  
 Biola University  
 California Baptist University  
 CSU Bakersfield  
 †CSU Channel Islands  
 CSU Chico  
 CSU East Bay  
 CSU Fresno  
 CSU Fullerton  
 CSU Long Beach  
 CSU Los Angeles  
 CSU Northridge  
 CSU Sacramento  
 CSU San Bernardino  
 †CSU San Marcos  
 †CSU Stanislaus  
 Concordia University Irvine  
 Dominican University of California

Holy Names University  
 Loma Linda University  
 Mount Saint Mary's University  
 †National University  
 Point Loma Nazarene University  
 †Samuel Merritt University  
 San Diego State University  
 †San Francisco State University  
 Simpson University  
 Sonoma State University  
 University of California Irvine  
 University of California Los Angeles  
 †University of Phoenix - Northern California  
 University of San Francisco  
 The Valley Foundation School of Nursing at  
 San Jose State University  
 †West Coast University  
 Western Governors University

*ELM Programs (16)*

†Azusa Pacific University  
 California Baptist University  
 CSU Dominguez Hills  
 CSU Fresno  
 CSU Fullerton  
 CSU Long Beach  
 CSU Los Angeles  
 Charles R. Drew University

†Samuel Merritt University  
 †San Francisco State University  
 \*United States University  
 University of California Los Angeles  
 University of California San Francisco  
 University of San Diego  
 University of San Francisco  
 Western University of Health Sciences

† Reported student data for satellite campuses

\* - New programs in 2013-2014

<sup>†</sup> - In 2013-2014, the three programs at West Coast University were consolidated into one main campus with two satellite campuses and Humboldt State University graduated its last cohort of BSN students in 2012-2013, reducing the total number of BSN programs.

## APPENDIX B – Definition List

---

The following definitions apply throughout the survey whenever the word or phrase being defined appears unless otherwise noted.

**Accelerated Program:** An Accelerated Program's curriculum extends over a shorter time-period than a traditional program. The curriculum itself may be the same as a generic curriculum or it may be designed to meet the unique learning needs of the student population.

**Active Faculty:** Faculty who teach students and have a teaching assignment during the time period specified. Include deans/directors, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, adjunct professors, instructors, assistant instructors, clinical teaching assistants, and any other faculty who have a current teaching assignment.

**Adjunct Faculty:** A faculty member that is employed to teach a course in a part-time and/or temporary capacity.

**Advanced Placement Students:** Pre-licensure students who entered the program after the first semester/quarter. These students include LVNs, paramedics, military corpsmen, and other health care providers, but does not include students who transferred or were readmitted.

**Assembly Bill 1559 Criteria:** Requires California Community College (CCC) registered nursing programs who determine that the number of applicants to that program exceeds the capacity and elects, on or after January 1, 2008 to use a multicriteria screening process to evaluate applicants shall include specified criteria including, but not limited to, all of the following: (1) academic performance, (2) any relevant work or volunteer experience, (3) foreign language skills, and (4) life experiences and special circumstances of the applicant. Additional criteria, such as a personal interview, a personal statement, letter of recommendation, or the number of repetitions of prerequisite classes or other criteria, as approved by the chancellor, may be used but are not required.

**Assistant Director:** A registered nurse administrator or faculty member who meets the qualifications of section 1425(b) of the California Code of Regulations (Title 16) and is designated by the director to assist in the administration of the program and perform the functions of the director when needed.

**Attrition Rate:** The total number of generic students dropped or disqualified who were scheduled to complete the program between August 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014, divided by the total number of generic students enrolled who were scheduled to complete during the same time period.

**Census Data:** Number of students enrolled or faculty present on October 15, 2014.

**Clinical Placement:** A cohort of students placed in a clinical facility or community setting as part of the clinical education component of their nursing education. If you have multiple cohorts of students at one clinical facility or community setting, you should count each cohort as a clinical placement.

**Clinical Simulation:** Clinical simulation provides a simulated real-time nursing care experience using clinical scenarios and low to hi-fidelity mannequins, which allow students to integrate, apply, and refine specific skills and abilities that are based on theoretical concepts and scientific knowledge. It may include videotaping, de-briefing and dialogue as part of the learning process.

**Collaborative/Shared Education:** A written agreement between two or more nursing programs specifying the nursing courses at their respective institutions that are equivalent and acceptable for transfer credit to partner nursing programs. These partnerships may be between nursing programs offering the same degree or between an entry degree nursing program(s) and a higher degree nursing program(s). These later arrangements allow students to progress from one level of nursing education to a higher level without the repetition of nursing courses.

**Completed on Schedule Students:** Students scheduled on admission to complete the program between August 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014.

**Contract Education:** A written agreement between a nursing program and a health care organization in which the nursing program agrees to provide a nursing degree program for the organization's employees for a fee.

**Distance Education:** Any method of presenting a course where the student and teacher are not present in the same room (e.g., internet web based, teleconferencing, etc.).

**Entry-level Master's (ELM):** A master's degree program in nursing for students who have earned a bachelor's degree in a discipline other than nursing and do not have prior schooling in nursing. This program consists of pre-licensure nursing courses and master's level nursing courses.

**Evening Program:** A program that offers all program activities in the evening (i.e. lectures, etc.). This does not include a traditional program that offers evening clinical rotations.

**Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs):** One FTE is equal to 40 hours per week.

**Full-Time Faculty:** Faculty that work 1.0 FTE, as defined by the school.

**Generic Pre-licensure Students:** Students who enter the program in the first nursing course.

**Hi-Fidelity Mannequin:** A portable, realistic human patient simulator designed to teach and test students' clinical and decision-making skills.

**Home Campus:** The campus where your school's administration is based. Include data here about any satellite campuses if they are located in the same county as your home campus.

**Hybrid Program:** Combination of distance education and face-to-face courses.

**LVN to BSN Program:** A program that exclusively admits LVN to BSN students. If the school also has a generic BSN program, the LVN to BSN program is offered separately or differs significantly from the generic program.

**LVN 30 Unit Option Students:** LVNs enrolled in the curriculum for the 30-unit option.

**Part-Time Faculty:** Faculty that work less than 1.0 FTE and do not carry a full-time load, as defined by school policy. This includes annualized and non-annualized faculty.

**Readmitted Students:** Returning students who were previously enrolled in your program.

**Retention Rate:** The total number of generic students who completed the program between August 1, 2012 and July 31, 2013 divided by the total number of generic students enrolled who were scheduled to complete during the same time period.

**Satellite/Alternate campus:** A campus other than your home campus that is approved by the BRN as an alternate/secondary location, operates under the administration of your home campus, is in a county other than where your home campus is located, is in California, and enrolls pre-licensure registered nursing students.

**Screened applications:** The number of applications selected from the total applicant pool to undergo additional screening to determine if they were qualified for admission to the nursing program between 8/1/13 and 7/31/14.

**Shared Faculty:** A faculty member is shared by more than one school, e.g. one faculty member teaches a course in pediatrics to three different schools in one region.

**Students who Dropped Out or were Disqualified:** Students who have left the program prior to their scheduled completion date occurring between August 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014.

**Time Period for the Survey:** August 1, 2013 - July 31, 2014. For those schools that admit multiple times a year, combine all student cohorts.

**Traditional Program:** A program on the semester or quarter system that offers most courses and other required program activities on weekdays during business hours. Clinical rotations for this program may be offered on evenings and weekends.

**Transfer Students:** Students in your programs that have transferred nursing credits from another pre-licensure program. This excludes RN to BSN students.

**Validated Prerequisites:** The nursing program uses one of the options provided by the California Community College Chancellor's Office for validating prerequisite courses.

**Waiting List:** A waiting list identifies students who qualified for the program, were not admitted in the enrollment cycle for which they applied, and will be considered for a subsequent enrollment cycle without needing to reapply.

**Weekend Program:** A program that offers all program activities on weekends, i.e. lectures, clinical rotations, etc. This does not include a traditional program that offers clinical rotations on weekends.

**APPENDIX C – BRN Education Issues Workgroup Members**

---

**Members**

Loucine Huckabay, Chair  
 Judee Berg  
 Audrey Berman  
 Brenda Fong  
 Marilyn Herrmann  
 Deloras Jones

Stephanie Leach  
 Judy Martin-Holland  
 Vicky Maryatt  
 Tammy Rice  
 Paulina Van

**Organization**

California State University, Long Beach  
 California Institute for Nursing and Health Care  
 Samuel Merritt University  
 Community College Chancellor’s Office  
 Loma Linda University  
 Independent Consultant, Former Executive Director of  
 California Institute for Nursing and Health Care  
 Kaiser Permanente National Patient Care Services  
 University of California, San Francisco  
 American River College  
 Saddleback College  
 California State University, East Bay

**Ex-Officio Member**

Louise Bailey

California Board of Registered Nursing

**Project Manager**

Julie Campbell-Warnock

California Board of Registered Nursing