In the School of Nursing (SON), Gap Analysis Values (GAV) greater than 0.75 (or values farthest from the ideal Target Value of zero when no Gap Analysis Values exceed the 0.75 level) are used to clearly identify areas for development of Improvement Action Plans. However, faculty reflection is required to verify whether the opportunities for improvement indicated by GAVs is the result of episodic events, respondent’s incorrect selection of values for one or more tool items, or evidence of a pattern.

When conducting Gap Analysis, respondents are asked to assess both degree of agreement and degree of importance for each tool item. The degree of agreement rating provides information about current SON performance, i.e., “where we are” for each tool item. The degree of importance rating provides information about how the SON should be striving to perform on each tool item, i.e., “where we need/want to be.” The “difference” between agreement values and importance values is the “GAP” we need to fill to get to “where we want to be.”

When analyzing respondent data, agreement values and importance values are averaged independently across respondents for each tool item. The Agreement Mean is then subtracted from the Importance Mean for each tool item. Then, the resulting value is the GAV and the “gap” we need to fill. The process is repeated to calculate Tool Totals. Thus, tool items with GAVs less than or equal to 0.75 are identified as Strengths. Tool items with GAVs greater than 0.75 (or values farthest from the ideal Target Value of zero when no Gap Analysis Values exceed the 0.75 level) are identified as Opportunities for Improvement. GAVs are used to determine whether Improvement Action Plans are needed.

Respondent comments include strengths strategies, opportunity for improvement strategies, and respondent comments. The Strengths Recommendations are the activities alumni found important for optimal learning. The Improvement Recommendations are based on suggestions alumni have for changes to reduce barriers to optimal learning. Faculty reflection about GAVs and alumni recommendations is essential to develop the best strategies for programmatic Improvement Action Plans.

Gap Analysis is an important contribution for Continuous Quality Improvement and development of Improvement Action Plans. The difference between QA and CQI is the focus of QA is on the number of individuals making positive and/or negative comments or recommendations, including the assumption for every positive or negative comment, there are at least ten more people who had the same thought/perception. However, the focus of QI for decision-making is not on the number of individuals making a positive/negative comment as the basis for decision-making. Instead, decisions for
improvement are based on the numerical value of the Gap Analysis and the respondent comments are used to provide insight for development of improvement action plans.

Strength, Importance, and Gap Analysis Value Interpretations

- The Agreement Mean is the aggregated mean value scored by each student for each tool item scored.
- The Importance Mean is the aggregated mean value scored by each student for each tool item scored.
- The Gap Analysis Value for each tool item is calculated by subtracting the Agreement Mean from the Importance Mean (i.e., Importance Mean – Agreement Mean = Gap Analysis Value for each tool item).
- The Gap Analysis Value for each tool item is interpreted as a strength or opportunity for improvement for each Tool Item.
- The Gap Analysis Value for each tool item is interpreted as a strength when the numeric value is at or below 0.75.
- The Gap Analysis Value for each tool item is interpreted as an improvement opportunity when the Gap Analysis Value is greater than 0.75 (or the item with a Gap Analysis Value farthest from the ideal Target Value of zero when Gap Analysis Values for an item are less than 0.75).
- Student Comments are categorized as Strengths Strategies to continue with sample narrative for areas students find necessary for optimal learning, Improvement Opportunity Strategies with sample narrative data for areas the students find necessary for removing barriers to optimal learning, i.e., barriers to achieving required criteria, and Student Suggestion Strategies for Improvement.
- Decision-making is based on the numeric value of each Gap Analysis Value.
- Student comments are used to provide faculty insight for the numeric values students select.
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS RESULTS</th>
<th>ALL ITEMS LIST</th>
<th>STRENGTHS Gap Analysis</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES Gap Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAME SEMESTER PREVIOUS YEAR: 0.0000</td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE STATEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Rate: 00.00% (00 of 00) an acceptable return.</td>
<td>o Learning experiences at LCCHWC were effective for helping me achieve learning objectives.</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Orientation to LCCHWC was effective for helping me complete skills.</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Health Provider clearly explained the client history, diagnosis &amp; intervention to me.</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Clinical learning opportunities were effective for helping me achieve my learning goal.</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Overall, my satisfaction with my experience at the LCCHWC was extremely high.</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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