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Problem Statement
• Nurse residency programs (NRPs) support the successful transition of newly licensed nurses (NLNs) to practice following graduation (Asker, 2019; Van Camp & Chappy, 2017) and represent a significant financial investment for organizations (Pillai et al., 2018).
• Evaluation typically focuses on preceptors and NLNs, with limited tools available to obtain feedback from key stakeholders (Laflamme & Hykrai, 2020).

Background
• Despite evidence supporting NRPs, there are few tools available to measure their effectiveness from the perspective of key stakeholders.
• The Nurse Residency Program – Stakeholder Evaluation Survey (NRP-SES) (Failla et al., 2021) was developed to address the gap in the literature and has been found to effectively measure key stakeholders’ perceptions of NRPs.

Purpose
• To evaluate the effectiveness of the current NLN Residency Program from the perception of key stakeholders.

Research Question
• “What are the perceptions of the key stakeholders about the effectiveness of the NLN Residency Program?”

Conceptual Framework
• Benner’s novice to expert framework (Bennet, 1984)

Methodology

Study Design: Cross-sectional descriptive design
Setting: 171-bed Magnet® designated community teaching hospital in the Northeast U.S.
Sample: Purposive sampling was used to recruit 107 key stakeholders knowledgeable about the nurse residency program
IRB: IRB review conducted and met regulatory requirements for exempt research
Data analysis: Data analysis included means, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients with current sample compared to the NRP-SES study sample
Data Collection: Demographic questions, NRP-SES, two open ended questions

Results
• Response rate was 45% (n=49); response rate differed by roles
  • Highest response rate from clinical leaders (77%) and lowest from preceptors (27%)
  • Demographic data suggests need to strengthen preceptor education at the organization
  • 74.1% (n=20) reported that they had not received formal preceptor education
  • Findings highlight the perceptions of effectiveness of the NRP by key stakeholders (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRP-SES Scales</th>
<th>Current Sample (n = 49)</th>
<th>Failla et al. (n = 301)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean (SD)</td>
<td>mean (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based practice</td>
<td>5.0 (0.41)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-centered care</td>
<td>3.23 (0.41)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork and collaboration</td>
<td>3.07 (0.43)</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement and safety</td>
<td>3.12 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informatics</td>
<td>3.25 (0.45)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>3.05 (0.38)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
<td>3.12 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• A series of t-tests were conducted to assess if NRP-SES scale means differed for various demographic groups; only one set of comparisons revealed significant differences (Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRP-SES Scales</th>
<th>Clinical Nurses (n = 10)</th>
<th>Preceptors (n = 17)</th>
<th>Levene’s test</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based practice</td>
<td>2.64 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.24 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-centered care</td>
<td>3.01 (0.25)</td>
<td>3.38 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork &amp; collaboration</td>
<td>2.93 (0.26)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.53)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement &amp; safety</td>
<td>2.93 (0.26)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informatics</td>
<td>3.13 (0.24)</td>
<td>3.44 (0.49)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>2.89 (0.26)</td>
<td>3.09 (0.49)</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
<td>2.95 (0.22)</td>
<td>3.26 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Ended Responses

Strengths
• Program length & use of cohort model
• Clinical and didactic components
• Ongoing reflective exercises
• Supportive environment provided by NPDMs and preceptors

Opportunities
• Improve preceptor education and development
• Limit # of preceptors assigned to NLNs
• Promote consistency for unit-based progress meetings
• Increase # of simulation experiences
• Address retention and establish a mentor program
• Extend orientation for NLNs hired to specialty practice units

Implications
• Nurse leaders may use the NRP-SES to determine baseline and ongoing effectiveness of NRPs.

Conclusions
• Study highlighted the effectiveness of the organization’s residency program.
• Demographic data and open-ended responses identified numerous opportunities to strengthen the NRP.
• Results showed concordance with Failla et al. (2021), validating usefulness of the NRP-SES instrument when used in a different setting with a different sample size.
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