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## Until recently . . .

- Students enrol, go to lectures
- Sit for drug calc exam, week 4,5 or 6
- < 100\% = Fail!
- More practice examples $\rightarrow$ Resit exam
- Fail resit BUT pass all other aspects of course $\rightarrow$ More practice examples $\rightarrow$ Resit exam
- Fail resit $\rightarrow$ Fail unit



## The situation . . .

- Many students cannot perform drug calculations
- Not only ACU, not only Vic, not only Aus, but many countries
- Based on observations, school mathematics seems largely irrelevant
- OECD survey: Australia ranked 4 of 23 countries in literacy but $13^{\text {th }}$ in numeracy



## Musings

- Diagnostic tool - question items to test specific competencies required to do drug calculations.
- Identify students likely to struggle
- Identify areas of support needed
- Topic-specific workshops $\rightarrow$ Drug calcs exam
- Fail exam $\rightarrow$ Further topic specific workshops $\rightarrow$ Resit exam
- Informed by the work of Hutton, as quoted in Wright $(2007,279)$ : A revision program for 184 out of 231 students who scored less than $75 \%$ on a 50 -item maths test.


## Numeracy and Literacy



## Other studies . . .

- Kerri Wright: University of Greenwich, London, has encountered similar issues in her nursing students.
- Wright (2004): student nurses need both mathematical skills and the ability to conceptualise clinical information to perform drug calculations.
- Wright's 2007 study: important for an intervention program to address both conceptual skills and mathematical ability.
- Our experience: many students made incorrect dosage calculations either through lacking certain mathematical skills or through not understanding exactly what the question was asking.
- Review conducted by van de Mortel, Whitehair and Irwin (2014) showed the importance of students' understanding of terminology and contextual meaning
- Backed up by Bliss-Holtz (as quoted in Wright $(2007,279)$ ) who found that students made errors either in arithmetic or their understanding of mathematical concepts.



## Actions

- Diagnostic tool developed
- Enlisted help and advice of Prof. Doug Clarke \& assistant researcher
- Administered diagnostic "quiz" to $1^{\text {st }} \& 2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{yr}$ Students
- Quiz corrected; feedback results to Lecturers
- Lecturers schedule workshops \& encourage students to attend. (Cannot make them compulsory)
- Students re-sit exam $\rightarrow$ improved performance.


## Sample Questions - First Draft

Write one half as a fraction.

Which is larger: $\frac{2}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{5}$ ?

Arrange in order from smallest to largest: $0.54,0.6,0.312$
$\frac{1}{5} \times \frac{2}{3}=\quad \frac{2}{3} \times 5=$

You have a bottle of 100 ml of medicine. The strength of the medicine is 5 mg per 2 ml . If you give 10 ml , how many mg are you giving?
$5: 8=x: 20, \quad x=?$
(Many students found this difficult)

## Results

| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | Highest | Yrs Since | Conf. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 7 STUDENT CODE | Lvi Maths | Achieved | Level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | Total | \%age |
| 107 S00 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 64\% |
| 108 S00 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 84\% |
| 109 S00 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 48\% |
| 110 S00 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 40\% |
| 111 S00 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 68\% |
| $112 \mathrm{S00}$ | 13 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 76\% |
| 113 SOO | 10 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 28\% |
| 114 S00 | 13 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 80\% |
| 115 S00 | 12 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 96\% |
| 116 SOO | 12 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 80\% |
| 117 S00 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 72\% |
| 118 S00 |  |  | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 92\% |
| 119 S00 | 12 |  | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 36\% |
| 120 S00 | 13 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 88\% |
| 121 S00 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 68\% |
| $122 \quad 114$ students took part | No. C | orrect Resp | nses | 95 | 110 | 107 | 107 | 114 | 74 | 101 | 114 | 110 | 76 | 49 | 70 | 51 | 75 | 75 | 95 | 00 | 06 | 60 | 24 |  |  |
| 123 | No. who did | id not score | fll marks | 19 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 40 | 13 | 0 | 4 | 38 | 65 | 44 | 63 | 41 | 41 | 19 | 34 | 28 | 48 | 90 |  |  |
| 124 | \% who did | d not score | Il marks | 17\% | 4\% | 6\% | 6\% | 0\% | 35\% | 11\% | 0\% | 4\% | 33\% | 57\% | 39\% | 55\% | 36\% | 36\% | 17\% | 30\% | 25\% | 42\% | 79\% |  |  |
| 125 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Problems involving reading and understanding the question, and deciding which strategy to use to solve the problem or answer the question.

## Analysis



- $>80 \% \rightarrow \mathrm{OK}$
- $>60 \%$ but $<80 \% \rightarrow$ Attend workshops
- $<60 \% \rightarrow$ Make an appointment for support
- Similar difficulties demonstrated by both $1^{\text {st }} \& 2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{yr}$
- Areas identified: rounding, conversions, estimating, fractions, ratios, formula substitution
- Highest level of maths achieved prior to enrolling not relevant.
- A significant worsening of results (pro rata) from Yr 1 to Yr 2


## Actions following $1^{\text {st }}$ attempt . . .

- First year students were given verbal feedback by email on areas done well and areas needing further consolidation
- First year students were directed to set aside time to access the online software tool and work on these areas, along with other on-line resources, such as the Khan Academy.
- Session on drug calculations given in the (2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ year) lecture by AS numeracy person
- Organised a series of "numeracy support" sessions before scheduled exam
- A "remedial" lecture session the week after scheduled exam
- Reinforced through lectures the availability of and importance of attending, consultation appointments
- Promoted further revision resources on the LMS and online software tool, to be completed prior to re-sit


## Some further results

- First year results:
> Sem 12014
* HLSC110-93.2\% pass rate
- Second year results:
$>$ Improved pass rate on first attempt Sem. 1, 2015
* Pass rate for the first attempt: $64 \%$ which is better than last year
> Improved eventual total pass rate $86 \%$


## Refinements . . .

Wanted to make it more diagnostic

Decided on a Multiple Choice version - wrong answers would indicate what specific skill needed improving

Developed wrong answer options for each question, based on variety of wrong answers encountered when correcting previous attempts

Considered how students might think "mistakenly" to arrive at wrong answer - not just random incorrect answers

ACER personnel ratified the answer options, hence the design of the quiz

Quiz A and Quiz B developed

## Possibilities

- Target $2^{\text {nd }}$ year students only
- Completion of diagnostic quiz a hurdle task.

- For those who need it, workshops compulsory - attendance marked.
- Develop worksheets to be completed as hurdle task - on line or hard copies
- Failure on drug calcs exam $\rightarrow$ compulsory to make an appointment for AS support
- Completion of diagnostic quiz again at end of semester $\rightarrow$ map improvement
- Long term project $\rightarrow$ record results each semester over 3-4 years
- Publish project description, results, findings $\rightarrow$ Education \& Nursing Journals


## Most recent results . . .

- Second year results:
$>$ Improved pass rate on first attempt (Sem. 2 , 2015)
The total pass rate is $63 \%$
That is an improvement from 50\% (previous years).
> Improved eventual total pass rate 93\%

Analysis of Problem Areas - $1^{\text {st }}$ Year students Sem1, 2015
(Group A)


Analysis of Problem Areas - $1^{\text {st }}$ Year students Sem1, 2015 (Group B)


## New Initiatives . . .

Generic workshops, online and video resources for different platforms (PC, tablet, smartphone) in

- Problem solving
- Algebra
- Unit conversions
- Critical reading of graphs/tables
- Terminology
- Ratio and proportion
being developed, refined and scheduled for introduction in 2016.

Examples:
(Click on image)
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## Watch this space . . .



