

**School of Nursing
MSN
2017-2018**

Learning Outcomes:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Learning Outcome |
|------------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #1 Inquiring Faithfully | Students will demonstrate knowledge, skill, and behavior of the evidence- based practice of nursing which integrates growth in reasoning, analysis, decision-making and the application of theory with the goal of advocating for others and/or self. This includes holistic nursing skills and the nursing process. |

Outcome Measures:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Outcome Measure |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #1 | GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written |

Criteria for Success:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Statement of Criteria for Success |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #1 | 85% of students will achieve at least, or greater than, 3 on a 4-point rubric scale. |

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. **Specialized Knowledge**
2. **Broad Integrative Knowledge**
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. **Applied and Collaborative Learning**
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: Note – PLO 1.5 is listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comprehensive Exam rubric.

| AY | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
|-----------|---------------|----------|---|--|
| 2013-2014 | GNSG695 | 21 | (20/21) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. |
| 2014-2015 | GNSG695 | 41 | (39/41) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 2 students repeated written portion prior to oral defense. |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
| 2015-2016 | GNSG695 | 31 | Total: (29/31) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. (PLO 1.2, Essential I) 29/29 students = 100% scored at or above the benchmark (PLO 1.1, 1.2, Essential II) 26/29 students = 89.6% scored at or above the benchmark (PLO 1.3, 1.4, Essential IV) 17/29 students = 58.6% scored at or above the benchmark | 2 students successfully repeated the written portion. Oral & Written Comprehensive Exam |
| | | | | |

| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success | Comments |
|------|----------|----|---|---|
| 2017 | GNSG 695 | 31 | (27/31) students = 87% successfully completed the oral and written portions of the exam on the first attempt (PLOs 1-5) | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. 3 students successfully repeated the written exam portion. |
| 2018 | GNSG695 | 25 | <p>SP 2018 (25/25) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (PLO 1.2, Essential I) 23/25 students = 92% scored at or above the benchmark • (PLO 1.1, 1.2, Essential II) 22/25 students = 88% scored at or above the benchmark • (PLO 1.3, 1.4, Essential IV) 17/25 students = 68% scored at or above the benchmark <p>SU 2018 23/25 students = 92% successfully completed the written examination portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. Achievement of stated PLO benchmarks for the written exam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLO 1.2: 25/25 students = 100% • PLO 1.3, 1.4: 18/25 = 72% | The students who did not pass initial attempt passed on the second attempt. |

| | | | | |
|------|---------|----|---|--|
| 2019 | GNSG695 | 22 | <p>SP2019: (22/22) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PLO 1.1 = 77.3% scored at or above the benchmark• PLO 1.2 = 78.8% scored at or above the benchmark• PLO 1.3 = 81.8% scored at or above the benchmark• PLO 1.4 = <p>Students will complete the written paper portion of the exam during SU19, and results will be updated when available.</p> | |
|------|---------|----|---|--|

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Conclusions Drawn from Data |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #1 | Overall, students are below established benchmarks (79.9%). PLO 1.1 and 1.2 are measured by the rubric element “Develop PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework”. |

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #1 | We will review our effort on assisting students in developing a PICO questions using the appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework. We will also continue to work on providing clarity for students as we review our rubrics for content and application. |

Rubrics Used (all rubrics attached at the end of this document):

GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubrics

Note: Rubrics are evaluated and modified for clarity, consistency, and accuracy. Inter-rater reliability through a nursing faculty process is assured in the CE grading process for both the written and oral components.

| GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubric | | |
|---|---|--|
| Graded Project Points: Initial = 3 Emerging = 6 Developing = 9 Highly Developed = 12 For the purpose of benchmarking criteria for success, the rating scale was adjusted. Initial = 1 Emerging = 2 Developing = 3 Highly Developed = 4 | | |
| CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA | CROSS-WALKED OUTCOMES |
| <i>Assessed by Comprehensive Exams: PLOs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3</i> | | |
| <i>Listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric: PLOs 1.5, 2.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1</i> | | |
| I | Examines significant problem in an area of nursing specialization. | Essential I, VII, VIII PLO 1.2 |
| II | Develops PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework. | Essentials I, V PLOs 1.1, 1.2 |
| III | Creates Evidence Evaluation Table as a handout for faculty with project abstract and references. | Essentials I, IV PLOs 3.2, 3.3 |
| IV | Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. Synthesizes the key findings of the evidence review. | Essentials I, IV, V PLOs 1.3, 1.4, 2.3 |
| V | Evaluates the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment. | Essentials II, VII PLOs 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3 |
| VI | Implementation strategies | Essentials II, VI, IX PLOs 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 |
| VII | Organization | Essential IX PLO 3.2 |
| VIII | Language | Essential IX PLO 3.2 |
| IX | Delivery; intellectual competence | PLOs 3.1, 3.2 |
| X | Presentation mechanics | PLOs 3.1, 3.3 |

**School of Nursing
MSN 2017-2018**

Learning Outcome:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Learning Outcome |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #2 Caring Faithfully | The student will embrace a calling to the ministry of compassionate care for all people in response to God's grace, which aims to foster optimal health and bring comfort in suffering and death. |

Outcome Measures:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Outcome Measure |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #2 | GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written |

Criteria for Success:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Statement of Criteria for Success |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #2 | 85% of students will achieve at least, or greater than, 3 on a 4-point rubric scale. |

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. **Broad Integrative Knowledge**
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. **Civic and Global Learning**

Longitudinal Data: Note – PLO 2.1 is listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric.

| AY | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|--|--|
| 2013-2014 | GNSG695 | 21 | (20/21) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. |
| 2014-2015 | GNSG695 | 41 | (39/41) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 2 students repeated written portion prior to oral defense. |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
| 2015-2016 | GNSG695 Sec. 01 | 31 | Total: (29/31) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. (PLO 2.3, Essential IV) 17/29 = 58.6% scored at or above the benchmark for the Essential outcome, "Critically appraises the primary research evidence." <i>Note: When PLO 2.3 is cross-walked onto Essential V, 100% of the students scored at or above the benchmark.</i> (PLOs 2.2, 2.3, Essential V) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark in other relevant sub-categories. | 2 students successfully repeated the written portion. Oral & Written Comprehensive Exam |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success | Comments |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------------|--|---|
| 2016-2017 | GNSG 695 | 31 | (27/31) students = 87% successfully completed the oral and written portions of the exam on the first attempt (PLOs 1-5) | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. 3 students successfully repeated the written exam portion. |
| 2018 | GNSG695 | 25 25 | <p>SP 2018: (25/25) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (PLO 2.3, Essential IV) 17/25 = 68% scored at or above the benchmark (PLOs 2.2, 2.3, Essential V) 21/25 = 84% scored at or above the benchmark <p>SU 2018: 23/25 students – 92% successfully completed the written presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on their first attempt. Achievement of stated PLO benchmarks for the written exam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLO 2.2 = (18/25) = 78% PLO 2.3 = (19/25) = 78% | |
| 2019 | GNSG695 | 22 | <p>SP 2019: (22/22) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLO 2.2 (17/22) = 68% scored at or above the benchmark (PLOs 2.2, 2.3) 17.5/25 = 79.5% scored at or above the benchmark <p>SU 2019: Students will complete their oral examination in summer. Results will be reported when available.</p> | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Conclusions Drawn from Data |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #2 | Overall, students are not quite meeting established benchmarks (79.2). Both PLO's are slightly below benchmark. |

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #2 | MSN Faculty will take a look at changing/strengthening teaching activities that address PLO#2. |

Rubrics Used (all rubrics attached at the end of this document):

GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubrics

Note: Rubrics are evaluated and modified for clarity, consistency, and accuracy. Inter-rater reliability through a nursing faculty process is assured in the CE grading process for both the written and oral components.

| GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubric | | |
|--|---|--|
| Graded Project Points: Initial = 3 Emerging = 6 Developing = 9 Highly Developed = 12 Note: For the purpose of benchmarking criteria for success, the rating scale was adjusted to the following: Initial = 1 Emerging = 2 Developing = 3 Highly Developed = 4 | | |
| CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA | CROSS-WALKED OUTCOMES |
| <i>Assessed by Comprehensive Exams: PLOs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3</i> <i>Listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric: PLOs 1.5, 2.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1</i> | | |
| I | Examines significant problem in an area of nursing specialization. | Essential I, VII, VIII PLO1.2 |
| II | Develops PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework. | Essentials I, V PLOs 1.1, 1.2 |
| III | Creates Evidence Evaluation Table as a handout for faculty with project abstract and references. | Essentials I, IV PLOs 3.2, 3.3 |
| IV | Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. Synthesizes the key findings of the evidence review. | Essentials I, IV, V PLOs 1.3, 1.4, 2.3 |
| V | Evaluates the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment. | Essentials II, VII PLOs 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3 |
| VI | Implementation strategies | Essentials II, VI, IX PLOs 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 |
| VII | Organization | Essential IX PLO3.2 |
| VIII | Language | Essential IX PLO3.2 |
| IX | Delivery; intellectual competence | PLOs 3.1, 3.2 |
| X | Presentation mechanics | PLOs 3.1, 3.3 |

**School of Nursing
MSN 2017-2018**

Learning Outcomes:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Learning Outcome |
|--|--|
| MSN PLO #3 Communicating Faithfully | The student will actively engage in the dynamic interactive process that is intrapersonal and interpersonal with the goal of advocating for others and/or self. This includes effective, culturally appropriate communication conveys information, thoughts, actions and feelings through the use of verbal and nonverbalskills. |

Outcome Measures:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Outcome Measure |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #3 | GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written |

Criteria for Success:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Statement of Criteria for Success |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #3 | 85% of students will achieve at least, or greater than, 3 on a 4-point rubric scale. |

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. **Specialized Knowledge**
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. **Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies**
4. **Applied and Collaborative Learning**
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

| AY | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
|------------------|---------------|----------|--|--|
| 2013-2014 | GNSG695 | 21 | (20/21) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. |
| 2014-2015 | GNSG695 | 41 | (39/41) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 2 students repeated written portion prior to oral defense. |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
| 2015-2016 | GNSG695 | 31 | Total: (29/31) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. (PLOs 3.2, 3.3, Essential III) 25/29 = 86% of the students scored at or above the benchmark for the Essential outcome, "Creates Evidence Evaluation Table." (PLO 3.5, Essential V) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark. | 2 students successfully repeated the written portion. Oral & Written Comprehensive Exam |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | <p>(PLO3.2, Essential VII) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark.</p> <p>(PLOs 3.1, 3.2, Essential IX) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark.</p> <p>(PLOs 3.1, 3.3, Essential X) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark.</p> | |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success | Comments |
| 2016-2017 | GNSG 695 | 31 | (27/31) students = 87% successfully completed the oral and written portions of the exam on the first attempt (PLOs 1-5) | <p>1 student successfully repeated the oral defense.</p> <p>3 students successfully repeated the written exam portion.</p> |
| 2018 | | | <p>SP2018 (25/25) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (PLOs 3.2, 3.3, Essential III) 21/25 = 84% scored at or above the benchmark • (PLO 3.5, Essential V) 21/25 = 84% scored at or above the benchmark • (PLO 3.2, Essential VII) 24/25 = 96% scored at or above the benchmark • (PLOs 3.1, 3.2, Essential IX) 25/25 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark. • (PLOs 3.1, 3.3, Essential X) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark. <p>SU 2018: 23/25 students – 92% successfully completed the written presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on their first attempt. Achievement of stated PLO benchmarks for the written exam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLO 3.2 = (18/25) = 89% • PLO 3.3 = (19/25) = 92% • PLO 3.5 = (19.6/25) = 68% | |

| | | | | |
|-------------|---------|----|---|--|
| 2019 | GNSG695 | 22 | <p>SP2018 (19.2/22) students = 87.3% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLO 3.1 (25/22) = 100% • PLO 3.2 (16.6/22) = 75.7% • PLO 3.3 (16.3/22) = 74.2% • PLO 3.4 (14/22) = 63.6% • PLO 3.5 (21/22) = 95.5% <p>SU 2019 Students will complete their oral examination in summer. Results reported when available.</p> | |
|-------------|---------|----|---|--|

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Conclusions Drawn from Data |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #3 | All students are meeting established benchmarks and are demonstrating achievement of PLO 3. |

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #3 | We will increase our focus on assisting students to adequately create evidence evaluation and adequately critically appraising primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. We will continue to work on providing clarity for students as we review our rubrics for content and application. |

Rubrics Used (all rubrics attached at the end of this document):

GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubrics

Note: Rubrics are evaluated and modified for clarity, consistency, and accuracy. Inter-rater reliability through a nursing faculty process is assured in the CE grading process for both the written and oral components.

| GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubric | | |
|--|---|---|
| Graded Project Points: Initial=3 Emerging=6 Developing=9 Highly Developed=12 For the purpose of benchmarking criteria for success, the rating scale was adjusted. Initial=1 Emerging=2 Developing=3 Highly Developed=4 | | |
| CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA | CROSS-WALKED OUTCOMES |
| <i>Assessed by Comprehensive Exams: PLOs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3</i> | | |
| <i>Listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric: PLOs 1.5, 2.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1</i> | | |
| I | Examines significant problem in an area of nursing specialization. | Essential I, VII, VIII PLO1.2 |
| II | Develops PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework. | Essentials I, V PLOs 1.1, 1.2 |
| III | Creates Evidence Evaluation Table as a handout for faculty with project abstract and references. | Essentials I, IV PLOs 3.2, 3.3 |
| IV | Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. Synthesizes the key findings of the evidence review. | Essentials I, IV, V PLOs 1.3, 1.4, 2.3 |

| | | |
|------|---|--|
| V | Evaluates the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment. | Essentials II, VII PLOs 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3 |
| VI | Implementation strategies | Essentials II, VI, IX PLOs 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 |
| VII | Organization | Essential IX PLO3.2 |
| VIII | Language | Essential IX PLO3.2 |
| IX | Delivery; intellectual competence | PLOs 3.1, 3.2 |
| X | Presentation mechanics | PLOs 3.1, 3.3 |

**School of Nursing
MSN 2017-2018**

Learning Outcomes:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Learning Outcome |
|---------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #4 Following Faithfully | Defined as claiming the challenge from Florence Nightingale that nursing is a “divine imposed duty of ordinary work.” The nursing student will integrate the ordinary work by complying with and adhering to regulatory and professional standards (e.g. American Nurses Association (ANA) Code of Ethics, the California Board of Registered Nursing (BRN), Scope of Nursing Practice, SON Handbook). This includes taking responsibility, being accountable for all actions and treating others with respect and dignity. |

Outcome Measures:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Outcome Measure |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #4 | GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written |

Criteria for Success:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Statement of Criteria for Success |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #4 | 85% of students will achieve at least, or greater than, 3 on a 4-point rubric scale. |

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. **Specialized Knowledge**
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. **Applied and Collaborative Learning**
5. **Civic and Global Learning**

Longitudinal Data: Note – PLOs 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 are listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric.

| AY | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
|-----------|---------------|----------|---|--|
| 2013-2014 | GNSG695 | 21 | (20/21) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. |
| 2014-2015 | GNSG695 | 41 | (39/41) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 2 students repeated written portion prior to oral defense. |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
| 2015-2016 | GNSG695 | 31 | Total: (29/31) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. (PLOs 4.1, 4.2, Essential VI) 28/29 = 96.6% of students scored at or above the benchmark. | 2 students successfully repeated the written portion. Oral & Written Comprehensive Exam |

| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success | Comments |
|------------------|----------|----|---|---|
| 2016-2017 | GNSG 695 | 31 | (27/31) students = 87% successfully completed the oral and written portions of the exam on the first attempt (PLOs 1-5) | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. 3 students successfully repeated the written exam portion. |
| 2018 | GNSG695 | 25 | <p>SP 2018 (25/25) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (PLOs 4.1, 4.2, Essential VI) 16/25 = 76% of students scored at or above the benchmark. <p>SU 2018 (23/25) students = 92% of students successfully completed the written portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the written exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLO 4.1 & 4.2 = 80% | 2 students successfully repeated the written exam portion. |
| 2019 | GNSG695 | 22 | <p>SP2019 (22/22) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLO 4.1 & 4.2 (14/22) = 63.6% <p>SU 2019 Students will complete their oral examination in summer. Results reported when available.</p> | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Conclusions Drawn from Data |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #4 | Overall, students are meeting established benchmarks and are demonstrating achievement of PLO 4 (63.6%). The exception is a percentage of students (36.4%) scored below the benchmark for "Implementation strategies" PLOs 4.1, 4.2. |

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #4 | We will increase our focus on assisting students to adequately design and implement strategies that evaluate outcome data and develop strategies to reduce risks and improve health outcomes. We will continue to work on providing clarity for students as we review our rubrics for content and application. |

Rubrics Used (all rubrics attached at the end of this document):

GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubrics

Note: Rubrics are evaluated and modified for clarity, consistency, and accuracy. Inter-rater reliability through a nursing faculty process is assured in the CE grading process for both the written and oral components.

| GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubric | | |
|---|---|--|
| Graded Project Points: Initial = 3 Emerging = 6 Developing = 9 Highly Developed = 12 For the purpose of benchmarking criteria for success, the rating scale was adjusted. Initial = 1 Emerging = 2 Developing = 3 Highly Developed = 4 | | |
| CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA | CROSS-WALKED OUTCOMES |
| <i>Assessed by Comprehensive Exams: PLOs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3</i> | | |
| <i>Listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric: PLOs 1.5, 2.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1</i> | | |
| I | Examine significant problem in an area of nursing specialization. | Essential I, VII, VIII PLO 1.2 |
| II | Develop PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework. | Essentials I, V PLOs 1.1, 1.2 |
| III | Creates Evidence Evaluation Table as a handout for faculty with project abstract and references. | Essentials I, IV PLOs 3.2, 3.3 |
| IV | Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. Synthesizes the key findings of the evidence review. | Essentials I, IV, V PLOs 1.3, 1.4, 2.3 |
| V | Evaluate the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment. | Essentials II, VII PLOs 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3 |
| VI | Implementation strategies | Essentials II, VI, IX PLOs 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 |
| VII | Organization | Essential IX PLO 3.2 |
| VIII | Language | Essential IX PLO 3.2 |
| IX | Delivery; intellectual competence | PLOs 3.1, 3.2 |
| X | Presentation mechanics | PLOs 3.1, 3.3 |

**School of Nursing
MSN 2017-2018**

Learning Outcomes:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Learning Outcome |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #5 Leading Faithfully | The student will incorporate a foundational relationship with Christ and others and embrace a willingness to serve others in the midst of life- circumstances (e.g. illness, injustice, poverty). The student will role-model the need for “Sabbath Rest” as a means of personal renewal, and true care of the self so that service to others is optimally achieved. The student will incorporate the characteristics of a servant leader including: humility, courage, forgiveness, and discernment. |

Outcome Measures:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Outcome Measure |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #5 | GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written |

Criteria for Success:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Statement of Criteria for Success |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #5 | 85% of students will achieve at least, or greater than, 3 on a 4-point rubric scale. |

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. **Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies**
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data: Note – PLO 5.1 is listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric.

| AY | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
|-----------|---------------|----------|--|--|
| 2013-2014 | GNSG695 | 21 | (20/21) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. |
| 2014-2015 | GNSG695 | 41 | (39/41) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. | 2 students repeated written portion prior to oral defense. |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success Criteria | Comments |
| 2015-2016 | GNSG695 | 29 | Total: (29/31) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt. (PLOs 5.3, Essential V) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark in the relevant sub-categories. (PLO 5.2, Essential VI) 28/29 = 96.6% scored at or above the benchmark for “Implementation Strategies.” | 2 students successfully repeated the written portion. Oral & Written Comprehensive Exam |
| | Course | N | Students Meeting or Exceeding Success | Comments |

| | | | | |
|------------------|----------|----|--|---|
| 2016-2017 | GNSG 695 | 31 | (27/31) students = 87% successfully completed the oral and written portions of the exam on the first attempt (PLOs 1-5) | 1 student successfully repeated the oral defense. 3 students successfully repeated the written exam portion. |
| 2018 | GNSG695 | 25 | <p>SP 2018 (25/25) students = 100% successfully completed the oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (PLO 5.3, Essential V) 21/25 = 84% scored at or above the benchmark • (PLO 5.2, Essential VI) 16/25 = 64% scored at or above the benchmark <p>SU 2018 (23/25) students = 92% of students successfully completed the written portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the written exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLO 5.2 20/25 = 80% scored at or above benchmark • PLO 5.3 17/25 = 68% scored at or above benchmark | 2 students successfully repeated the written exam portion. |
| 2019 | GNSG695 | 22 | <p>SP2019 (22/22) students = 100% successfully completed the Oral presentation portion of the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. PLO benchmarks for the oral exam measured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLO 5.2 (22/22) = 100% • PLO 5.3 (22/22) = 100% <p>SU 2019 Students will complete their written portion of the examination in summer. Results reported when available.</p> | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Conclusions Drawn from Data |
|--------------------------------|--|
| MSN PLO #5 | Overall, students are not quite meeting established benchmarks for achievement of PLO 5 with the Oral Presentation of the Comprehensive Examination. |

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

| Program Learning Outcome (PLO) | Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data |
|--------------------------------|---|
| MSN PLO #5 | We will increase our focus on assisting students to adequately discuss proposals for change of practice including evaluation. We will continue to work on providing clarity for students as we review our rubrics for content and application. This issue will be revisited in Fall 2019 by the Assessment Committee in conjunction with MSN Program. |

Rubrics Used (all rubrics attached at the end of this document):

GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubrics

Note: Rubrics are evaluated and modified for clarity, consistency, and accuracy. Inter-rater reliability through a nursing faculty process is assured in the CE grading process for both the written and oral components.

| GNSG 695 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written Rubric | | |
|---|---|--|
| Graded Project Points: Initial = 3 Emerging = 6 Developing = 9 Highly Developed = 12 For the purpose of benchmarking criteria for success, the rating scale was adjusted. Initial = 1 Emerging = 2 Developing = 3 Highly Developed = 4 | | |
| CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA | CROSS-WALKED OUTCOMES |
| <i>Assessed by Comprehensive Exams: PLOs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3 Listed on MSN Curriculum Map but missing on Comp. Exam rubric: PLOs 1.5, 2.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1</i> | | |
| I | Examines significant problem in an area of nursing specialization. | Essential I, VII, VIII PLO1.2 |
| II | Develops PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework. | Essentials I, V PLOs 1.1, 1.2 |
| III | Creates Evidence Evaluation Table as a handout for faculty with project abstract and references. | Essentials I, IV PLOs 3.2, 3.3 |
| IV | Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. Synthesizes the key findings of the evidence review. | Essentials I, IV, V PLOs 1.3, 1.4, 2.3 |
| V | Evaluate the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment. | Essentials II, VII PLOs 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3 |
| VI | Implementation strategies | Essentials II, VI, IX PLOs 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 |
| VII | Organization | Essential IX PLO 3.2 |
| VIII | Language | Essential IX PLO 3.2 |
| IX | Delivery; intellectual competence | PLOs 3.1, 3.2 |
| X | Presentation mechanics | PLOs 3.1, 3.3 |

APPENDIX B
Oral Comprehensive Exam: Evidence Based Practice Project
Rubric

Passing = 81%

Student _____

Date _____

Score _____

Title of Project _____

| STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES | Initial (70%) | Emerging (75%) | Developing (85%) | Highly Developed (100%) | Points Possible | Points Awarded |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----------------|----------------|
| <p>Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)</p> <p>Integrate organizational science and informatics to make changes in the healthcare environment (MSN Essential I:7)</p> <p>PLO 1.2</p> | Meets < 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 4 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Examines significant problem in an area of nursing specialization</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n =6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem statement is clear, focused and logically related to background • Includes supportive relevant statistical data of the problem <p>Examines impact of the identified problem in relation to the 3 areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients • Nursing/Nurses • Organization/System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compares and contrasts current practice with best practice | 12 | |
| <p>Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)</p> <p>PLO 1.1,1.2</p> | Meets < 2 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 2 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 3 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Develops PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated PICO question using PICO format (i.e. Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) • Describes evidence search strategies using various databases • Sufficient amount of evidence identified • Describe theoretical framework in relation to problem | 12 | |
| <p>Apply ethical analysis and clinical reasoning to assess, intervene and evaluate advanced nursing care delivery (MSN Essential I:4)</p> <p>Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application</p> | Meets < 8 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 9 of 10 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Creates Evidence Evaluation Table as a handout for faculty with project abstract and references</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10)</p> <p>Evidence Evaluation Table (as handout) includes succinct summary key features from published research articles including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors/year • Purpose of study • Design | 10 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------|--|
| <p>of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)</p> <p>PLO 3.2, 3.3</p> | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of Evidence • Sample size and description • Instruments • Results • Strengths/limitations • Abstract included • References included | | |
| <p>Apply ethical analysis and clinical reasoning to assess, intervene and evaluate advanced nursing care delivery (MSN Essential I:4)</p> <p>Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)</p> <p>Articulate to a variety of audiences the evidence base for practice decisions, including the credibility of sources of information and the relevance to the practice problem confronted. (MSN Essential IV-3)</p> <p>Apply practice guidelines to improve practice and the care environment. (MSN Essential IV-5)</p> <p>Perform rigorous critique of evidence from databases to generate meaningful evidence for nursing practice. (MSN Essential IV-6)</p> <p>PLO 1.3, 1.4, 2.3</p> | <p>Meets < 4 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Meets 4 of 6 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Meets 5 of 6 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. Synthesizes the key findings of the evidence review</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 6)</p> <p>Includes criteria for appraising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability • Validity • Applicability • Concisely summarizes other interprofessional sources of evidence including clinical practice guidelines (CPGs), systematic reviews, position statements, benchmarks) • Compares and contrasts findings from different studies • Cites high-quality evidence related to the topic | <p>12</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|--|
| <p>Analyze information about quality initiatives recognizing the contributions of individuals and inter-professional healthcare teams to improve health outcomes across the continuum of care (MSN Essential III-1)</p> <p>Analyze information and design systems to sustain improvements and promote transparency using high reliability and just culture principles (MSN Essential III-3)</p> <p>PLO 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3</p> | <p>Meets < 4 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Meets 4 of 6 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Meets 5 of 6 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Evaluate the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 6) Appraises feasibility of the intervention as it pertains to the environmental context including (n =8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical factors • Cultural considerations • Clear/thorough discussion of organizational stakeholders and impact each stakeholder has on progression of clinical change • SWOT analysis (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) of project is accurately and clearly discussed, focus on strengths encourage “buy-in” of reader and stakeholders • Cost benefit assessment is convincing and adds to “buy-in” • Addresses the sustainability of the project over time | <p>12</p> | |
| <p>Design and implement systems change strategies that improve the care environment. (MSN Essential II-6)</p> <p>Direct quality improvement methods to promote culturally responsive, safe, timely, effective, efficient, equitable and patient-centered care. (MSN Essential II-7)</p> <p>Evaluate outcome data using current communication technologies, information systems, and statistical principles to develop strategies to reduce risks and improve health outcomes (MSN Essential V-2)</p> <p>PLO 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1,</p> | <p>Meets < 6 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Meets 6 of 8 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Meets 7 of 8 criteria in highly developed column</p> | <p>Implementation strategies</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 8) Outline steps for implementation plan of proposal in a logical sequence, detailed and clearly stated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic timeline • Outcomes/ Measures • Identify if IRB process or quality improvement approval is required • Data management & analysis plan • Estimated project cost &/or savings potential • Evaluation process • Future recommendations <p>• Conclusion includes restatement of the problem, desired outcomes and succinct evaluation of the evidence without redundancy or introduction of new material</p> | <p>10</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|----|--|
| 4.2, 5.2) | | | | | | |
| Conduct a comprehensive and systematic assessment as a foundation for decision-making. (MSN Essential IX- 1) PLO 3.2 | Meets 1 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 2 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 3 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Organization Meets the following criteria (n = 4) Organizational pattern meets the following criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific introduction • Conclusion • Sequenced material within the body, and transitions) are clearly and consistently observable • Skillful and made the content of the presentation cohesive | 10 | |
| Use effective communication strategies to develop, participate, and lead inter-professional teams and partnerships MSN Essential VII-4 PLO 3.2) | | Meets 1 of 3 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 2 of 3 criteria in highly developed column | Language Meets the following criteria (n = 3) Language choices meet all of the following criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imaginative, memorable, and compelling • Enhance the effectiveness of the presentation • Appropriate to the audience | 10 | |
| Use information and communication technologies, resources and principles of learning to teach patients and others. (MSN Essentials V-5) (PLO 3.1,3.2) | Meets 4 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 6 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | Presentation Delivery Meets the following criteria (n= 7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posture, • Gesture, • Eye contact, • Vocal expressiveness • Compelling presentation • Speaker appears polished / confident | 10 | |
| (PLO 3.1, 3.3) | Meets 5 of 8 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 6 of 8 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 7 of 8 criteria in highly developed column | Presentation mechanics Meets the following criteria (n = 8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides were within the 8 slide guideline (not including title and reference) • Spelling accurate • Grammar accurate • Slides concise, clear, readable • Presentation 10 minutes/ 10 minutes for questions • Professional dress • Arrived on time & prepared • Presentation sent in on time (1 week prior to date of presentation) | 12 | |
| Total Points | | | | | | |

Examiner's Comments:

Strengths demonstrated in the Oral Comprehensive Exam:

Opportunities for growth demonstrated in the Oral Comprehensive Exam:

Examiner's Signature

Date

Examiner's Signature

Date

Examiner's Signature

Date

Written Comprehensive Exam: Evidence Based Practice Project Rubric

All Sections Must Be Included in the Written Exam

Passing = 81%

Title _____

Student/Author of Paper _____ Spring/Summer _____

| Student Learning Outcomes | Initial 70% | Emerging 75% | Developing 85% | Highly Developed 100% | Points Poss. | Points Awarded |
|---|---|--|--|---|--------------|----------------|
| Abstract | | | | | | |
| I. Develop a concise abstract of the significant aspects of the EBP project (MSN 1,4; PLO3.2) | Meets < 2 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 2 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 3 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets the following criteria (n = 4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succinct summary of the background, purpose & project intervention • Succinct summary of impact of the findings to patient, nurse/nurses, and/or system/organization. • Evidence aligned with practice problem • Limits to 250 words (single paragraph without paragraph indentation, no abbreviation/citations) | 10 | |
| Introduction | | | | | | |
| II. Examine significant problem in an area of nursing specialization (MSN 7&8; PLO1.2) | Meets < 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 4 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | Meets the following criteria (n =6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem statement is clear, focused and logically related to background • Includes supportive relevant statistical data of the problem • Examines impact of the identified problem in relation to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients • Nursing/Nurses • Organization/System • Compares and contrasts current practice with best practice | 10 | |
| Literature Review | | | | | | |
| III. Develop PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework | Meets < 2 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 2 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 3 of 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets the following criteria (n = 4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated PICO question using PICO format (i.e. Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) • Describes evidence search strategies using various databases • Describes detailed evidence search strategies with limiting parameters and keywords used | 12 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|----|--|
| (MSN 5; PLO 1.1,1.2) | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient amount of evidence identified (10 articles within previous 5 years) | | |
| IV. Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence (MSN 1,4,5; PLO 1.3,1.4,2.3) | Meets <5 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 6 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chooses research evidence in the last 5 years Critically appraises primary research evidence including the following key elements: Sample, design, instruments, results, interpretations of findings, and strengths/limitations for validity, reliability, and applicability Concisely summarizes other inter-professional sources of evidence including clinical practice guidelines, as applicable (CPGs, position statements, benchmarks) Compares and contrasts findings from different studies Logical organization of the contents by theme Cites high-quality evidence related to the topic Linked connection with Evidence Evaluation Table | 14 | |
| V. Develop a logical discussion of the findings as they pertain to the project (MSN 8,9; PLO 3.2) | Meets < 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 4 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 6)</p> <p>Logically and systematically discusses the significance of the evidence review findings in relation to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patient Nurse/nurses System/organization Existing research without restating the evidence evaluation Limitations of the evidence evaluation Recommendations for future studies | 12 | |
| Proposal | | | | | | |
| VI. Evaluate the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment (MSN 3,7; PLO 2.2,2.3,3.5, 5.3) | Meets < 4 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 4 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 6 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 6)</p> <p>Appraises feasibility of the intervention as it pertains to the environmental context including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EBP model in relation to project EBP cultural considerations Clear/thorough discussion of organizational stakeholders and impact each stakeholder has on progression of clinical change SWOT analysis (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) of project is accurately and clearly discussed, focus on strengths encourage “buy-in” of reader and stakeholders Cost benefit assessment is convincing and adds to “buy-in” Project implementation setting/considerations | 14 | |
| VII. Discuss proposal for change of | Meets < 5 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 6 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 7)</p> <p>Outline steps for implementation plan of proposal in a logical sequence, detailed and clearly stated</p> | 12 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|----|--|
| practice inclusive of evaluation (MSN 2,4,7; PLO 4.1,4.2,5.2) | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic timeline • Instruments • IRB process/process improvement • Data collection procedures • Evaluation process • Future recommendations • Concluding paragraph includes restatement of the problem, desired outcomes and succinct evaluation of the evidence findings without redundancy or introduction of new material | | |
| VIII. Creates Evidence Evaluation Table (See Appendix E) (MSN 1,4; PLO 3.2,3.3) | Meets < 6 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 6 of 8 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 7 of 8 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 8)</p> <p>Evidence Evaluation Table (as an appendix) includes succinct summary key features from published evidence including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors/year • Design, methods & level of evidence • Sample & setting • Major variables • Measurement • Data analysis • Results/findings • Validity, reliability & applicability | 12 | |
| Professional, Scholarly Writing | | | | | | |
| IX. Construct a scholarly change process paper (MSN 9; PLO 3.2) | Meets < 5 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 5 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 6 of 7 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not exceed 12 pages in length (exclusive of title page, abstract, reference pages and appendices) • Organized with proper headings such as Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, References, and Appendices with necessary subheadings/transitions so that the entire project flows smoothly and cogently • Contains < 5 grammar, spelling and/or punctuation errors for the entire paper, including attachments • Sentences written without fragments or run-ons • Paragraphs are neither short or long • At least 10 professional, primary, peer-reviewed research articles cited. • At least 10 references are current (< 5 years) | 10 | |
| X. Apply APA format according to the 6th edition of the APA manual (MSN 9; | Meets < 10 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 10-11 of 14 criteria in highly developed column | Meets 12-14 of 14 criteria in highly developed column | <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 14)</p> <p>Written Comprehensive Examination was typed/formatted according to APA 6th edition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover Sheet • Title page • Font and typeface | 10 | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| PLO3.2) | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Running head and page numbers• Margins• Spacing• Headers• Abbreviations• Professional Language (e.g. no use of contractions, first person, colloquialisms)• Citations• Italics for points of emphasis• Direct Quotes (max = 1)• Reference page• Appendices (e.g. Evidence Evaluation Table) | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|