

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

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 6095 Comprehensive Examination – Oral & Written

Note: As of Fall 2019, sub-PLO's previously reported (i.e. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5) on will no longer be assessed individually. The School of Nursing assesses only the overall PLO-1 of Inquiring Faithfully.

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

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

	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"> • PLO1.2: 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.

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

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>	
2020	GNSG695A	28	<p>SP2020 Oral Presentation (Part A) (28/28) students = 100% successful completion of the oral comprehensive exam (Part A) on the first attempt. 89% of students met PLO 1.</p> <p>Written Paper (Part B) (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt</p>	<p>As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.</p>

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #1	<p>Per the Oral Comprehensive Examination (GNSG6095A), all students are meeting the benchmark for PLO#1.</p> <p>This year the COVID-19 pandemic caused many problems with assessment. The program was in the process of switching from the use of Livetext to Portfolium when the pandemic hit. All focus went toward pivoting to online/remote instruction. This led to a lack of instructional design support to finish Porfolium work. Faculty ended up collecting Comprehensive Examination data via paper rubrics (Oral Exam) or via Canvas (written paper). Unfortunately, we were unable to extract data from the written examination assessment due to the way the assignment was set up in Canvas.</p> <p>Many MSN students work in acute care facilities caring for COVID patients. We believe that the onset of the pandemic in the middle of the Spring 20 semester contributes significantly to the high failure rate for the written examination. Students who made a second attempt have been successful.</p>

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #1	<p>Per the Oral Comprehensive Examination (GNSG6095A), all students are meeting the benchmark for PLO#1.</p> <p>Future assessments will be conducted in Portfolium to collect and extract more PLO-specific data. This new data collection process will be overseen by the School of Nursing Program Assessment Committee (PAC).</p> <p>Oral Examination (Part A) – while students met PLO#1, it became obvious looking at the rubric and the resulting data that we are not adequately measuring achievement of PLO's across this assignment. We also determined that too much weight was being placed on the presentation portion rather than the other elements of the examination. The Graduate Nursing Committee will review the rubric in December 2020 to review alignment and reweight the assignment in alignment with program goals/outcomes.</p> <p>Written Examination (Part B) – since there is no specific data available for this assignment, we cannot make any determination about the ability of students to meet the PLO's.</p>

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

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 (1-5) 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
2019-2020**

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

Note: As of Fall 2019, sub-PLO's previously reported (e.g. 2.1, 2.2, etc.) are no longer assessed individually. The School of Nursing assesses only the overall PLO 2 of Caring Faithfully.

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

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

	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: Data is only present for 30% of students assessed. Of those, 100% met PLO 1.</p>	

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

2020	GNSG695	28	<p>SP2020</p> <p>Oral Presentation (Part A) (28/28) students = 100% successful completion of the oral comprehensive exam (Part A) on the first attempt. 89% of students met PLO 1.</p> <p>Written Paper (Part B) (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt.</p>	<p>As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.</p>
------	---------	----	---	--

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #2	<p>Per the Oral Comprehensive Examination (GNSG6095A), with only 67.9% achieving the benchmark for this outcome, students are not meeting PLO#2. See PLO #1 for explanation.</p>

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #2	<p>See PLO#1 for explanation of changes to assessment procedures.</p> <p>Oral Examination (Part A) – Review of the data and the rubric reveal that we are not adequately measuring achievement of PLO 2 across this assignment. We also determined that too much weight is being placed on the presentation portion rather than the other elements of the examination. The Graduate Nursing Committee will review the rubric in December 2020 to review alignment and reweight the assignment in alignment with program goals/outcomes. PLO 2 is measured by only 2 criterion on the oral examination rubric. Faculty need to look closely at this area of the rubric and reevaluate. Faculty will also evaluate assignments in courses that teach these skills to determine how to improve outcomes.</p> <p>Written Examination (Part B) – since there is no specific data available for this assignment, we cannot make any determination about the ability of students to meet the PLO's.</p>

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

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 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 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
2019-2020**

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 nonverbal skills.

Outcome Measures:

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

Note: As of Fall 2019, sub-PLO's previously reported (e.g. 4.1, 4.2, etc.) are no longer assessed individually. The School of Nursing assesses only the overall PLO 3 of Communicating Faithfully.

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**
3. 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

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

<p>2015-2016</p>	<p>GNSG695</p>	<p>31</p>	<p>Total: (29/31) students = 95% scored at or above the benchmark on first attempt.</p> <p>(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 EvaluationTable."</p> <p>(PLO 3.5, Essential V) 29/29 = 100% of students scored at or above the benchmark.</p>	<p>2 students successfully repeated the written portion.</p> <p>Oral & Written Comprehensive Exam</p>
-------------------------	----------------	-----------	--	---

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

			<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>

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

<p>2018</p>			<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% 	
<p>2019</p>	<p>GNSG695</p>	<p>22</p>	<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>	

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

2020	GNSG695	28	<p>SP2020</p> <p>Oral Presentation (Part A) (28/28) students = 100% successful completion of the oral comprehensive exam (Part A) on the first attempt. 100% of students met PLO 3.</p> <p>Written Paper (Part B) (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt.</p>	<p>As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.</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 PLO3.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #3	<p>See PLO#1 for explanation of changes to assessment procedures.</p> <p>No changes to be made at this time.</p>

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

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	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
2019-2020**

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

Note: As of Fall 2019, sub-PLO’s previously reported (e.g. 4.1, 4.2, etc) are no longer assessed individually. The School of Nursing assesses only the overall PLO 4 of Following Faithfully.

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

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

	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>	

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #4	Students are not meeting established benchmarks for PLO 4 (46.4%).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #4	<p>See PLO#1 for explanation of changes to assessment procedures.</p> <p>Oral Examination (Part A) – Review of the data and the rubric reveal that we are not adequately measuring achievement of PLO 4 across this assignment. The Graduate Nursing Committee reviewed the rubric in December 2020 and re-aligned and reweighted the assignment. PLO 4 was measured by only 1 criterion on the oral examination rubric. Faculty also evaluated scaffolding assignments in courses that teach these skills and determined ways to improve student learning.</p> <p>Written Examination (Part B) – since there is no specific data available for this assignment, we cannot make any determination about the ability of students to meet the PLO's.</p>

**School of Nursing MSN
2019-2020**

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	Examine significant problem in an area of nursing specialization.	Essential I, VII, VIII PLO1.2
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 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

[Type here]

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

Note: As of Fall 2019, sub-PLO’s previously reported (e.g. 5.1, 5.2, etc) are no longer assessed individually. The School of Nursing assesses only the overall PLO 5 of Leading Faithfully.

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

[Type here]

	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	Students are not meeting established benchmarks for PLO 5 (67.9%).

[Type here]

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #5	<p>Oral Examination (Part A) – Review of the data and the rubric reveal that we are not adequately measuring achievement of PLO 5 across this assignment. We also determined that too much weight is placed on the presentation portion rather than the other elements of the examination. The Graduate Nursing Committee will review the rubric in December 2020 to review alignment and reweight the assignment in alignment with program goals/outcomes. PLO 5 is measured by only 2 criterion on the oral examination rubric. Faculty need to look closely at this area of the rubric and reevaluate. Faculty will also evaluate assignments in courses that teach these skills to determine how to improve outcomes.</p> <p>Written Examination (Part B) – since there is no specific data available for this assignment, we cannot make any determination about the ability of students to meet the PLO’s.</p>

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	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 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

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 • 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</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 	10	

<p>appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)</p> <p>PLO 3.2, 3.3</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design • 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) 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</p> <p>(MSN Essential III-1)</p> <p>Analyze information and design systems to sustain improvements and promote transparency using high reliability and just culture principles</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(MSN Essential II-6)</p> <p>Direct quality improvement methods to promote culturally responsive, safe, timely, effective, efficient, equitable and patient-centered care.</p> <p>(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>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>	

PLO 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 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	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	

framework (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	

<p>practice inclusive of evaluation (MSN 2,4,7; PLO 4.1,4.2,5.2)</p>				<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 		
<p>VIII. Creates Evidence Evaluation Table (See Appendix E) (MSN 1,4; PLO 3.2,3.3)</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>Meets the following criteria (n = 8) 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 	<p>12</p>	
Professional, Scholarly Writing						
<p>IX. Construct a scholarly change process paper (MSN 9; PLO 3.2)</p>	<p>Meets < 5 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Meets 5 of 7 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Meets 6 of 7 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<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) 	<p>10</p>	
<p>X. Apply APA format according to the 6th edition of the APA manual</p>	<p>Meets < 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Meets 10-11 of 14 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Meets 12-14 of 14 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Meets the following criteria (n = 14) 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 	<p>10</p>	

(MSN 9; 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) 		
--------------------	--	--	--	---	--	--