School of Nursing

MSN
2020-2021

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)	Course	Description of Outcome Measure
MSN PLO #1	GNSG 6095B Comprehensive Exam B	Written Comprehensive Examination (Written CE) The purpose of the Comprehensive Examination is to evaluate the student's ability to apply advanced clinical and theoretical knowledge in a selected area of specialization. The Comprehensive Examination consists of comprehensive evidence synthesis and a proposal for an evidence-based practice project to translate evidence findings in a specialized area of nursing practice. The Written CE takes place during the Summer Semester (Semester 6). This assignment assesses students' ability in assessing current practice; acquiring research evidence; analyzing/synthesizing information; and designing an evidence-based quality improvement proposal.

 Note: As of 2019-2020, sub-PLOs previously reported (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, etc) are no longer assessed individually. The School of Nursing assesses only the overall PLO#1 of Inquiring Faithfully. As of 2020-2021, we use Written CE for assessing PLO #1.

Criteria for Success:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Statement of Criteria for Success
MSN PLO #1	85 % of students will achieve at least 81%

Note: As of 2020-2021, the benchmark has changed from '3 on a 4-point rubric scale' to '81%' based on the revised Grading Rubric.

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. (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 (PLO 1.2, Essential VI) 28/29 students = 96.6%	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.
2017-2018	GNSG695	25	**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: • (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) 17/25students = 68% scored at or above the benchmark **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: • 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.

2018-2019	GNSG695	22	**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: - 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 = Students will complete the **written paper** portion of the exam during SU19, and results will be updated when available.	
2019-2020	GNSG6095A	28	**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. **Written Paper (Part B)** (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt	As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.
2020-2021	GNSG6095B Comprehensive Exam B	19	Benchmark was not met (14/17=82.4%). Overall, it was just below the benchmark of 85%. 2 students failed to submit their papers due date. 14 students out of 17 (82.4%) who submitted the papers successfully met or exceeded the benchmark on the 1st attempt.	Although the class average was 87.6 (ranging from 69.8 to 96.5), several criteria were below 80%, such as abstract, critical appraisal/synthesis, pre-program assessment, implementation, writing mechanics, and APA style. 3 students who failed the Written CE on the 1st attempt are currently working closely with a faculty to improve the quality of the papers. They are scheduled for a 2nd submission by October 21, 2021. Extension was granted to those 2 students who failed to submit the papers due to family health concern/potential move to other state and health problem (anticipating surgery for arm injury). We will continue to follow up with them.

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #1	After 2019-2020 data, we have revised the grading rubric with a more clear description of each criterion, content, and point distribution. We've also decided to use the class mean score for assessment of each PLO as well as score for each criterion. We've utilized a rubric score template on Google Sheets that enables automatic calculation of the mean score in each criterion of multiple faculty graders' scores. This revised grading rubric was helpful to identify specific areas that needed improvements. There were several areas below the benchmark of 81%: (1) abstract writing; (2) organization of the evidence synthesis; (3) pre-program section in addressing SWOT analysis; (4)description of project Implementation including sustainability and evaluation plan; and (5) writing mechanics and APA style. These findings were helpful to identify the areas that need to be re-emphasized in class next year.

Conclusions Drawn from Data

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #1	All faculty graders met and developed the following recommendations for the next year: (1) revise the grading rubric for clarity in the above-identified areas, including abstract, critical appraisal, and project implementation sections; (2) faculty who teach the EBP course will emphasize this content to students and use the CE grading rubric as a guide; (3) provide an exemplar peer-reviewed articles to students to be more familiarized with the proper abstract writing skills; (4) recommend the Grammarly and EndNote programs as strategies to improve writing mechanics and APA style in a scholarly paper; and (5) incorporate the Turnitin program in submitting the papers.

Rubrics Used: Rubrics are evaluated and modified for clarity, consistency, and accuracy. Inter-rater reliability through a nursing faculty process is assured in the Written CE grading process.

Attached at the end of this document

GNSG 6095B: Written CE Grading Rubric

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.

Note: As of 2019-2020, sub-PLOs 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. As of 2020-2021, we use Written CE for assessing PLO #2.

Outcome Measures:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Course	Description of Outcome Measure
MSN PLO #2	GNSG 6095B Comprehsnive Exam B	Written Comprehensive Examination (Written CE) The purpose of the Comprehensive Examination is to evaluate the student's ability to apply advanced clinical and theoretical knowledge in a selected area of specialization. The Comprehensive Examination consists of comprehensive evidence synthesis and a proposal for an evidence-based practice project to translate evidence findings in a specialized area of nursing practice. The Written CE takes place during the Summer Semester (Semester 6). This assignment assesses students' ability in performing the professional leader's role by applying ethical analysis and clinical reasoning to improve patient care and safety.

Criteria for Success:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Statement of Criteria for Success
MSN PLO #2	85 % of students will achieve at least 81%

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. (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 (PLO 1.2, Essential VI) 28/29 students = 96.6%	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.
2017-2018	GNSG695	25	**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: • (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) 17/25students = 68% scored at or above the benchmark **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: • 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.

2018-2019	GNSG695	22	**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: • 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 = Students will complete the **written paper** portion of the exam during SU19, and results will be updated when available.	
2019-2020	GNSG6095A	28	**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. **Written Paper (Part B)** (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt	As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.
2020-2021	GNSG6095B: Comprehensive Exam B	19	Benchmark was not met (14/17=82.4%). Overall, it was just below the benchmark of 85%. 2 students failed to submit their papers due date. 14 students out of 17 (82.4%) who submitted the papers successfully met or exceeded the benchmark on the 1st attempt.	Although the class average was 87.6 (ranging from 69.8 to 96.5), several criteria were below 80%, such as abstract, critical appraisal/synthesis, pre-program assessment, implementation, writing mechanics, and APA style. 3 students who failed the Written CE on the 1st attempt are currently working closely with a faculty to improve the quality of the papers. They are scheduled for a 2nd submission by October 21, 2021. Extension was granted to those 2 students who failed to submit the papers due to family health concern/potential move to other state and health problem (anticipating surgery for arm injury). We will continue to follow up with them.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #2	After 2019-2020 data, we have revised the grading rubric with a more clear description of each criterion, content, and point distribution. We've also decided to use the class mean score for assessment of each PLO as well as score for each criterion. We've utilized a rubric score template on Google Sheets that enables automatic calculation of the mean score in each criterion of multiple faculty graders' scores. This revised grading rubric was helpful to identify specific areas that needed improvements. There were several areas below the benchmark of 81%: (1) abstract writing; (2) organization of the evidence synthesis; (3) pre-program section in addressing SWOT analysis; (4)description of project Implementation including sustainability and evaluation plan; and (5) writing mechanics and APA style. These findings were helpful to identify the areas that need to be re-emphasized in class next year.

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #2	All faculty graders met and developed the following recommendations for the next year: (1) revise the grading rubric for clarity in the above-identified areas, including abstract, critical appraisal, and project implementation sections; (2) faculty who teach the EBP course will emphasize this content to students and use the CE grading rubric as a guide; (3) provide an exemplar peer-reviewed articles to students to be more familiarized with the proper abstract writing skills; (4) recommend the Grammarly and EndNote programs as strategies to improve writing mechanics and APA style in a scholarly paper; and (5) incorporate the Turnitin program in submitting the papers.

Rubrics Used: Rubrics are evaluated and modified for clarity, consistency, and accuracy. Inter-rater reliability through a nursing faculty process is assured in the Written CE grading process.

Attached at the end of this document

GNSG 6095B: Written CE Grading Rubric

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)	Course	Description of Outcome Measure
MSN PLO #3 Communicating Faithfully	GNSG 6095A: Comprehensive Exam A	Oral Comprehensive Examination (Oral CE) The purpose of the Comprehensive Examination is to evaluate the student's ability to apply advanced clinical and theoretical knowledge in a selected area of specialization. The Comprehensive Examination consists of comprehensive evidence synthesis and a proposal for an evidence-based practice project to translate evidence findings in a specialized area of nursing practice. The Oral CE takes place during the Spring Semester (Semester 5). This assignment includes 10 minutes for student's Powerpoint presentation of their CE exam and 10 minutes for Q & A in front of 3 faculty members.

Note: As of 2019-2020, sub-PLOs previously reported (e.g. 3.1, 3.2, etc) are no longer assessed individually. The School of Nursing assesses only the overall PLO#3 of Communicating Faithfully. As of 2020-2021, we use Oral CE for assessing PLO #3.

Criteria for Success:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Statement of Criteria for Success
MSN PLO #3 Communicating Faithfully	85 % of students will achieve at least 81%

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

	Course	N	Students Meeting or Exceeding Success	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 (PLO 1.2, Essential VI) 28/29 students = 96.6%	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.
2017-2018	GNSG695	25	**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: • (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 **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: • 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.

2018-2019	GNSG695	22	**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: • 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 = Students will complete the **written paper** portion of the exam during SU19, and results will be updated when available.	
2019-2020	GNSG6095A	28	**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. **Written Paper (Part B)** (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt	As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.
2020-2021	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	19	19/19 students = 100% successful completion of the oral CE on the 1st attempt (met the benchmark) with the class average score of 91.9.	The average score was 91.9, ranging from 81.1 to 97.7. However, the Introduction and Implementation criteria were below 81%.

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. After 2019-2020 data, we have revised the grading rubric with a more clear description of each criterion and content. These changes were reflected in the 2020-2021 MSN Comprehensive Handbook and also presented to the students in class. Since multiple faculty graders were involved in this process, we have also revised the grading report system by creating a rubric score template on Google Sheets that enables automatic calculation. This system has made the grading process smoother and clearer. Although much improvement was noted on overall students' performance this year, we have also identified the areas for improvement in their oral CE presentation, such as Introduction (in presenting statistical perspectives) and Implementation (project aim statement and description of intervention) criteria.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #3	Three faculty members involved in Oral CE met for debriefing and recommended the followings: (1) Allow oral presentation time from 10 minutes to 15 minutes so that students will have sufficient time of presenting all relevant information; (2) be consistent in Oral and Written CE grading rubric content; (3) emphasize the importance of discussing statistical perspectives and best practice recommendations in the Introduction section; (4) include Project Aim statement and description of Program Intervention by adding them to the revised grading rubric; (5) provide faculty feedback to students' Written CE evaluation; and (6) update 2021-2020 CE Handbook to reflect the above changes.

Rubrics Used: Attached at the end of this document
GNSG 6095A: Oral CE Grading Rubric

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)	Course	Description of Outcome Measure
MSN PLO #4	GNSG 6095A Comprehensive Exam A	Oral Comprehensive Examination (Oral CE) The purpose of the Comprehensive Examination is to evaluate the student's ability to apply advanced clinical and theoretical knowledge in a selected area of specialization. The Comprehensive Examination consists of comprehensive evidence synthesis and a proposal for an evidence-based practice project to translate evidence findings in a specialized area of nursing practice. The Oral CE takes place during the Spring Semester (Semester 5). This assignment assesses student's ability in upholding professional practice and ethical standards to ensure positive patient, nursing, and organizational outcomes.

Note. As of 2019-2020, sub-PLOs 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. As of 2020-2021, we use Oral CE for assessing PLO #4.

Criteria for Success:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Statement of Criteria for Success
MSN PLO #4	85 % of students will achieve at least 81%

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

	Course	N	Students Meeting or Exceeding Success	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.
2017-2018	GNSG695	25	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: • (PLOs 4.1, 4.2, Essential VI) 16/25 = 76% of students scored at or above the benchmark. **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: • PLO 4.1 & 4.2 = 80%	2 students successfully repeated the written exam portion.
2018-2019	GNSG695	22	**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: • PLO 4.1 & 4.2 (14/22) = 63.6% **SU 2019** Students will complete their oral examination in summer. Results reported when available.	

2019-2020	GNSG6095A	28	**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. **Written Paper (Part B)** (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt	As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.
2020-2021	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	19	19/19 students = 100% successful completion of the oral CE on the 1st attempt.	The average score was 91.9, ranging from 81.1 to 97.7. However, the Introduction and Implementation criteria were below 81%.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #4	All students are meeting established benchmarks and are demonstrating achievement of PLO 4. After 2019-2020 data, we have revised the grading rubric with a more clear description of each criterion and content. These changes were reflected in the 2020-2021 MSN Comprehensive Handbook and also presented to the students in class. Since multiple faculty graders were involved in this process, we have also revised the grading report system by creating a rubric score template on Google Sheets that enables automatic calculation. This system has made the grading process smoother and clearer. Although much improvement was noted on overall students' performance this year, we have also identified the areas for improvement in their oral CE presentation, such as Introduction (in presenting statistical perspectives) and Implementation (project aim statement and description of intervention) criteria.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #4	Three faculty members involved in Oral CE met for debriefing and recommended the followings: (1) Allow oral presentation time from 10 minutes to 15 minutes so that students will have sufficient time of presenting all relevant information; (2) be consistent in Oral and Written CE grading rubric content; (3) emphasize the importance of discussing statistical perspectives and best practice recommendations in the Introduction section; (4) include Project Aim statement and description of Program Intervention by adding them to the revised grading rubric; (5) provide faculty feedback to students' Written CE evaluation; and (6) update 2021-2020 CE Handbook to reflect the above changes.

Rubrics Used: Attached at the end of this document
GNSG 6095A: Oral CE Grading Rubric

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)	Course	Description of Outcome Measure
MSN PLO #5	GNSG 6022 Evidence Based Practice Process	EBP Phase II Paper This assignment includes assessing the characteristics of the practice environment before the program implementation and developing an evidence-based proposal for improvement.

Note: As of 2019-2020, sub-PLOs 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. As of 2020-2021, we use GNSG 6022-EBP Phase II Paper for assessing PLO #5.

Criteria for Success:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Statement of Criteria for Success
MSN PLO #5	85 % of students will achieve at least 81%

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	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.
2017-2018	GNSG695	25	**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: • (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 **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: • 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.
2018-2019	GNSG695	22	**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: • PLO 5.2 (22/22) = 100% • PLO 5.3 (22/22) = 100% **SU 2019** Students will complete their written portion of the examination in summer. Results reported when available.	

2019-2020	GNSG6095A	28	**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. **Written Paper (Part B)** (11/28) students = 61% successful completion of the written comprehensive exam (Part B) on the first attempt	As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2nd attempt paper with a passing score.
2020-2021	GNSG6022 Evidence Based Practice Process	19	100% (9/9) of students scored at or above the benchmark with the average score of 46.8 (ranging from 41-50).	This assignment was applied to only in GNSG 6022- Section 2. This assignment was not awarded in Section 1.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #5	No criteria were below the benchmark; 100% criteria were above 91% with the scholarly writing criterion at the lowest.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #5	Continue to conduct detailed assessment of grading criteria where students fell short of benchmark; collaborate with GNSG 6022-Section 1 faculty to discuss and implement best practice to build learning activities that are consistent between two sections; focus improvements in learning activities addressing student learning outcomes.

Rubrics Used: Attached at the end of this document

GNSG 6022: EBP Phase II Paper Grading Rubric

APPENDIX B

Oral Comprehensive Examination: Evidence Based Practice ProjectRubric

Passing = 81%

Student_____   **Date**_____   **Score**_____ **/100 pts**

Title of Project _____

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	Initial **<69%**	Emerging **70%-79%**	Developing **80% - 89%**	Highly Developed(90%-100%)	Points Possible	Points Awarded

Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)
 	
Integrate organizational science and informatics to make changes in the healthcare environment (MSN Essential I:7)
PLO 1.2
	Points: 0-6
	
	Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column
		Points: 7
		
		Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column
			Points: 8
			
			Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column
				Points: 9-10
				
				Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column
				
				Examines significant problem in an area of nursing specialization
				
				Meets the following criteria (n = 10)
				• Introduction of self with first name, last name and credentials
				• Identifies purpose of presentation
				• 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 3 areas:
				    • Patients
				    • Nursing/Nurses
				• Organization/System
				• Identifies current practice
					10	

					10	
				• Identifies best practice • Compares and contrasts current practice with best practice		

Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)
 	
PLO 1.1,1.2
	Points: 0-6
	
	Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column
		Points: 7
		
		Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column
			Points: 8
			
			Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column
				Points: 9-10
				
				Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column
				
				Develops PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework
				
				Meets the following criteria (n = 10):
				• Clearly stated PICO question using PICO format:
				  • Population
				  • Intervention
				  • Comparison Intervention
				  • Outcome
				• Describes evidence search strategies using various databases
				• Describes detailed evidence search strategies with limiting parameters and keywords used
				• Sufficient amount of evidence identified & how evidence chosen
				• Describe EBP theoretical framework in relation to problem, provide rationale for using the theory & identify pertinent steps ofthe theory (3 criteria)
					10	

					10	

Apply ethical analysis and clinical reasoning to assess, intervene and evaluate advanced nursing care delivery (MSN Essential I:4)
 	
Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5)
 	
PLO 3.2, 3.3
 	
Perform rigorous critique of evidence from databases to generate meaningful evidence for nursing practice. (MSN Essential IV-6)
PLO 1.3, 1.4, 2.3
	Points: 0-6 Meets < 6 criteriain highly developed column	Points: 7 Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 8 Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 9-10
				
				Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column
				
				Evidence Evaluation Table (as an appendix) includes succinct summary key features from published evidence, including the items below
				
				Meets the following criteria (n = 10):
				• Authors/year/
				• Title
				• Purpose
				• Design & level of evidence
				• Sample & setting
				• Measurements- Instruments/Tools Used, Identifies Validity & Reliability
				• Results
				• Critiques/appraises quantitative research study:
				  • Validity
				  • Reliability
				  • Applicability
				• OR Critiques/appraises qualitative research study:
				  • Trustworthiness
				  • Credibility
				  • Dependability		

					10	
Apply ethical analysis and clinical reasoning to assess, intervene and evaluate advanced nursing care delivery (MSN Essential I:4) Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions across diverse populations. (MSN Essential I:5) 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) Apply practice guidelines to improve	Points: 0-6 Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 7 Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 8 Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 9-10 Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column **Evidence Synthesis Table (as an appendix). Critically appraises the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence. Synthesizes the key findings of the evidence review, including the items below** Meets the following criteria (n = 10): • Identifies interventions in all pieces of evidence • Identifies outcomes of all pieces of evidence • Includes comparison of all evidence's outcomes • Concisely summarizes other interprofessional sources of evidence including clinical practice guidelines (CPGs), systematic reviews, position statements, benchmarks) • Cites common themes among evidence • Identifies outliers in evidence and how to address in application of intervention • Cites high-quality evidence related to the topic, including the credibility of sources • Compares and contrasts findings from different studies • Synthesize evidence for practice to determine appropriate application of interventions • Identify the specific intervention supported by the evidence and how it will be applied		

practice and the care environment. (MSN Essential IV-5) Perform rigorous critique of evidence from databases to generate meaningful evidence for nursing practice. (MSN Essential IV-6) PLO 1.3, 1.4, 2.3					

					20	

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)
 	
Analyze information and design systems to sustain improvements and promote transparency using high reliability and just culture principles
 	
(MSN Essential III-3)
 	
PLO 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3
	Points: 0-12
	
	Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column
		Points: 14
		
		Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column
			Points: 16
			
			Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column
				Points: 18-20
				
				Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column
				
				Evaluate the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment
				
				Meets the following criteria (n = 10, 2 points each)
				Appraises feasibility of the intervention as it pertains to the environmental context including:
				• Physical factors
				• Cultural considerations
				• Clear/thorough discussion of organizational stakeholders and impact each stakeholder has on progression of clinical change
				• Accurately and clearly discussed SWOT analysis- assessment of the internal and external environment's:
				    • Strengths
				    • Weaknesses
				    • Opportunities
				    • Threats
				• Describe environment's strengths & opportunities to encourage "buy-in" of reader and stakeholders
				• Describe how to mitigate environment's weaknesses & threats to encourage "buy-in" of reader and stakeholders
				• Cost benefit assessment is convincing and adds to "buy-in"		

					20	
Design and implement systems change strategies that improve the care environment. (MSN Essential II-6) Direct quality improvement methods to promote culturally responsive, safe, timely, effective, efficient, equitable and patient-centered care. (MSN Essential II-7) Evaluate outcome data	Points: 0-12 Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 14 Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 16 Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 18-20 Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column **Outcomes Measurement Table (an appendix) & Implementation Strategies & Outcomes** Meets the following criteria (n = 10, 2 points each) Outline steps for implementation plan of proposal in a logical sequence, detailed and clearly stated • Describe practice change/intervention innovation • Realistic timeline • Identify if IRB process or quality improvement approval is required • Identify outcomes and measurement tools, include validity & reliability of tools/instruments • Describe sampling method, data collection and management plan • Identify Evaluation Plan (Analysis) • Estimated project cost &/or savings potential • Future Recommendations • Describe the sustainability of the project over time • Conclusion includes restatement of the problem, desired outcomes and succinct evaluation of the		

using current communication technologies, information systems, and statistical principlesto develop strategies toreduce risks and improve health outcomes (MSN Essential V-2) PLO 1.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2)				evidence without redundancy or introduction of new material		
Conduct a comprehensive and systematic assessment as a foundation for decision-making. (MSN Essential IX- 1) PLO 3.2	Points: 0-3 points Meets $\leq$ 3 of 5 criteria in highly developed column		Points: 4 Meets 4 of 5 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 5 Meets 5 criteria in highly developed column **Organization** Meets the following criteria (n = 5, 1 point each) Organizational pattern meets the following criteria • Specific introduction • Sequenced material within the body, and transitions) are clearly and consistently observable • Skillful and made the content of the presentation cohesive • Logical flow of presentation, with appropriate transitions • Conclusion	5	
Use effective communication strategies to develop, participate, and lead inter-professional teams and partnerships MSN Essential VII-4	Points: 0-3 points Meets $\leq$ 3 of 5 criteria in highly developed column		Points: 4 Meets 4 of 5 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 5 Meets 5 criteria in highly developed column **Language** Meets the following criteria (n = 5, 1 point each) Language choices meet all of the following criteria: • Imaginative, memorable, and compelling • Enhance the effectiveness of the presentation • Appropriate to the audience	5	

				• Language without bias (e.g. gender) or informality • Maintenance of confidentiality	
PLO 3.2)					
Use information and communication technologies, resources and principles of learning to teach patients and others. (MSN Essentials V-5) (PLO 3.1,3.2)	Points: 0-3 Meets ≤ 6 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 3.5 Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 4 Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column	Points: 4.5-5 Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column **Presentation Delivery** Meets the following criteria (n= 10, 0.5 points each) • Delivery techniques • Posture, • Gesture, • Engaging Eye contact, • Vocal expressiveness- speech free from fillers (e.g. uh, like, um, etc.), • Appropriate volume • Appropriate rate/pace – neither too fast nor too slow • Compelling presentation • Speaker appears polished / confident • Time-limit adherence to 10 minutes and 10 minute Q&A period • Expert response to questions	5

| (PLO 3.1, 3.3) | Points: 0-3

Meets ≤ 6 of 10 criteria in highly developed column | Points: 3.5

Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column | Points: 4

Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column | Points: 4.5-5

Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column

Presentation mechanics

Meets the following criteria (n = 10, 0.05 points each)
• Slides were within the 8 slide guideline (not including title and reference)
• Slides: Spelling accurate
• Slides: Grammar accurate
• Slides: Slides concise, clear, readable
• Professional dress
• Arrived on time & prepared
• Presentation sent in on time (1 week prior to date of presentation)
• Appendices and required paperwork adhere to APA 7th edition formatting
• Required Paperwork: Spelling accurate
• Required Paperwork: Grammar accurate | 5 | |
| **Total Points: 100** | | | | | | |

Examiner's Comments:

Strengths demonstrated in the Oral Comprehensive Examination:

_____
_____
_____
_____

Opportunities for growth demonstrated in the Oral Comprehensive Examination:

_____
_____
_____

Examiner's Signature   Date

_____   _____

Examiner's Signature   Date

_____   _____

Examiner's Signature   Date

Written Comprehensive Examination: Evidence Based Practice ProjectRubric
All Sections Must Be Included in the Written Examination
Passing = 81%

Title _____

Student/Author of Paper _____   Spring/Summer _____   Score: _____ / 100 pts

Student Learning Outcomes	Initial <70%	Emerging70-79%	Developing 80-89%	Highly Developed90%-100%	Points Poss.	Points Awarded
Abstract						
I. Develop a concise abstract of the significant aspects of the EBP project **(MSN 1,4; PLO3.2)**	Pts 0-6 Meets < 2 criteria in highly developed column	Pts 7 Meets 2 of 4 criteria in highly developed column	Pts: 8 Meets 3 of 4 criteria in highly developed column	Pts: 9-10 Meets the following criteria (n = 4) • Succinct summary of the background, purpose & project intervention • Succinct summary of impact of the findings topatient, 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)
				• 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:
				  • 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 theoretical frameworks **(MSN 5; PLO 1.1, 1.2)**	Meets < 2 criteria in highly developed column (PICO and search strategies) EBP model inconsistent with the project	Meets 2 of 4 criteria in highly developed column (PICO and search strategies) Vague description of EBP model	Meets 3 of 4 criteria in highly developed column (PICO and search strategies) Description of EBP model – some connection with the project, vague rationale	Meets the following criteria (n = 4) PICO and search strategies: 5 points • Clearly states PICO question using PICO format (i.e. Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) • Describes evidence search strategies using at least 3 databases • Describes detailed evidence search strategies with limiting parameters and keywords used • Sufficient amount of evidence identified (10 articles within previous 5 years) • Describes EBP model in relation to problem - provides rationale for using the model & identifies pertinent steps of the model: 5 points	10	
IV. Critically appraise the primary research evidence and inter-professional sources of evidence **(MSN 1,4,5; PLO 1.3,1.4,2.3)**	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	Meets the following criteria (n = 6) • 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 • Logically organizes content by theme • Cites high-quality evidence related to the topic • Connects evidence appraisal to the Evidence Evaluation Table	10	
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	Meets the following criteria (n = 6) Logically and systematically discusses the significance of the evidence review findings in relation to: • Patient • Nurse/nurses • System/organization • Existing research without restating the evidence evaluation • Limitations of the evidence evaluation • Evidence-based change project	10	

				Proposal		
VI. Assess the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment **(MSN 3,7; PLO 2.2,2.3,3.5, 5.3)**	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	Meets the following criteria (n = 7) Appraises feasibility of the intervention as it pertains to the environmental context including: • Physical considerations of project implementation setting • EBP cultural considerations • Clear/thorough discussion of organizational stakeholders and impact each stakeholder has on progression of clinicalchange • SWOT analysis of the environment (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) is accurately and clearly discussed • Focus on environment's strengths & opportunities to encourage "buy-in" of reader and stakeholders • Strategies on how to mitigate environment's weaknesses & threats to encourage "buy-in" of reader and stakeholders • Cost benefit assessment is convincing and adds to "buy-in"	10	
VII. Discuss proposal for change of practice inclusiveof evaluation **(MSN 2,4,7; PLO 4.1,4.2,5.2)**	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	Meets the following criteria (n = 8) Outlines steps for implementation plan of proposal in a logical sequence, detailed and clearly stated, including: • Clear description of implementation plan (intervention) with realistic timeline • Instruments for outcomes and process measurements • IRB process • Data collection procedures • Evaluation plan • Future recommendations, including plan for sustainability of the project over time • Concluding paragraph includes restatement of theproblem, desired outcomes and succinct evaluation of theevidence findings without redundancy or introduction of new material • Outcome Measurement Table (as appendix) specifying data collection tool(s), validity & reliability of tool(s), data collection procedures	10	

VIII. Create Evidence Evaluation Table (See Appendix E) (MSN 1,4; PLO 3.2,3.3)	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	Meets the following criteria (n = 7) Evidence Evaluation Table (as an appendix) includes succinct summary key features from published evidence of 10 studies including: • Authors/year/title • Purpose (including major variables studied) • Design and level of evidence • Sample and setting • Measurements • Results/findings • Validity, reliability & applicability (quantitative) OR Trustworthiness, credibility & dependability (qualitative)	10	
IX. Create Evidence Synthesis Table (MSN 1,4; PLN 3.2,3.3)	Unclear connections/comparisons across studies	Table includes some features from some studies (<10)	Table includes some pertinent features of all 10 studies	Evidence Synthesis Table (as an appendix) includes succinct and pertinent features to compare across all 10 studies	10	

Professional, Scholarly Writing						
X. Construct a scholarly change processpaper (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	Meets the following criteria (n = 7) • 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/transitionsso 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-reviewedresearch articles cited • At least 10 references are current (< 5 years)	5	
XI. Apply APA	Meets < 9 criteria	Meets 9-10 of 13	Meets 11-13 of	Meets the following criteria (n = 13) Written Comprehensive Examination was typed/formatted according to APA 7th edition • Title page • Font and typeface • Running head and page numbers • Margins • Spacing • Headings • 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)	5	

GNSG 6022 FA21 EBP Phase II Written
Paper:Evidence Based Practice Project
Rubric

All Sections Must Be Included in the EBP Phase II Paper

Passing = 81%

Title _____

Student/Author of Paper_____ Fall 2021_____ Score ____/50 pts

Student Learning Outcomes	Initial <70%	Emerging 70-79%	Developing 80-89%	Highly Developed 90%-100%	Points Poss.	Points Awarded
	Pts 0-6	Pts 7	Pts: 8	Pts: 9-10	10	
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) • Background and summary of evidence synthesis • Project implementation plan • Implications for nursing practice • Limits to 250 words (single paragraph without paragraph indentation, no abbreviation/citations) and includes 5-6 keywords	10	
Proposal						
VI. Assess the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment **(MSN 3,7; PLO 2.2,2.3,3.5,**	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	Meets the following criteria (n = 7) Appraises feasibility of the intervention as it pertains to the environmental context including: • Physical considerations of project implementation setting • EBP cultural considerations • Clear/thorough discussion of organizational stakeholders and impact each stakeholder has on progression of clinical change • SWOT analysis of the environment (strength, weakness,	10	

5.3)				opportunity, threat) is accurately and clearly discussed • Focus on environment's strengths & opportunities to encourage "buy-in" of reader and stakeholders • Strategies on how to mitigate environment's weaknesses & threats to encourage "buy-in" of reader and stakeholders • Cost benefit assessment is convincing and adds to "buy-in"		
VII. Discuss proposal for change of practice inclusive of evaluation **(MSN 2,4,7; PLO 4.1,4.2,5.2)**	0-12 points Meets < 6 criteria in highly developed column	14 points Meets 6 of 8 criteria in highly developed column	16 points Meets 7 of 8 criteria in highly developed column	18-20 points Meets the following criteria (n = 8) Outlines steps for implementation plan of proposal in a logical sequence, detailed and clearly stated, including: • Clear description of implementation plan (intervention) with aims & pertinent patient/nursing outcomes & realistic timeline • Instruments for outcomes and process measurements • IRB process • Data collection procedures • Evaluation plan • Future recommendations, including plan for sustainability of the project over time • Concluding paragraph includes restatement of the problem, desired outcomes and succinct evaluation of the evidence findings without redundancy or introduction of new material • Outcome Measurement Table (as appendix) specifying data collection tool (s), validity/reliability of tool(s), data collection procedures, if permission required to use tool and cost to use	20	
Professional, Scholarly Writing						
X. Construct a scholarly change process paper **(MSN 9;**	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	Meets the following criteria (n = 7) • Does not exceed 6 pages per paper (Total: 12 pages) in length (exclusive of title page, abstract, reference pages and appendices) • Organized with proper headings such as Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion,	5	

PLO 3.2)				References, and Appendices with necessary subheadings/transitions so that the entire project flows smoothly and cogently • Contains < 5 grammar, spelling and/or punctuationerrors 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)		
XI. Apply APA format according to the 7th edition of the APA manual (MSN 9; PLO3.2)	Meets < 9 criteria in highly developed column	Meets 9-10 of 13 criteria in highly developed column	Meets 11-13 of 13 criteria in highly developed column	Meets the following criteria (n = 13) Written Comprehensive Examination was typed/formatted according to APA 7th edition • Title page • Font and typeface • Page numbers • Margins<hr>• Spacing • Headings • 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)	5	

Faculty Comments:

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

APPENDICES: STAKEHOLDERS, SWOT, COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS, IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

WITHAIMS/OUTCOMES & TIMELINE, OUTCOMES MEASUREMENT TABLE WITH PT/RN

OUTCOMES