

**School of Nursing: MSN
2022-2023**

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	<p><u>Written Comprehensive Examination (Written CE)</u> 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).</p> <p>This assignment assesses students' ability in assessing current practice; acquiring research evidence; analyzing/synthesizing information; and designing an evidence-based quality improvement proposal.</p>

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
2018-2019	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>	
2019-2020	GNSG6095A	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>	As of 11/1/20, 10/11 students who failed the initial written paper had submitted a 2 nd attempt paper with a passing score.
2020-2021	GNSG 6095B Comprehensive Exam B	19	<p>Benchmark was not met (14/17=82.4%). Overall, it was just below the benchmark of 85%.</p> <p>2 students failed to submit their papers due date.</p> <p>14 students out of 17 (82.4%) who submitted the papers successfully met or exceeded the benchmark on the 1st attempt.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2021-2022	GNSG 6095B Comprehensive Exam B	19	100% (19/19) of students met or exceeded the benchmark of 85%.	The class average was 93.1, ranging from 83 to 99.
2022-2023	GNSG 6095B Comprehensive Exam B	19	Benchmark was not met (15/19=73.7%). 15 students out of 20 met or exceeded the benchmark.	The class average was 88.18 (range from 70-99). Criteria below the benchmark for this cohort included critical appraisal, evidence summary, pre-program and scholarly writing. 4 out of 5 students were able to submit the 2 nd attempt within 2 weeks of notice. They addressed all reviewers' comments, and the paper was professionally edited. One student is delayed to to personal issue.

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #1	<p>The data from the August 2023 MSN Comprehensive Exam (n=19) were reviewed and shared with faculty. Students' weakest criteria were the evidence summary (11/19=57.9%) and pre-program data (13/19=68.4%). This is way below the proposed benchmark that 85% of students would score above 81% on these criteria. Compared to 2022 scores, the critical appraisal scores increased from 68% to 80% meeting the benchmark. Results will be taken into considerations for the revision of the CE in 2024 and discussions with MSN faculty regarding ways to improve these as well prior to the CE at the completion of the program.</p>

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	<p>Faculty discussed confusion among students in developing the evidence summary. Many students are not able to synthesize the evidence and compare/contrast studies per the rubric. Continue to suggest strategies for students to use when writing this section.</p>

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

**School of Nursing, MSN
2022-23**

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 Comprehns ive Exam B	<u>Written Comprehensive Examination (Written CE)</u> 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).

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
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 1 st 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 1 st attempt are currently working closely with a faculty to improve the quality of the papers. They are scheduled for a 2 nd 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.
2021-2022	GNSG6095B: Comprehensive Exam B	19	Benchmark was met in Abstract and Introduction section of the paper– 100% (19/19) met or exceeded the benchmark.	
2022-2023	GNSG6095B: Comprehensive Exam B	19	The benchmark was met for this PLO in the abstract(100%) and introduction(89%) sections	

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #2	<p>The data from the August 2023 MSN Comprehensive Exam (n=20) were reviewed and shared with faculty. Abstract and Introduction sections of the written CE exam were used to assess this PLO #2: Caring Faithful. These sections show students made ethical decisions in the types of change projects they proposed to implement and outcomes. Students were expected to show background and statistics related to their assigned topic and changes that implementing this change could make. The students were to address the three spheres of influence: Patients, Nursing, and Organization. The results showed that both sections met the benchmark. 100% achieved a score greater than or equal to 80% in the abstract and 89% met the benchmark in the Introduction.</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>After discussion with the faculty assigned to grade the CE, it was decided that students did not always address all three spheres of influence on "Patients, Nursing, and Organizations" in the introduction. It is suggested that students continue to be made aware of addressing these spheres throughout the program.</p>

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

**School of Nursing, MSN
2022-23**

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	<p><u>Oral Comprehensive Examination (Oral CE)</u></p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>

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
2020-2021	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	19	19/19 students = 100% successful completion of the oral CE on the 1 st 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%.
2021-2022	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	18	17/18 students = 94.4% successful completion of the oral CE on the 1st attempt (met the benchmark) with the class average score of 91.1.	The average score was 91.1, ranging from 79.17 to 97.67. All criteria scores were above the benchmark 81%. Written evaluation/recommendations from 3 faculty were emailed to each student. One failed student was scheduled for 2nd attempt on May 13 and passed the oral presentation successfully.
2022-2023	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	19	100% of students (19/19) had successfully completed the oral CE on the 1st attempt with the class average score of 93.0.	The average score of 93 with the range from 83.7 to 96.3.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #3	<p>100% of students met the established level of achievement with overall class average score of 93, which exceeded the benchmark of 85% of students meeting 81 or higher.</p> <p>This year, we have extended the oral presentation from 10 minutes to 15 minutes. It was obvious that students had sufficient time of presenting their slides. The PPT slides were professional with effective use of images/pictures. Their speech was clear and easy to follow. They have shown a strong grasp of the understanding the EBP process. The introduction section was right on target (score of 9.59 out of 10) in discussing the significance of the problem with statistical perspectives and also its influences on 3 spheres: patients, nurses, and organization. were noted. Although the formulation of the PICO question was improved, but students need to use the template published in the textbook. The average score of the Evidence Evaluation Table was 8.4 out of 10. Students needs to be reminded on how to appraise the validity and reliability of the study findings. The student with the lowest overall score also had the lowest score for the Evidence Evaluation Table (6.67 out of 10).</p>

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
MSN PLO #3	<p>Three faculty members involved in Oral CE met for debriefing and recommended the followings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) continue to have one adjunct faculty member who is a CNS in a healthcare setting; she brought a very practical perspective in FAQ sessions (1) emphasize the logical connection of the Project Aim statement, description of Program Intervention, selected tools, and data collection procedures in the Outcomes Measurement Table. (2) update 2023-2024 CE Handbook as a new MSN curriculum will be implemented: Students will select a CE topic from their clinical sites and carry out the evidence-based change project. (3) Continue to use the grading report system with a rubric score template on Google Sheets, which will enable automatic calculation. This system has made the grading process smoother and clearer.

Rubrics Used: Attached at the end of this document

GNSG 6095A: Oral CE Grading Rubric

**School of Nursing, MSN
2022-23**

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	<p><u>Oral Comprehensive Examination (Oral CE) – Proposal plan</u></p> <p>This Proposal Implementation stage assesses student’s ability in upholding professional practice and ethical standards to ensure positive patient, nursing, and organizational outcomes. The steps of implementation plan of proposal requires understanding of research methodology.</p> <p>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.</p>

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
2020-2021	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	19	19/19 students = 100% successful completion of the oral CE on the 1 st attempt.	The average score was 91.9, ranging from 81.1 to 97.7. However, the Introduction and Implementation criteria were below 81%.
2021-2022	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	18	14/18 students = 77.8% students successfully exceeded the benchmark score of 16 (>81%). The average score of this Implementation Criterion was 17.30.	The average score of 17.30 was higher than 16 (81%), ranging from 13.67 to 20.00. One student who received a failing score also received 13.67 out of 20.0 in this Implementation criterion. Written comments were provided.
2022-2023	GNSG6095A Comprehensive Exam A	19	The average score of this Implementation Criterion was 17.6 out of 20, which exceeded the benchmark of 16. However, 17 out of 19 students (89.5%) met or exceeded the benchmark score of 16 (81% or higher).	The scores for the Implementation Criterion ranged from 14 to 18.7 (out of 20). One student who had the lowest overall score also received the lowest score of 14 in this criterion. Detailed written comments were provided.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #4	17 out of 19 students (89.5%) met the established benchmarks in achievement of PLO4. Half of the students used the incorrect Outcome Measurement Table template, which could cause them explaining the implementation stage difficult. In CE Handbook, this Table was included to assist students with the cogent organization and structure of the implementation process, including proposal, timeline, IRB process, description of the intervention, measurement tools/reliability/validity, and data collection procedures, and data analysis plan. However, the aim statements for primary and secondary outcomes, and project design need to be clearly stated.

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) emphasis on using the correct Outcomes Measurement Table from the CE Handbook (2) logical connection of the implementation stage with clearly stated aims for primary and secondary outcomes and the description of program intervention; (3) simplify the Outcomes Measurements Table for concise presentation; and (4) update the 2023-2024 CE Handbook for Teachout curriculum and the New curriculum

Rubrics Used: Attached at the end of this document

GNSG 6095A: Oral CE Grading Rubric

**School of Nursing, MSN
2022-23**

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	<u>EBP Phase II Paper</u> 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
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.
2021-2022	GNSG6022 Evidence Based Practice Process	18	94.4% (17/18) scored at or above the benchmark (Average score was 46.19 pts, ranging from 40 – 50).	
2022-2023	GNSG6023 Evidence Based Practice Process	19	100% (19/19) students scored at or above the benchmark. So, the criteria for success was met- 85 % of students will achieve at least 81%. The average score on the EBP Phase II paper was 60.7/65 points or 93%, paper scores ranging from 55-65 points.	Note that this course was new Note that there were 2 sections of this course- 1 synchronous hybrid with 12 students and 1 face to face course with 8 students and a new faculty member.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: See next page

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Conclusions Drawn from Data
MSN PLO #5	<p>During AY 2022-2023, PLO #5 Outcome Goal (of 85% of students achieving 81% or great on the EBP Phase II Paper in GNSG 6023) for the MSN Program was successfully met & exceeded. The FA22 results were improved from the FA21 results overall due to several course changes and improvements. Faculty were reminded that for this signature assignment, students were required to earn an 81% grade to pass the course. In FA22, the GNSG 6023 course changes included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New course number, PLOs, CLOs, assignments, grading rubrics, and improved assignment preparation. Learning activities included: increased lecture & discussion times; use of specific example/exemplar papers; use of Turnitin.com draft assignments; peer review activities; and other course improvements. - EBP Phase II Paper scoring increased from 50 points to 65 points in FA22, with 30 points being allotted for the Plan/Proposal section to specify the evidence based implementation plan/proposal. <p>The EBP Phase II Paper consists of several grading rubric criteria tallied within paper sections. A detailed assessment of the grading criteria was conducted overall and individually for the FA22 semester.</p> <p>In FA22, there were 19 students enrolled in 2 sections of the course. GNSG 6023.1 was taught by a seasoned faculty and 11 students were enrolled. GNSG 6023.2 was taught by a faculty new to academia and the course. Eight students were enrolled in the section. The goal of 85% of students meeting 81% or greater benchmark was met in the following paper sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Abstract (89.4% or 17/19 students met the benchmark; improved from FA21's 81.1%); (2) Plan-Proposal (100% or 19/19 students met the benchmark; same success as FA21); (3) Overall Paper Total Score (100% or 19/19 students met the benchmark; improved from FA21's 94.1%). <p>In FA22, 85% of the students did not meet 81% or higher of the points in the criterion of the: Pre-Assessment; Scholarly Writing; or APA & Professional Writing. The paper sections/criteria that were below the benchmark were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Pre-Assessment (84.2% or 16/19 students met the benchmark; this paper section is new to the grading rubric because it combines paper sections from the past to include Intro/Catalyst and other sections so it is difficult to compare with previous data from FA21; this FA22 semester, the students were close to meeting the 85% criteria for success); (2) Scholarly Writing (57.8% or 11/19 students met the benchmark; improved from FA21's 56%); (3) APA & Professional Writing (73.6% or 14/19 met the benchmark; improved from FA21's 61%).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Description of Changes to be Made Based on Data
<p>MSN PLO #5</p>	<p>Success in meeting MSN PLO #5 with the EBP Phase II Papers. Goal met with 19/19 (100%) students meeting the aim of 81% or greater, with 93% average or 60.7/65 points scored; paper score ranged from 55-65 points.</p> <p>The plan is to continue success by continuously improving this course assignment. If this assignment is chosen to measure success of PLO #5 (Leading Faithfully), then the communication among the 2 GNSG 6023 sections must continue and be linked from the outcomes data from the SP23 & SU23 Comprehensive Exam Oral & Written results. CE Feedback themes to be shared with FA23 students. Will revise the FA23 Grading Rubric for the written assignments to match the new 2024 CE Handbooks to build student success. Will continue improvements from FA22 assignments to include: use of Turnitin.com feedback to students; use of exemplar paper examples in class lectures & discussions, along with in class narrative writing exercises (especially with evidence synthesis, proposal plans & nursing implications); and continuance of peer review opportunities.</p> <p>Will work with students on Scholarly Writing & APA formatting by providing them resources (writing center & editing services) early on.</p> <p>For the FA23 course, the CLOs have been revised as have the CE Handbooks. There will be a new faculty teaching one of the GNSG 6023 sections and also a revised edition of the ebook for the course. Overall, the PLNU SON MSN program will have several changes within the curriculum- most notably, the addition of a FNP program. As such, the PAC reports for PLOs within the MSN program will change. Will stand by for future assignments.</p>

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 Project Rubric

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
<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>	<p>Points: 0-6</p> <p>Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 7</p> <p>Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 8</p> <p>Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 9-10</p> <p>Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column</p> <p>Examines significant problem in an area of nursing specialization</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients • Nursing/Nurses • Organization/System • Identifies current practice 	10	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies best practice • Compares and contrasts current practice with best practice 		
<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>	<p>Points: 0-6</p> <p>Meets \leq 6 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 7</p> <p>Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 8</p> <p>Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 9-10</p> <p>Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column</p> <p>Develops PICO question and describes appropriate search strategies and theoretical framework</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated PICO question using PICO format: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 of the theory (3 criteria) 	10	

<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>PLO 3.2, 3.3</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>Points: 0-6 Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 7 Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 8 Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 9-10 Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column</p> <p>Evidence Evaluation Table (as an appendix) includes succinct summary key features from published evidence, including the items below</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors/year/ • Title • Purpose • Design & level of evidence • Sample & setting • Measurements- Instruments/Tools Used, Identifies Validity & Reliability • Results • Critiques/appraises quantitative research study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity • Reliability • Applicability • OR Critiques/appraises qualitative research study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trustworthiness • Credibility • Dependability 	<p>10</p>	
---	--	--	--	--	-----------	--

<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</p>	<p>Points: 0-6</p> <p>Meets \leq 6 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 7</p> <p>Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 8</p> <p>Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 9-10</p> <p>Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column</p> <p>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</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>10</p>	
--	---	---	---	--	-----------	--

<p>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>Analyze information about quality initiatives recognizing the contributions of individuals and inter-professional healthcare teams to improve health outcomes across the continuum of care (MSN Essential III-1)</p> <p>Analyze information and design systems to sustain improvements and promote transparency using high reliability and just culture principles (MSN Essential III-3)</p> <p>PLO 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 5.3</p>	<p>Points: 0-12</p> <p>Meets \leq 6 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 14</p> <p>Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 16</p> <p>Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 18-20</p> <p>Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column</p> <p>Evaluate the pre-program change with characteristics of the environment</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10, 2 points each)</p> <p>Appraises feasibility of the intervention as it pertains to the environmental context including:</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 • Accurately and clearly discussed SWOT analysis- assessment of the internal and external environment's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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" 	<p>20</p>	
---	--	--	--	--	-----------	--

<p>Design and implement systems change strategies that improve the care environment. (MSN Essential II-6)</p> <p>Direct quality improvement methods to promote culturally responsive, safe, timely, effective, efficient, equitable and patient-centered care. (MSN Essential II-7)</p> <p>Evaluate outcome data</p>	<p>Points: 0-12</p> <p>Meets ≤ 6 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 14</p> <p>Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 16</p> <p>Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 18-20</p> <p>Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column</p> <p>Outcomes Measurement Table (an appendix) & Implementation Strategies & Outcomes</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10, 2 points each)</p> <p>Outline steps for implementation plan of proposal in a logical sequence, detailed and clearly stated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion includes restatement of the problem, desired outcomes and succinct evaluation of the 	<p>20</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	-----------	--

using current communication technologies, information systems, and statistical principles to develop strategies to reduce 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imaginative, memorable, and compelling • Enhance the effectiveness of the presentation • Appropriate to the audience 	5	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 \leq 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) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	<p>Points: 0-3</p> <p>Meets \leq 6 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 3.5</p> <p>Meets 7 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 4</p> <p>Meets 8 of 10 criteria in highly developed column</p>	<p>Points: 4.5-5</p> <p>Meets 9-10 criteria in highly developed column</p> <p>Presentation mechanics</p> <p>Meets the following criteria (n = 10, 0.05 points each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

APPENDIX D

Written Comprehensive Examination: Evidence Based Practice Project Rubric

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%	Emerging 70-79%	Developing 80-89%	Highly Developed 90%-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) <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 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, 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 inclusive of 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 process paper (MSN 9; PLO 3.2)	Meets < 5 criteria in highly developed column	Meets 5 of 7 criteria in highly developed column	Meets 6 of 7 criteria in highly developed column	Meets the following criteria (n = 7) <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) 	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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <p>Appraises feasibility of the intervention as it pertains to the environmental context including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)				<p>opportunity, threat) is accurately and clearly discussed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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)				<p>References, and Appendices with necessary subheadings/transitions so that the entire project flows smoothly and cogently</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) 		
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	<p>Meets the following criteria (n = 13)</p> <p>Written Comprehensive Examination was typed/formatted according to APA 7th edition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title page • Font and typeface • 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	

Faculty Comments:

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

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

OUTCOMES