**Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-2021 AY will be due September 30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. For purposes of this report, you should only report on two or three student learning outcomes (department’s choice) even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_\_School of Nursing\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Degree \_\_DNP\_\_\_

Assessment Coordinator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Kathleen Rindahl\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

**Doctoral Nursing Practice Essential VII**

*Conduct a comprehensive and systematic assessment of health and illness parameters in complex situations, incorporating diverse and culturally sensitive approaches.*

*Design, implement, and evaluate therapeutic interventions based on nursing science and other sciences*.

**Courses** NURS 596 **Translating Evidence into Reflective Practice.** Integration of clinical practice, theory, and research. Development of clinical expertise in management of health problems in selected populations. Implementation of project proposal. NURS 597 **Doctoral Project** Dissemination of results through an oral defense and manuscript submission to a peer-reviewed journal.

What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

All DNP Projects follow the Criteria set forth by The American Association for College of Nursing which state:

“All DNP Projects should:

* Focus on a change that impacts healthcare outcomes either through direct or indirect care.
* Have systems (micro-, meso-, or macro- level) or population/aggregate focus.
* Demonstrate implementation in the appropriate arena or area of practice.
* Include a plan for sustainability (e.g. financial, systems or political realities, not only theoretical abstractions).
* Include an evaluation of processes and/or outcomes (formative or summative). DNP Projects should be designed so that processes and/or outcomes will be evaluated to guide practice and policy. Clinical significance is as important in guiding practice as statistical significance is in evaluating research.
* Provide a foundation for future practice scholarship”

*(retrieved from,* ***The American Association for College of Nursing***[*https://www.aacnnursing.org/DNP/Tool-Kit*](https://www.aacnnursing.org/DNP/Tool-Kit)*)*

Scoring Rubric for the Doctoral Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Poor | Good | Excellent |
| Introduction  Section | Neither implicit nor explicit reference is made to the topic that is to be examined.  There is no research question or clear purpose for the study. | Identified a relevant specific problem of study  Focused on a significant advanced nursing practice issue.  Clearly states the purpose of the study  Makes a statement of the research question | Identified a relevant specific problem of study  Addresses ma significant advanced nursing practice issue. |
| Problem statement | There is insufficient evidence to support that there was a problem. | Evidence has been gathered to support the problem statement. | Evidence has been gathered to show the significance of the problem for the specific group under study. |
| Purpose | No purpose stated. | Purpose has been stated but is unclear | Purpose clearly stated and relates to problem statement |
| Theoretical  Framework | No framework discussed. | Framework offered but has not adequately  related to problem/purpose statement and  results | Framework offered but has adequately  related to problem/purpose statement and  results |
| Review of the literature | There is an insufficient or unclear review of the literature. | A review of relevant literature has been completed, written, and reviewed. | A rigorous but focused review of literature is clear, significant, accurate and updated. |
| Methodology | Unclear as to exact procedures that was carried out to implement project. | Procedures are stated clearly. However correlation with purpose is questionable and how carried out was nebulous. | Procedure is clearly stated and relates appropriately to purpose of study. Procedures are reproducible. |
| Evaluation | Evaluation of the data/ outcome is incomplete or inaccurate. | Evaluation of the data/outcome is complete and accurate | Analysis of the data/outcome is complete, accurate, relevant to the problem and related to purpose of project |
| Timeline | Time schedule not met. | Time schedule met. Some specific deadlines were not met but the overall project is on time. | All deadlines met. |
| Clarity of Writing | Writing is unclear and it is difficult to try to determine what the writer is trying to express.  Misspelled words, incorrect grammar or punctuation are evident. | Writing is generally clear. May need revision to increase clarity. | Writing is crisp, clear, and succinct. The writer incorporates the active voice when appropriate. Minor or no revisions are needed. |
| Formatting | Citations are missing or are done incorrectly. | Citations and references presented are on works pertinent to the specific project and not works of tangential or general significance. | Citations are accurate, specific, and appropriate. |
| Oral Presentation | Little or no advance preparation evident.  Disorganized. | Prepared; clear in presentation, presents a strong case, seeks questions and listens actively. | Presentation is prepared in advance, clear, articulates in presentation, draws out concerns of others, and listens actively. Presents a compelling case. |

Rubric for Project Defense

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Poor | Good | Excellent |
| Introduction  Section | Neither implicit nor explicit reference is made to the topic that is to be examined.  There is no research question or clear purpose for the study. | Has introduced a relevant specific problem to be studied.  Clearly states the purpose of the study.  Makes a statement of the research question. | The topic is introduced and groundwork is laid as to the direction of the study.  A research question is clearly stated and it  poses relevant ideas to examine in the study. |
| Problem statement | There is insufficient evidence to believe that there is a problem. | Has adequately problematized the issue | A compelling argument for why this is a  problem is presented. |
| Purpose | No purpose stated | Purpose has been stated but is unclear | Purpose clearly stated and relates to  problem statement |
| Theoretical  Framework | No framework discussed | Framework offered but has not adequately  related to problem/purpose statement | Framework offered but has adequately  related to problem/purpose statement |
| Review of the literature | There is an insufficient or unclear review of the literature. | A review of relevant literature has been completed, written, and reviewed. | The review of literature is clear, significant, and accurate. |
| Participants | It is not obvious who will serve as the participants in this project or the population they represent. | Information on participants is presented.  It is not clear how many will be participating.  It is clear what general population they represent. | The number of participants, how they will be selected, and what population they represent are all identified. |
| Procedures | If provided they are too limited to identify if the study will be successful | The procedures section does a fair job in explaining how the project will be carried out, how participants will be enrolled and encouraged to participate.  There is an explanation of how the design will be implemented, by whom, and methods of data gathering are spelled out.  IRB approval in process or obtained. | The procedures are clear and straight forward. If another researched wanted to replicate the study, enough information is provided to follow each step.  IRB approval has been obtained. |
| Methodology | Unclear as to exact  procedures to be carried out  to implement project | Procedures are stated clearly.  However correlation with purpose is questionable. | Procedure is clearly stated and relates appropriately to purpose of study. |
| Evaluation | No discussion is included as  to the type of evaluation that will be used. | A description of the techniques that will be used to evaluate the data/outcome is included. However the plan has not been worked out. | The plan for evaluation is justified and correct for the kind of data/outcome to be collected or measured. |
| Timeline | No time schedule is presented. | There is a time schedule but it is unclear or  questionable whether it will be able to be carried out under normal circumstances | The time schedule is clear with logical estimates as to the amount of time required to conduct the study. |
| Clarity of Writing | Writing is unclear and it is difficult to try to determine what the writer is trying to express.  Misspelled words, incorrect grammar or punctuation are evident. | Writing is generally clear, but may be too wordy. Some ideas are not made explicitly.  Paragraph or sentence structure may be repetitive. | Writing is crisp, clear, and succinct.  The writer incorporates the active voice when appropriate. |
| Formatting | Citations are missing or are done incorrectly. | Shows citations and specific credit is given to earlier works.  Citations and references presented are for works pertinent to the specific project and not works of tangential or general significance. | Citations are accurate, specific, and appropriate. |
| Oral Presentation | Little or no advance preparation evident does not take initiative in the presentation; waits for questions/prompts from others. | Prepared; clear in presentation takes some part in setting the agenda, listens to input. | Well prepared in advance, sets the agenda, clear, articulate in presentation, draws out concerns of others, and listens actively. |

Original document with adaptations from rubrics from SDSU, Bowling Green University

1. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient. Also indicate your benchmark (e.g. 80% of students will be designated as proficient or higher) and indicate the number of students who met that benchmark.

All 11 DNP students were successful in advancing to candidacy and defending their final project. The bench mark for these criteria is 90% and 100% was achieved

1. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

Currently there are no recommended changes. The incoming DNP Cohort will have their project proposals reviewed by the DNP faculty for approval to ensure the rigor of the Doctoral Project and the DNP project guidelines of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing are followed.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2018-19 assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question. N/A
2. What assessment activities will you be conducting during AY 2021-22?

Research Methods. DNP Essential II Organizational and Systems Leadership for Quality Improvement & Systems Thinking

1. Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed.

No major issues were identified