NSU College of Nursing and School of Allied Health
Assessment Year 2017-2018

Program – Doctor of Nursing Practice

College: College of Nursing (College of Nursing and School of Allied Health)

Prepared by: Dr. Connie Hale   Date: 6-28-2018

Approved by: Dr. Dana Clawson, Dean   Date: 6-28-2018

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

College of Nursing's Mission. Northwestern State University College of Nursing serves the people of Louisiana and in so doing improves the health of its citizens while advancing the mission of Northwestern State University through excellence in accessible undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education programs that are designed to assist individuals in achieving their professional goals as responsible and contributing members of their profession and society.

Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) Mission Statement: Same as the CON

DNP Program Goals:

1. Provide advanced practice nurse leaders with expertise, specialized competencies, and advanced knowledge required for evidence-based nursing practice and mastery in an area of specialization within the larger domain of nursing.

2. Prepare advanced practice nurse leaders to influence, design, direct, and implement change in healthcare practice, education, and policy through the development of collaborative alliances to improve healthcare outcomes and decrease morbidity and mortality in vulnerable populations.

3. Develop advanced practice nurse leaders who contribute to nursing's body of knowledge through professional development and scholarly inquiry into practice, processes, or outcomes which affect morbidity and mortality in vulnerable populations.

Methodology: The assessment process for the DNP program is as follows:

(1) Data from assessment tools (both direct & indirect, quantitative & qualitative) are collected and sent to the program director.

(2) The program director enters the data in the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) database.

(3) The results are shared with the Director of Assessment and analyzed at the DNP Assessment Committee meeting. The committee discusses data analysis, interpretation, actions, trends, results, and future plans to address needed improvements.

(4) The Assessment committee findings are discussed in the program curriculum committee meetings. Additional insights and actions are added to the SLOs based on faculty input.

(5) Significant findings are reported in the Administrative Council meeting.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Note[1]: Skyfactor™ Survey (a student satisfaction tool) is given the semester the student graduates. Skyfactor™ is a tool that is based on research and is designed to provide data for benchmarking and longitudinal comparisons. Questions utilized in Skyfactor™ are designed based on specialized/professional accreditation standards. The survey is administered by Skyfactor™, ensuring student anonymity. Results from the year are compiled by Skyfactor™ into an aggregate report which provides student responses and compares the NSU DNP program with like programs across the nation. The Skyfactor™ survey compares the DNP program mean to schools with the same Carnegie classification. The NSU DNP program uses the Carnegie classification as a standard of comparison for the Skyfactor™ questions that are used as an assessment measure. The scale for responses to the Skyfactor™ questions ranges from one to seven with seven being the highest score.

Note[2]: Assessment period. The DNP assessment data is based on the calendar year, Jan – Dec. For clarity and to be consistent with university programs, we will label the 2016 year as 2016-2017 and 2017 year as 2017-2018.

SLO 1. Integrate nursing science with knowledge from ethics, biophysical, psychosocial, analytical, and organizational sciences as the foundation for the highest level of nursing practice.

Measure 1.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Scientific Underpinnings Assignment (NURG 7000): Midterm Exam
Expected outcome: 80% of students will achieve 80%or better

Findings

2014-2015 AY: 81% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2015-2016 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2016-2017 AY: 90% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Not Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending

Fall 2014 –   81% (13/16)
Fall 2015 – 100% (7/7)
Fall 2016 –   90% (9/10)
Fall 2017 – 100% (13/13)

Analysis.   The NURG 7000 midterm examination meets the second course objective, which is for "… students to analyze the philosophical underpinnings of major contributors to the development of nursing knowledge." This course objective, and outcome measure, also meets the first Essential of Doctoral Education for Advanced Nursing Practice (AACN, 2006) and the first DNP program objective (SLO).

        In 2014 and 2015, the first two years the course and DNP program were offered, the midterm examination assessed students' synthesis of content for modules 1 through 4B in the course. All of these modules included philosophical content, which is material new to the nursing doctorate student. After receiving student feedback about their difficulty in completing the required readings for all four modules, and the difficult nature of understanding philosophical content, as well as reviewing content from other DNP programs for a similar course, the structure of the course was changed prior to offering the course in Fall 2016 so that all philosophical underpinning content be covered prior to the midterm examination (modules 1 & 2) and all discipline specific theoretical content be covered after the midterm examination. An in-class midterm review was held in 2014 and 2015, but in hopes of having an increase in attendance, the in-class review was changed in 2016 to a WebEx midterm examination review.

        In 2016, although a WebEx was used instead of the in-class review, only 50% of the class attended the WebEx midterm review (much like the in-class review percentages from 2015). Also implemented in 2016 was a reduction in the number of course modules from 10 to six (6), which was favorably received by students. However,

students still expressed dissatisfaction about the amount of reading in the course. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, 90% of students made an 80% or higher on the midterm exam, thus meeting the expected outcome. Based on the analysis of the results from 2016-2017, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to add an audio enhanced PowerPoint to the Moodle shell for those students unable to attend the midterm review via WebEx. This would give all students unable to attend the WebEx midterm review the same information and benefit of attending a review.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm was posted to the Moodle shell as planned. Some students who did not attend the WebEx midterm review did access the posted audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm review. Additionally, students scheduled individual phone conferences to discuss with faculty difficult material for midterm. Analysis of 2017-2018 data revealed that 100% of the students made an 80% or higher on the midterm exam, thus meeting the expected outcome. By passing the midterm exam with an 80% or better, the students demonstrated that they were learning how to analyze the philosophical underpinnings of major contributors to the development of nursing knowledge. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2018 is to: (1) find YouTube videos which enhance learning of difficult content and integrate selected videos into required readings/materials, (2) integrate student-course faculty phone calls to review difficult course content into student learning practices for 2018, and (3) continue to post the audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm review to the Moodle shell for those who cannot attend the WebEx Midterm review.

Decision. In 2017, an audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm review was posted to the Moodle shell and faculty discussed difficult course concepts with students via phone. The result was 100% of students making an 80% or higher on the midterm exam, thus meeting the expected outcome. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for 2018-2019 is to 1) find YouTube videos which enhance learning of difficult content and integrate selected videos into required readings/materials, 2) integrate student-course faculty phone calls to review difficult course content into student learning practices for 2018, and 3) continue to post the audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm review to the Moodle shell for those who cannot attend the WebEx Midterm review.

Measure 1.2. (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ survey: To what degree did your DNP program enhance your ability to integrate nursing science with knowledge from the following areas as the basis for the highest level of nursing practice: 1) Ethics, 2) Bio-physical Science, 3) Psychosocial Science, 4) Analytical Science, 5) Organizational Science. Note: Factor 5 on the Skyfactor Survey gives a score for the combined results of these five questions.
Expected outcome: Mean score $\geq$ Carnegie mean score

Findings

Factor 5 – Summary of the five questions
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.75; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.07   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 5.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 6.01   Target Not Met

Ethics
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.75; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.21   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 6.33; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.12   Target Met
Bio-physical Science
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.75; Carnegie Mean Score – 5.80   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 5.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 5.85   Target Not Met
Psychosocial Science
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.75; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.04   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 5.67; Carnegie Mean Score – 5.97   Target Not Met
Analytical Science
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.75; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.12   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 5.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 6.02   Target Not Met
Organizational Science
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.75; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.18   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 5.00; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.10   Target Not Met

Trending

Skyfactor	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)
	Q49 (ethical science)	Q50 (ethical science)
NSU	6.75	6.33
Carnegie	6.21	6.12
	Q50 (biophysical science)	Q51 (biophysical science
NSU	6.75	5.67
Carnegie	5.80	5.85
	Q51 (psychosocial science)	Q52 (psychosocial science)
NSU	6.75	5.67
Carnegie	6.04	5.97
	Q52 (analytical science)	Q53 (analytical science)
NSU	6.75	5.67
Carnegie	6.12	6.02
	Q53 (organizational science)	Q54 (organizational science)
NSU	6.75	5.0
Carnegie	6.18	6.1
	Factor 5	Factor 5
NSU	6.75	5.67

Carnegie	6.07	6.01

Analysis. The concepts for this measure are taught in NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings through a discussion forums and assignments. In the 2016-2017 assessment year NSU meet the expected outcome measures of all five (5) questions and the combined measure of the questions – Factor 5 (see chart above). The 2016-2017 Factor 5 mean score was 6.75 which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.07. The data from Skyfactor for the 2016-2017 assessment year represent the first graduating class' assessment of the DNP program; therefore, there is no previous data for trending. Because these findings represent the first graduating DNP class, a program decision was made to not change major content or structure of the program, given the high mean scores on the Skyfactor report. Rather, faculty continued to assess all course aspects in the end of semester course reports and made small course changes that enhanced students learning or their ability to complete the program on time (See measure 1.1). Although the number of course modules had been reduced from ten to six in 2016, students still expressed dissatisfaction in the end of course evaluations about the amount of reading in the course. Based on the analysis of the results from 2016-2017, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year included actions to help students be successful on the midterm exam, material that students found difficult. The plan for 2017-2018 was to add an audio enhanced PowerPoint to the Moodle shell for those students unable to attend the midterm review via WebEx. This would give all students unable to attend the WebEx midterm review the same information and benefit of attending a review.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the audio enhanced PowerPoint was added to the class Moodle Shell and students did access the file. For the 2017-2018 assessment year, NSU did not meet the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score for four of the five questions in this measure, nor for Factor 5 (see chart). In 2017-2018, the NSU mean score for Factor 5 was 5.67 which did not meet the Carnegie mean score of 6.01. However, before developing a plan to make program changes based on this one end of program assessment measure (which was based on the responses of only three students), faculty reviewed the end of course assessments given by the University and by the faculty teaching the course. For this measure, 100% of students (n=7) enrolled in NURG 7000 stated that the assignments and instructional methods supported their achievement of course objective 3. NURG 7000 course objective 3 states students will: Describe the role of the DNP prepared nurse in the integration of nursing science with knowledge from ethics, philosophical, biophysical, psychosocial, analytical, and organizational sciences as a basis for the highest level of nursing practice. Further, course objective 3 was measured in the end of course evaluation. The expected outcome for Objective 3 was that 100% of students would make an 80% or better on the Module 1 Study Guide. The actual outcome for objective 3 was 100% of students achieving an 80% or better in 2016 (N=10) and in 2017 (N=13) on the Module 1 Study Guide. Based on the analysis of the 2017-2018 results, the plan for 2018-2019 assessment year is for faculty to: 1) evaluate the continued use of

Skyfactor as a measure of this SLO, especially when Skyfactor is administered one year after students take NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings, and the results were vastly different from the end of semester course evaluation results; 2) increase the percentage of class time in NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings devoted to teaching content which demonstrates integration of biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational sciences and decrease content which teaches philosophical concepts and precepts.

Decision. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome, to meet or exceed the Carnegie mean score on Skyfactor questions comprising Factor Five, was not met. Though the scores did not meet the Carnegie mean scores for Factor Five, consideration must be given for the small number of students (n=3) who answered these questions. Based on end of course evaluations, which had a larger number of students give feedback (n=13) than Skyfactor (N=3), the plan for 2018-2019 assessment year is for faculty to: 1) evaluate the continued use of Skyfactor as a measure of this SLO, especially when Skyfactor is administered one year after students take NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings, and the results were vastly different from the end of semester course evaluation results; 2) increase the percentage of class time in NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings devoted to teaching content which demonstrates integration of biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational sciences and decrease content which teaches philosophical concepts and precepts.

SLO 2. Critically analyze health care delivery models based on contemporary nursing science and organizational and systems perspectives to eliminate health disparities and promote patient safety and excellence in practice.

Measure 2.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Clinical Scholarship (NURG 7002) Assignment: Module 1, Discussion Forum 2
Expected outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Findings

2016-2017 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Not
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending.
Spring 2015   –   93% (13/14)
Spring 2016   – 100% (6/6)
Summer 2017 – 100% (8/8)

Analysis. Discussion forum two asked students to evaluate evidence-based practice (EBP) frameworks and models discussed in the required readings by comparing and contrasting two frameworks or models of their choice. In 2016-2017 100% of the students made an 80% or higher on the Module 1 Assignment (Discussion Forum 2),

which met the expected outcome of 80% of students achieving a score of 80% or better. Though students achieved a score of 80% or better, faculty reported that students had difficulty in citing references and using quotes in the NURG 7002 discussion board postings. In addition, students were having difficulty beginning their Scholarly Project/Paper in NURB 7010 Scholarly Project Practicum I. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2017-2018 was for faculty to 1) develop and post a "tips for answering discussion forums" PowerPoint recorded over WebEx for student use before beginning discussion board assignments, and 2) move the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course to the summer semester, instead of the spring semester. The expectation was that movement of this course to the summer semester would allow students to critically analyze models to incorporate into their scholarly project/paper *immediately prior* to writing their scholarly paper in NURG 7010 DNP Scholarly Project Practicum I in the fall semester.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan was executed to provide students with a PowerPoint recorded over WebEx on tips for answering discussion forums. The PowerPoint was posted in the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course Moodle Shell. All students accessed the Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx recording. Additionally, the NURG 7002 course was moved to the summer semester, as planned. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, data analysis revealed that 100% of students made an 80% or higher on the Module 1 Assignment (Discussion Forum 2), thus meeting the expected outcome. Faculty found that students used the tips for discussion board postings and the quality of discussions increased. However, because NURG 7002 was moved to the summer semester and because there are fewer weeks in the summer semester than the spring semester (12 weeks versus 16 weeks), the DNP faculty decided to remove the Discussion Forum 2 and replace the assignment with the Framework writing portion of their Scholarly Project Proposal (currently in the NURG 7010 course). The framework assignment requires students to critically analyze health care delivery models that are based on nursing science and organizational systems perspectives, and to integrate those into evidence supported practice changes for vulnerable populations. Faculty will grade the framework assignment with the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric. The new assignment will be comparable to the previous measure in student learning outcomes. Additionally, at the end of semester DNP curriculum meeting, it was decided that since the 2017-2018 data analysis revealed that students used the tips for discussion board postings, the 2018 plan should include adding the tips for answering discussion forums PowerPoint/WebEx in the first DNP course offering, NURG 7000, so that students could benefit from the tips throughout the program.

To summarize, based on the analysis of the results from the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan for 2018-2019 is to: 1) eliminate the NURG 7002 Module 1 Discussion Forum 2, and thus remove it from the assessment measure 2.1 for 2018-2019; 2) have students begin writing the framework application portion of their scholarly project defense as a replacement for the previous Discussion Forum 2; 3) grade the new framework application assignment with the *Framework* category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric which asks faculty to evaluate the students' work as *Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory with Revisions,* or *Satisfactory*; 4) post *Tips for Answering*

Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx recording in the first DNP course, NURG 7000; and 5) replace measure for 2.1 with the new measure "100% of students will score *Satisfactory with Revisions* or *Satisfactory* on the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric."

Decision.
In 2017, 100% of students made an 80% or higher on the Module 1 Assignment, Discussion Forum 2 in the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) eliminate the NURG 7002 Module 1, Discussion Forum 2, and thus remove it from the assessment measure 2.1 for 2018-2019; 2) have students begin writing the framework application portion of their scholarly project defense as a replacement for the previous Discussion Forum 2; 3) grade the new framework application assignment with the *Framework* category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric which asks faculty to evaluate the students' work as *Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory with Revisions,* or *Satisfactory*; 4) post *Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx* recording in the first DNP course, NURG 7000; and 5) replace measure for 2.1 with the new measure "100% of students will score *Satisfactory with Revisions* or *Satisfactory* on the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric." The expectation is that by having students integrate the framework content into their scholarly project defense proposal, students will be better be able to integrate a health care delivery model for vulnerable populations, be better prepared for the next semester, and have a portion of their scholarly project proposal written. Additionally, the expectation is that by incorporating the tips for discussion forums PowerPoint WebEx recording in the first DNP course students' postings will improve on their discussion forums.

Measure 2.2 (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Survey: Clinical Prevention and Population Health for Improving the Nation's Health: **"**To what degree did your DNP program enhance your ability to evaluate care delivery models and or strategies using concepts related to dimensions of health?"
Expected outcome: Mean score $\geq$ Carnegie mean score

Findings

2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.82**;** Carnegie Mean Score – 6.12   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 6.67; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.09   Target Met

Trending.

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)
	Q116	Q117
NSU	6.82	6.67
Carnegie	6.12	6.09

Analysis. For the 2016-2017 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.82 which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.12. Additionally, in 2016-2017, the faculty reported that students were having difficulty citing references and using quotes in discussion forums and completing their Scholarly Project/Paper in a timely manner, a portion of which requires students to integrate care delivery models and or strategies into their practice change project. Based on analysis of the results, plan for 2017-2018 was to: 1) construct a *Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint* to be used over recorded WebEx to enhance students' ability to correctly cite references in discussion board postings; 2) to continue using discussion board postings for the NURG 7002 course, to help students evaluate care delivery models and to, synthesize their thoughts succinctly and professionally; and 3) move the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course to the summer semester, instead of the spring semester. The expectation was that movement of this course to the summer semester would allow students to critically analyze models to incorporate into their scholarly project/paper *immediately prior* to writing their scholarly paper in NURG 7010 DNP Scholarly Project Practicum I in the fall semester.

In 2017-2018, the plan to provide students with a PowerPoint over recorded WebEx on tips for answering discussion forums was executed and the learning tool was posted in the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course Moodle Shell. The majority of the students accessed the tool and utilized it to aid in discussion board postings. Additionally, the NURG 7002 course was moved to the summer semester, which allowed students to have more time to critically analyze models to incorporate into their scholarly project.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.67 which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.09. The NSU mean score of 6.67 on a 7-point scale was a slight decrease from the 2016-2017 mean score, but it was still a very high score. In addition, because the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship was moved from the spring semester to the summer semester to better prepare students to complete their scholarly project/paper, a plan was made to have students begin constructing their scholarly proposal by writing the Framework portion of the scholarly proposal. Faculty will grade the framework assignment with the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric which asks faculty to evaluate the students' work as *Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory with Revisions,* or *Satisfactory.* If the student's Framework portion of their Scholarly Proposal paper is not satisfactory, the students will make revisions to the Framework portion of the proposal until a *Satisfactory with Revisions or Satisfactory* rating is achieved. The expectation is that by moving the NURG 7002 course to immediately before students begin constructing the paper in NURG 7010, and by having students begin writing the Framework portion of their scholarly proposal, students will better be able to integrate a health care delivery model for vulnerable populations into their Scholarly Defense Paper. Lastly, a decision was also made to integrate the Tips for Answering Discussion Forums Power Point Web Ex recording into the NURG 7000 DNP course, the first course of the DNP curriculum. It is expected that by integrating the Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx recording earlier in the program, students will be better able to answer all discussion forums throughout the program.

To summarize, based on the analysis of the evidence from the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) have students begin writing the framework application portion of their scholarly project defense in NURG 7002; 2) grade the new framework application assignment with the *Framework* category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric which asks faculty to evaluate the students' work as *Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory with Revisions,* or *Satisfactory*; 3) evaluate student and faculty perceptions of students' having difficulty completing their scholarly project before next offering of the NURG 7002 course to see if moving the course to Summer helped them to complete their scholarly project paper development on time; and 4) post *Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx* recording in the first DNP course, NURG 7000.

Decision. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.67 which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.09 for Skyfactor Question 117 which asks students their perceptions of the degree to which their DNP program enhanced their ability to "evaluate care delivery models and/or strategies using concepts related to dimensions of health". The NSU mean score of 6.67 on a 7-point scale was a slight decrease from the 2016-2017 mean. Based on the analysis of the evidence from the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) have students begin writing the framework application portion of their scholarly project defense in NURG 7002; 2) grade the new framework application assignment with the *Framework* category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric which asks faculty to evaluate the students' work as *Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory with Revisions,* or *Satisfactory*; 3) evaluate student and faculty perceptions of students' having difficulty completing their scholarly project before next offering of the NURG 7002 course to see if moving the course to Summer helped them to complete their scholarly project paper development on time; and 4) post *Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx* recording in the first DNP course, NURG 7000.

The expectation is that by moving NURG 7002 course to immediately before NURG 7010 where students begin constructing the paper, students will better be able to integrate a health care delivery model for vulnerable populations into their Scholarly Defense Paper and complete the scholarly project paper in a timely manner. Additionally, the expectation is that students utilizing the tips for answering discussion forums PowerPoint WebEx earlier in the program will aid students in answering discussion boards throughout the program.

SLO 3. Systematically appraise existing literature, outcomes of practice, practice patterns, systems of care, and health organizations to design and generate best practice evidence to improve practice and health care outcomes.

Measure 3.1 & 3.2 (Direct-Knowledge)
Measures 3.1 and 3.2 will be share the same analysis and decision as these two measures are very closely related.

Measure 3.1

Assessment Method: Clinical Scholarship Assigment (NURG 7002): Quantitative Research Appraisal
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Findings

2015-2016 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2016-2017 AY: 83.3% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending
Spring 2015   – 100% (14/14)
Spring 2016   – 83.33% (5/6)
Summer 2017 – 100**%** (8/8)

Measure 3.2.

Assessment Method: Clinical Scholarship (NURG 7002) Assignment: Qualitative research Critique
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Findings

2015-2016 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2016-2017 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending
Spring 2015   – 100% (14/14)
Spring 2016   – 100% (6/6)
Summer 2017 – 100 **%** (8/8)

Analysis. The quantitative research appraisal asks the student to systematically appraise/critique/evaluate a quantitative research study (approved by faculty prior to beginning the appraisal), so they are prepared to utilize best evidence in the improvement of a clinical practice outcome. A quantitative research appraisal model guides the student in the quantitative appraisal process. The qualitative research appraisal asks the student to systematically appraise/critique/evaluate a qualitative research study (approved by faculty prior to beginning the appraisal), to prepare the student to utilize best evidence in the improvement of a clinical practice outcome. A qualitative research appraisal model guides the student in the critique process.

     Analysis of 2016-2017 data revealed that five of six (83.33%) students enrolled in NURG 7002 achieved a score of 80% or higher on the quantitative research appraisal, thus exceeding the expected outcome. The data also revealed that 100% of students (N=6) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the qualitative research appraisal, thus exceeding the expected outcome. Although 83-100% of students achieved a score $\geq$

80%, the end of semester course evaluations revealed that many students did not find the recorded WebEx explaining how to perform the quantitative and qualitative research appraisals a sufficient explanation of how to perform the appraisal and write the appraisal critique. Further, because this course specifically describes how to use best evidence to implement quality practice changes, which is the intent of the scholarly project students start in NURG 7010 (fall semester), the DNP curriculum committee decided to move NURG 7002 from the spring semester to the summer semester. The intent of moving the course to the summer semester was to better prepare the students for the scholarly project process which begins in the fall semester. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to: 1) move the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course from the spring semester to the summer semester, 2) add a live WebEx (instead of recorded) to the NURG 7002 course to help students understand the appraisal process, and 3) have individual phone conversations or face-to-face discussions to help students understand the appraisal process.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan was executed to provide students with a live WebEx where students were able to ask questions and have them answered. Additionally, the faculty held individual phone conversations and face-to-face discussions to aid students in understanding the quantitative and qualitative appraisal process and formatting of the paper. The 2017-2018 data revealed that 100% of students (N=8) made an 80% or higher on the NURG 7002, quantitative research critique thus surpassing the percentage from 2016 (83%) and exceeding the expected outcome of 80%. The 2017-2018 data also revealed that 100% of students (N=8) made an 80% or higher on the NURG 7002, qualitative research critique, which exceeded the expected outcome of 80% and was equal to the 2016-2017 results.

Based on results of the 2017-2018 data analysis of measure 3.1 and 3.2 alone, the faculty would have continued to use the quantitative and qualitative research critiques. However, student feedback received in the university's end of course evaluations revealed that students were dissatisfied with the number of articles they were required to critique, both qualitative and quantitative. Students asked to perform fewer critiques and focus only on critiquing studies that provide quality evidence to initiate the best practice change possible in their scholarly project. Based on analysis of all results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to place less emphasis on the number of articles critiqued and more emphasis on the quality of the critique and the ability of the critique to be used in implementation of the scholarly project practice change. Specifically, students will be asked to perform only one complete, satisfactory research critique in the course. Additionally, the faculty will continue to utilize face-to-face discussions and/or individual student phone conversations, in addition to a live WebEx session, to explain the appraisal process and specific issues the students are having with the critique.

Decision. In the 2017-2018 assessment year 100% of students (N=8) made an 80% or higher on the NURG 7002, quantitative research critique thus surpassing the percentage from 2016 (83%) and exceeding the performance benchmark. The 2017-2018 data also revealed that 100% of students (N=8) made an 80% or higher on the NURG 7002, qualitative research critique, which exceeded the performance benchmark and was equal with the 2016-2017 results. In addition, student feedback on end of

course evaluations gave faculty insight into student dissatisfaction with the number of articles they were required to critique, both qualitative and quantitative. Based on analysis of all results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to:
1) combine the qualitative and quantitative research appraisal modules and have students only perform a single, satisfactory, research critique/appraisal, either qualitative or quantitative, rather than one qualitative critique and one quantitative critique; 2) continue to utilize face-to-face individual student conferences and/or individual phone calls to explain the one research critique; and 3) schedule a live WebEx session to explain the appraisal process, and specific issues the students are having with the critique. The expectation is that by having the quantitative and qualitative modules combined, and only requiring students to complete one satisfactory research critique, either qualitative or quantitative, students will be able to focus on finding quality studies that can be used to implement an evidence-based practice change.

Measure 3.3 (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Benchworks Survey: Clinical Scholarship and Analytical Methods for Evidence Based Practice: To what degree did your DNP program enhance your ability to use Analytical methods to critically appraise existing evidence to: 1) determine best practice; 2) implement best practice?
Expected Outcome: Mean score $\geq$ Carnegie mean score

Findings

Determine best practice
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.83**;** Carnegie Mean Score – 6.46   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 6.00; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.36   Target Not Met

Implement best practice
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.83; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.41   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 5.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 6.33   Target Not Met

Trending

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)
	Q71 Determine best practice	Q72 Determine best practice
NSU	6.83	6.0
Carnegie	6.46	6.36
	Q72 Implement best practice	Q73 Implement best practice
NSU	6.83	5.67
Carnegie	6.41	6.33

Analysis. Skyfactor survey question 71 asked students to evaluate their perceptions of the degree to which their DNP program enhanced their ability to use analytical methods to critically appraise existing evidence to determine best practice. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.83 (see chart above), which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.46. Skyfactor survey question 72 asked students to evaluate their perceptions of the degree to which their DNP program enhanced their ability to use analytical methods to critically appraise existing evidence to implement best practice. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, the NSU mean score was 6.83 (see chart above), which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.41. Although the 2016 data analysis revealed the expected outcome was achieved, and students felt they were able to critically appraise existing research evidence to determine best practice and implement best practice, DNP faculty discussions at the end of year retreat revealed that students were having trouble completing the program, specifically the scholarly project implementation and evaluation, according to the prescribed curriculum time frame. Based on these discussions, and the fact that the course analysis met the expected outcomes, the curriculum committee's plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to move the NURG 7002 course to immediately prior to students beginning NURG 7010 Scholarly Project Practicum I, the first of three scholarly project courses. In response to this course being moved, and with the knowledge that the course would also need to increase its focus on preparing students to complete the scholarly project, a course textbook, which primarily focused on research appraisal, was eliminated and a new textbook was adopted which specifically focuses on use of best evidence to develop and implement the scholarly project.

In 2017-2018, the plan developed in 2016-2017 to move the course from the spring semester to the summer semester was executed. Further, changes in textbook elimination and adoption were executed. Analysis of 2017-2018 data revealed that the NSU mean score for "determine best practice" had decreased to 6.0, which did not meet the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.36. The NSU mean score for "implement best practice" also significantly decreased from 6.83 to 5.67, which did not meet the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.33. Students shared in the end of course evaluations that the discussion forums were sometimes tiresome and not a good learning tool.

Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to begin having students perform a review of literature, which they can later incorporate into their Scholarly Project the next semester. By having students completed the review of literature, previously required in the NURG 7010 Scholarly Project Practicum I course, in the NURG 7002 course, the students would be achieving both outcome measures of appraising existing evidence to determine best practice and developing the plan to implement the best practices. Additionally, a grading rubric will be developed to be congruent with the expectations of the review of literature assignment. Finally, due to students' comments in the University's end of course evaluations, that the discussion forums were sometimes tiresome and not a good learning tool, a decision was made to try and find technology that would aid in making these discussions more robust. In 2017-2018 faculty attended a professional development workshop and learned about converting written discussion forums to video

discussion forums for students in graduate programs. The plan for 2018-2019 will incorporate these video discussion forums into the NURG 7002 course to enhance student learning and enhance the discussions amongst class members.

Decision. The NSU mean score for the two Skyfactor question utilized for this measure significantly decreased in the 2017-2018 assessment year and did meet the expected outcome Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 is for: 1) students to complete a review of literature in the NURG 7002 course that they can use as the basis for their completed evaluation of evidence in their next course, NURG 7010 Scholarly Project Practicum, 2) faculty to develop and utilize a grading rubric which is congruent with the review of literature assignment's expectations, and 3) faculty to convert the current discussion forums into video discussion forums to enhance student learning.

The expectation is that having students complete the major portion of their review of literature, previously required in NURG 7010 (Scholarly Project Practicum I) earlier in the curriculum, the students will achieve the outcome measures of appraising existing evidence to determine best practices, which they will implement in their practicum courses. Also, the expectation is that having a grading rubric that is congruent with the assignment will aid students in completing the assignment. Finally, the expectation is that by changing the discussion forums from written to video format, students will feel more engaged in the course, and learning via discussion format will be enhanced.

SLO 4. Utilize information systems technology to implement and evaluate healthcare resources, quality improvement initiatives, and programs of care that support practice decisions.

Measure 4.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Information Systems Technology Assignment (NURG 7005): CDSS Project
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Findings

2015-2016 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2016-2017 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 91% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending
Summer 2015 – 100% (13/13)
Summer 2016 – 100% (5/5)
Summer 2017 –   91% (10/11)

Analysis. The NURG 7005 Informatics Technology course is taught through a Jones and Bartlett (JBI) Navigate course where students have access to narrated lectures on

topics that correspond to their required readings. The course culminates in the development of a Clinical Decision Support System (CDSS) that can be used to help students improve vulnerable population outcomes. Development of the CDSS entails five assignments, each worth 100 points. The steps include: 1) practice issue identification, 2) plan development, 3) best practices paper, 4) Consumer E-Health paper, and 5) a presentation that synthesizes knowledge from all previous components. The entire CDSS assignment is worth 500 points.

In the 2016-2017 assessment year 100% of students (5/5) enrolled in NURG 7005 Information Systems Technology achieved a score of 80% or higher on the CDSS assignment. Although 100% of the students in 2016-2017 achieved a score of 80% or better on the CDSS assignment, it was not clear to all students that the CDSS consisted of 5 separate assignments until it was time for the presentation. For the CDSS assignment to aid students in identifying and utilizing best practices to implement practice changes in a vulnerable population, the students must clearly understand the dynamic nature of all five components. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to: 1) revise the NURG 7005 syllabus to ensure each component of the CDSS was viewed as separate and that students understood the separate grading process of each assignment, 2) update learning modules to reflect which component of the CDSS was being assigned, give a brief synopsis of the prior learning components, and tell students what to expect in future components.

In 2017-2018 the plans for syllabus revision and module revision were implemented. In 2017, 10 of the 11 students, or 91%, achieved a score of 80% or better on the CDSS, thus meeting the expected outcome. These results are evidence that students were able to utilize information systems technology to implement and evaluate healthcare resources, quality improvement initiatives, and programs of care that support practice decisions. When reviewing why there was a decrease in the percentage of students that made 80% of better from the previous year, it became apparent that one student did not follow the assigned rubrics or modules, and also did not request faculty help or clarification. Based on these findings, the NURG 7005's end of course evaluation included a plan for 2018-2019 to: 1) include a must-read document that links the DNP essential related to the course and the essential components in each assignment to help students understand why they are doing certain assignments and how those assignments related to DNP education; 2) change the CDSS project to a Health Information Technology Project that allows students several options, including the CDSS, so they can choose a project that is more congruent with their current practice role; and 3) change the Consumer E-Health information paper to a discussion forum where students engage others about E-Health, and are thus exposed to more information than writing a paper individually.

Decision. In 2017-2018, 91% (N=10/11) of students achieved a score of 80% or higher on the Clinical Decision Support System (CDSS) assignment, which met the expected outcome. However, it was a decrease from 2016-2017 (100%). Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for 2018-2019 is to: 1) include a must-read document that links the DNP essential related to the course and the essential components in each assignment to help students understand why they are doing certain assignments and how those assignments related to DNP education; 2) change the CDSS project to a

Health Information Technology Project that allows students several options, including the CDSS, so they can choose a project that is more congruent with their current practice role; and 3) change the Consumer E-Health information paper to a discussion forum where students engage others about E-Health, and are thus exposed to more information than writing a paper individually.

The expectation is that by adding a must-read document linking course content to DNP essentials, students will better understand why they are doing certain assignments and how those assignments relate to DNP education. Additionally, the expectation is that changing the CDSS module to a Health Information Technology Project, students will choose a project that is more congruent with their current role. Finally, it is expected that changing the Consumer E-Health Information paper to a discussion forum will prompt students to engage in robust discussion with each other and be exposed to more information than they would doing a paper individually.

Measure 4.2 (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Benchworks Survey: Information Systems Technology: "To what degree did your DNP program enhance your ability to: 1) develop an evaluation plan involving data extraction from practice information; 2) execute an evaluation plan involving data extraction from practice information; 3) effectively evaluate consumer health information sources?"
Expected Outcome: Mean score $\geq$ Carnegie mean score

Findings
Develop an evaluation plan
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.64**;** Carnegie Mean Score – 5.95   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 4.67; Carnegie Mean Score – 5.81   Target Not Met

Execute an evaluation plan
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.64; Carnegie Mean Score – 5.92   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 4.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 5.84   Target Not Met

Evaluate consumer health information sources
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.73; Carnegie Mean Score – 5.97   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – *NR; Carnegie Mean Score - 5.84   Data not reported

Trending

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)
	Q95 Develop evaluation plan	Q96 Develop evaluation plan
NSU	6.64	4.67
Carnegie	5.95	5.81
	Q96	Q97

	Execute evaluation plan	Execute evaluation plan
NSU	6.64	4.67
Carnegie	5.92	5.84
	Q97 Evaluate health resources	Q98 Evaluate health resources
NSU	6.73	*NR
Carnegie	5.97	5.84

*NR =not reported if N<3

Analysis. In 2016-2017, measure 4.2 was evaluated using data analysis results from three Skyfactor™ Questions 95, 96 and 97. These questions largely relate to the NURG 7005 Information Systems Technology course and ask students to evaluate how well they perceive the DNP program prepared them to utilize information systems technology to implement and evaluate healthcare resources, quality improvement initiatives, and programs of care that support practice decisions. The NURG 7005 Informatics Technology course is taught through a Jones and Bartlett (JBI) Navigate course where students have access to narrated lectures on topics that correspond to their required readings. The course culminates in the development of a CDSS that can be used to help students improve vulnerable population outcomes. Development of the CDSS entails five assignments, each worth 100 points. The steps include: 1) practice issue identification, 2) plan development, 3) best practices paper, 4) consumer e-health paper, and 5) a presentation that synthesizes knowledge from all previous components.

In 2016-2017 NSU students' mean scores were greater than the Carnegie mean scores on all three questions, which met the expected outcomes for Measure 4.2. These mean scores are also evidence that the DNP students believed the DNP program prepared them to 1) develop an evaluation plan involving data extraction from practice information, 2) execute an evaluation plan involving data extraction from practice information, and 3) effectively evaluate consumer health information sources. Though NSU's mean scores met the expected criteria, students had difficulty in the NURG 7005 course in understanding the expectations for the CDSS project. Specifically, it was not clear to all students that the CDSS consisted of the 5 separate assignments until it was time for the presentation. For the CDSS assignment to aid students in identifying and utilizing best practices to implement practice changes in a vulnerable population, the students must clearly understand the dynamic nature of all five components.

Based on analysis of the 2016-2017 assessment data, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year were to: 1) update the NURG 7005 course syllabus to reflect each component as a separate part of the CDSS that included points being assigned for each component, 2) update the CDSS learning modules to reflect which component of the CDSS was being assigned, give a brief synopsis of the prior components, and describe what students should expect in future components.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, these changes were executed. In 2017-2018, the first two Skyfactor questions related to developing an evaluation plan and executing an evaluation plan, revealed that NSU's mean scores of 4.67 and 4.67 did not meet or exceed the Carnegie mean scores (5.81 and 5.84, respectively), thus the benchmark was not met. The third Skyfactor question on evaluating consumer health information sources had less than three respondents; consequently, Skyfactor™ did not report the

data. During analysis, it was noted that only three students completed the first 2 questions, and less than three completed the third question. These low numbers could have affected the achievement of the expected outcomes. However, in the 2017-2018 end of course evaluations for NURG 7005, it was noted that students felt the CDSS modules were too limiting in making an information technology related practice change. Faculty also reported that that one student did not follow the rubrics or the order of the modules. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year are to: 1) add a must-read document that links the DNP essentials related to essential components of each assignment to help students understand why they are doing certain assignments and how those assignments relate to DNP education; 2) change the CDSS project to a Health Information Technology Project which allows students several options, including a CDSS, so they can choose a project that is congruent with their current role; and 3) change the Consumer E-Health Information paper to a discussion forum where students can engage each other and be exposed to more information than they would doing a paper individually.

Decision. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the first two Skyfactor questions related to developing an evaluation plan and executing an evaluation plan, revealed that NSU's mean scores of 4.67 and 4.67 did not meet or exceed the Carnegie mean scores (5.81 and 5.84, respectively), thus the benchmark was not met. The third Skyfactor question on evaluating consumer health information sources had less than three respondents; consequently, Skyfactor™ did not report the data. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) add a must-read document that links the DNP essentials related to essential components of each assignment to help students understand why they are doing certain assignments and how those assignments relate to DNP education; 2) change the CDSS project to a Health Information Technology Project which allows students several options, including a CDSS, so they can choose a project that is congruent with their current role; and 3) change the Consumer E-Health Information paper to a discussion forum where students can engage each other and be exposed to more information than they would doing a paper individually.

SLO 5. Advocate for health care policy which addresses social justice and equity in all health care settings

Measure 5.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Healthcare Policy Assignment (NURG 7007): Advocacy Project/Presentation
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Findings

2016-2017 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending.
Spring 2016 – 100% (13/13)
Spring 2017 – 100**%** (5/5)

Analysis. The advocacy project/presentation asked students to attend a political event where the policy/bill/issue that they had previously analyzed with a policy analysis model, was discussed or debated. The policy issue was required to be related to vulnerable health care populations. Prior to attending the political event, students were required to set goals for attending the meeting that included describing their role as a political advocate for or against the issue, identifying stakeholders related to the policy, networking with those stakeholders, and finally describing how the event was a positive or negative mediating factor for the policy/law/bill/issue. After attending the event, students self-evaluated how they could improve upon the advocacy skills they used in the meeting in their future DNP role.

      Analysis of 2016-2017 data revealed that 100% of students (N=13) enrolled in the NURG 7007 Healthcare Policy: Analysis, Advocacy, and Transformation course achieved a score of 80% or higher on the Healthcare Policy Assignment: Advocacy Project/Presentation, thus exceeding the expected outcome. Based on 2016-2017 data analysis, the plan for 2017-2018 was to continue using the advocacy project/ presentation assignment to meet SLO 5. However, because students were attending political events, and this correlated to expected DNP competencies, a decision was made at the DNP program curriculum meeting to have students complete a prescribed number of clinical/direct practice hours (i.e. 24 hours) in the NURG 7007 course. Students would be able to use hours working with policy makers or promoting policy change that address the needs of vulnerable populations for their advocacy assignment as clinical, or direct practice hours. Also, in the NURG 7007 end of course evaluations, students positively commented on how the audio enhanced PowerPoint modules were well produced and aided in their understanding of course content and also requested that some live WebEx question and answer sessions, or even lecture sessions, be added.

      Based on analysis of the 2016-2017 data, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to: 1) allow students' work with vulnerable populations, policymakers, and healthcare workers to count as clinical hours, 2) require students to complete a minimum of 24 clinical practice hours in the NURG 7007 course, and 3) add two live WebEx sessions to the NURG 7007 course.

      During the 2017-2018 assessment year, the above changes were implemented. The 2017-2018 data revealed that 100% of students (N=5) enrolled in NURG 7007 Health Policy made an 80% or higher on the Healthcare Policy Assignment: Advocacy Project/Presentation. This data is evidence that students were able to demonstrate advocating for health care policies which addresses social justice and equity in all health care settings. Changes initiated in the 2017 offering of NURG 7007 included requiring students to complete a minimum of 24 clinical/direct practice hours and

allowing students to count time working with policymakers or healthcare workers advocating for needed policy change for vulnerable populations as clinical/direct practice hours. In the end of course evaluation, students stated that although this requirement was in the syllabus and posted in a course module, they did not feel the clinical/direct practice hours requirement was clearly explained at the beginning of the course, and thus made it difficult for them to achieve the required hours. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) develop a WebEx explaining the clinical hours requirement and how those hours can be achieved through the advocacy assignment and other course assignments, and 2) have the students submit a plan within the first two weeks of the course on how they plan to meet the clinical hours requirement. The expectation is that by posting a WebEx about the clinical hours requirement and by having students submit a plan for meeting the requirement within the first two weeks of the course, students will not be overwhelmed trying to meet this requirement at the end of the course.

Decision. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, data analysis revealed 100% of students (N=5) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the Healthcare Policy Assignment: Advocacy Project/Presentation. Based on the analysis of the results presented above, the plan for 2018-2019 is to: 1) develop a WebEx explaining the clinical hours requirement and how those hours can be achieved through the advocacy assignment and other course assignments, and 2) have the students submit a plan within the first two weeks of the course on how they plan to meet the clinical hours requirement. The expectation is that by posting a WebEx about the clinical hours requirement and by having students submit a plan for meeting the requirement within the first two weeks of the course, students will not be overwhelmed trying to meet this requirement at the end of the course.

Measure 5.2 (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – Health Care Policy for Advocacy in Health Care: **"**To what degree did your DNP enhance your ability to advocate for ethical policies in all healthcare arenas?"
Expected Outcome: Mean score $\geq$ Carnegie mean score

Findings

2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean - 6.82; Carnegie Mean Score - 6.18   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean - 6.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 6.08   Target Met

Trending.

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)
	Q103	Q104
NSU	6.82	6.67
Carnegie	6.18	6.08

Analysis. In the NURG 7007 Healthcare Policy: Analysis, Advocacy and Transformation course, students utilize an ethical decision-making model to find a solution to an assigned ethical dilemma. Prior to coming to a resolution of the ethical dilemma, students conduct a debate about the assigned topic. The students then develop a policy, or find a current proposed policy/bill, that reflects the agreed upon decision, and explain how they would advocate for that decision. The entire assignment is done in pairs of two students and is submitted as a video recording. The assignment meets the fifth course objective in NURG 7007 that states students will "develop and utilize advocacy skills for development, initiation, and evaluation of social justice and ethical policy."

In 2016-2017, the NSU mean score was 6.82 which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.18. (See chart above). The mean score of 6.82 (scale 1-7) is evidence that students believed that the DNP program enhanced their ability to advocate for ethical policies in all healthcare arenas. In the end of course evaluations, students stated they would like WebEx videos that reviewed the grading criteria and formatting of large assignments, like the Ethical Debate and advocacy assignment. Based on the results of 2016-2017 data analysis, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to: 1) add WebEx sessions to review major course assignments, such as the Ethical Debate and advocacy assignment, and grading criteria, and 2) continue using the Ethical Debate and advocacy assignment in NURG 7007.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the above plan was executed. In 2017-2018 a WebEx session was added to the NURG 7007 course, as an introduction video, explaining the course syllabus and reviewing the course assignments. Additionally, a WebEx was added mid-course to explain the two remaining course assignments, as planned. In 2017-2018 the NSU mean score was 6.67 which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.08. The mean of 6.67 was a slight decrease from the 2016-2017 assessment year mean score of 6.82. However, it was still a very high score and is evidence that DNP students believed that the DNP program enhanced their ability to advocate for ethical policies in all healthcare arenas. Although the benchmark was met, the students' end of course evaluations of the NURG 7007 course indicated that students entering the DNP program in the newly formed Organizational Systems Leadership (OSL) concentration felt the Ethical debate topics, as well as some course discussion boards and assignments, were written for those students in the Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) concentration and was not inclusive of those in the OSL concentration.

Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to re-structure the course assignments to ensure course assignments are inclusive of students in both concentrations. Specific to this SLO, the plan is for the ethical debate topics to be revised and include ethical dilemmas which may affect those enrolled in the OSL concentration. The expectation is that by reviewing the entire course from an OSL student's perspective, including the ethical dilemmas, all students will feel the course enhances their ability to advocate for ethical policies in all healthcare arenas.

Decision: In 2017-2018 the NSU mean score was 6.67 which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.08. The mean of 6.67 was a slight decrease from the 2016-2017 assessment year mean score of 6.82. The end of course evaluations also gave pertinent feedback detailed above. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to re-structure the course assignments to ensure course assignments are inclusive of students in both concentrations. Specific to this SLO, the plan is for the ethical debate topics to be revised and include ethical dilemmas which may affect those enrolled in the OSL concentration. The expectation is that by reviewing the entire course from an OSL student's perspective, including the ethical dilemmas, all students will feel the course enhances their ability to advocate for ethical policies in all healthcare arenas.

SLO 6. Employ consultative and leadership skills to function on inter-and intra-professional multidisciplinary teams that work collaboratively to improve vulnerable populations' health outcomes.

Measure 6.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Organizational Theory and Systems Leadership Assignment (NURG 7004): Leadership Paper
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Findings

2015-2016 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2016-2017 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending
Summer 2015 – 100% (13/13)
Summer 2016 – 100% (5/5)
Spring 2017   – 100% (11/11)

Analysis. The leadership paper assignment asks students to examine a given scenario and evaluate the role of the DNP in employing leadership self-assessment findings, conflict resolution skills, and inter-professional collaboration. The NURG 7004 Leadership Paper assignment meets the third course objective which is to "institute leadership qualities used in team building, complex practice and organizational issues, management of ethical dilemmas, incorporation of sensitivity to diverse cultures, and elimination of health disparities, while demonstrating sensitivity to diverse organizational cultures and populations, including both patients and providers". This course objective and outcome measure meets the second Essential of Doctoral Education for Advanced Nursing Practice (AACN, 2006) and the sixth DNP program objective (SLO).

Analysis of 2016-2017 data revealed that 100% of students (N=5) enrolled in NURG 7004 achieved a score of 80% or higher on the Module 4 Leadership Paper assignment, thus meeting the expected outcome. This result is evidence that students were able to articulate the institute leadership qualities used in team building, complex practice and organizational issues, management of ethical dilemmas, incorporation of sensitivity to diverse cultures, and elimination of health disparities, while demonstrating sensitivity to diverse organizational cultures and populations including both patients and provider. The end of semester student course evaluations also indicated that students felt the leadership course assignments, including the leadership paper assignment, helped them to meet the third course objective. However, following the Summer 2016 semester, the DNP Curriculum Committee decided to move the NURG 7004 course from the summer semester to the Spring semester to help students understand their expected leadership competencies prior to needing them in the subsequent courses. The semester that the NURG 7004 course was initially offered (spring) was switched with the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course (summer), which was also better suited to be placed in the curriculum immediately before students begin their scholarly project courses. Based on the analysis of the 2016-2017 data, the plan for 2017-2018 was to: 1) move the NURG 7004 to the spring semester, and 2) continue using the Module 4 Leadership Paper assignment, which assessed students' synthesis of leadership theories, self-assessment of leadership skills, conflict management, and outcomes evaluation that were presented in NURG 7004 course modules one through three.

In 2017-2018, the above plan was implemented. The sequencing of courses was changed, and NURG 7002 and NURG 7004 were switched in the curriculum layout. Analysis of 2017-2018 data revealed that 100% (N=11) of students enrolled in NURG 7004 made an 80% or higher on the Module 4 Leadership Paper assignment, thus exceeding the expected outcome. This data is also evidence that students had learned how the DNP nurse could employ consultative and leadership skills to function on inter- and intra-professional multidisciplinary teams that work collaboratively to improve vulnerable populations' health outcomes. However, in the end of course report for NURG 7004, faculty indicated there was a need for students to be engaged in more robust class discussions in the online format. Based on the analysis of the results from the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) add video discussion forums, instead of only having written discussion forums, to increase student engagement in class discussions and to improve the quality of the discussion forums; 2) continue using the current modular format to present didactic leadership content, and 3) continue to use the NURG 7004 leadership paper assignment as a method of having students apply didactic knowledge in combination with their student leadership self-assessment to an organizational scenario.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, data revealed 100% of students made an 80% or higher on the Module 4 Leadership Paper Assignment. Based on the analysis of the results from the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan for the 2018-2019

assessment year is to: 1) add video discussion forums, instead of only having written discussion forums, to increase student engagement in class discussions and to improve the quality of the discussion forums; 2) continue using the current modular format to present didactic leadership content, and 3) continue to use the NURG 7004 leadership paper assignment as a method of having students apply didactic knowledge in combination with their student leadership self-assessment to an organizational scenario. The expectation is that by continuing what is working well, but incorporating learning methods that will enhance the course, the quality of student learning will improve.

Measure 6.2 (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – Inter-professional Collaboration for Improving Patient and Population Health Outcomes: **"**To what degree did your DNP program enhance your ability to employ consultative and leadership skills with teams to create change in complex health care delivery systems?
Expected Outcome: Mean score $\geq$ Carnegie mean score

Findings

2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.64; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.11   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 6.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 5.99   Target Met

Trending

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)
	Q114	Q115
NSU	6.64	6.67
Carnegie	6.11	5.99

Analysis. For the 2016-2017 assessment year NSU's mean score was 6.64, which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.11. Although this measure was met, Organizational Theory and Systems Leadership (NURG 7004) course faculty recognized that many students were confused about the specific content of the leadership skills self-assessment assignment. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2017-2018 was to: 1) provide an audio WebEx discussion of the various elements to be included in the leadership skills self-assessment assignment, and include the grading rubric in this discussion, and 2) have students include information from their leadership self-assessment evaluation in their final leadership paper assignment.

In 2017-2018, the plan developed in 2016 to present a detailed discussion of the various elements to be included and the grading rubric for the self-assessment and to continue the Leadership Paper assignment with inclusion of the information the students' gathered through their self-assessment evaluations was executed. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, NSU's mean score of 6.67 exceed the Carnegie mean score of 5.99. This data shows a two-year trend of meeting the expected outcome.

These excellent mean scores (6.64 and 6.67) are evidence that the students believed that the DNP program enhanced their ability to employ consultative and leadership skills with teams to create change in complex health care delivery systems. Course faculty, in the end of semester course report, stated they believed more content, or different content, on two topics, interprofessional collaboration and conflict management, were needed in the Organizational theory and Systems Leadership course (NURG 7004) offering. Based on the analysis of the results in 2017-2018, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) revise and update module quizzes, and 2) discuss Thomas and Kilmann's conflict management strategies to improve inter-professional collaboration skills. It is expected that by revising and updating quizzes for each content module and presenting Thomas and Kilmann's conflict management strategies, students development of leadership qualities expected in DNP graduates, such as inter-professional collaboration skills and conflict management skills will be enhanced.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, data analysis that revealed NSU's mean score of 6.67 exceeded the Carnegie mean score of 5.99, thus meeting the benchmark. Based on the analysis of the results in 2017-2018, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) revise and update module quizzes, and 2) discuss Thomas and Kilmann's conflict management strategies to improve inter-professional collaboration skills. It is expected that by revising and updating quizzes for each content module and presenting Thomas and Kilmann's conflict management strategies, students development of leadership qualities expected in DNP graduates, such as inter-professional collaboration skills and conflict management skills will be enhanced.

SLO 7. Synthesize data relevant to clinical prevention and health promotion for individuals, aggregates, and populations to guide implementation of the highest level of nursing practice.

Measure 7.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Clinical Prevention and Population Health (NURG 7001)
Assignment: Population Focused Prevention Project
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better

Findings

2015-2016 AY: 85.7% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2016-2017 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 92.3% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending
Fall 2014 – 100% (16/16)
Fall 2015 – 85.7% (6/7)
Fall 2016 – 100% (11/11)

Fall 2017 – 92.3% (12/13)

Analysis.   The Population Focused Prevention Project is a graded paper that is completed after students write their Vulnerable Population paper. In the Vulnerable Population paper, students identify a vulnerable population, discuss cultural and environmental influences that affect the population, describe health disparities or disparities that affect health, and finally analyze recourses, risks, and health status related to the Vulnerable Population Conceptual Model. Students also include a discussion about the role of the DNP prepared nurse related to improving outcomes in the population in their Vulnerable Population Paper.

This Vulnerable Population paper is a precursor for the Population Focused Prevention Project. The students build on the Vulnerable Population paper by developing a PICO question, identifying stakeholders, developing an interdisciplinary plan to achieve the outcome identified in the PICO question, and then discussing leadership competencies necessary for implementation of the proposed plan.

Analysis of 2016-2017 data revealed that 100% of students (N=11) enrolled in NURG 7001 Clinical Prevention and Population Health achieved a score of 80% or higher on the Population Focused Prevention Project, which met the expected outcome. Although this measure was met for the 2016-2017 assessment year, students enrolled in the organizational systems leadership (OSL) concentration of the DNP program struggled to understand how to determine health related disparities in their populations and how to relate those disparities to the Vulnerable Population Conceptual Model. Students must have a sound understanding of the vulnerable population and related disparities to complete the Population Focused Prevention Project. Based on the analysis of the results, the plans for the 2017-2018 assessment year included: 1) rewording/revising the rubric, 2) giving example content in each section, and 3) adding a recorded presentation of the expectations of both the Vulnerable Population paper and the Population Focused Prevention Project.

In 2017-2018 the plan was implemented. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, 92.3% of students (12 out of 13) acheived a score of 80% or better, meeting the expected outcome. It is noted, however, that the percentage of students passing dropped from 100% in 2016-2017 to 92.3% in 2017-2018. In 2017-2018 one student failed to make 80% on the Clinical Prevention and Population Health Assignment (NURG 7001): Population Focused Prevention Project. In reviewing this student's paper, 10 points were deducted for poor writing/grammar/spelling and APA. Had the student earned these 10 points, the grade would have been 81%, which would have met the expected outcome. Many students had points deducted for syntax, grammar, and failing to use APA formatting. NURG 7001 is one of the first courses in the DNP program and faculty have found that students' writing skills are often lacking. In a doctoral program, it is imperative that students be able to convey their intended message through writing. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) incorporate a writing seminar into the DNP Course Information Moodle shell with specific modules on grammar, sentence structure, professional writing, and APA; 2) discuss the importance of completing these modules prior to writing papers in the DNP orientation meeting; 3) continue to recommend the

use of editors for students who have difficulty writing; and 4) continue with the recorded presentation and provide updated rubrics and exemplars.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, 92.3% of students (12 out of 13) acheived a score of 80% or better, meeting the expected outcome. This was a decrease from the 2016-2017 results of 100%. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) incorporate a writing seminar into the DNP Course Information Moodle shell with specific modules on grammar, sentence structure, professional writing, and APA; 2) discuss the importance of completing these modules prior to writing papers in the DNP orientation meeting; 3) continue to recommend the use of editors for students who have difficulty writing; and 4) continue with the recorded presentation and provide updated rubrics and exemplars. The expectation is that by executing this plan, students will improve in their writing ability, understand course assignments, and be successful in both the NURG 7001 course and the DNP program.

Measure 7.2 (Indirect-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Skyfactor™ Question – Clinical Prevention and Population Health for Improving the Nation's Health: To what degree did your DNP program enhance your ability to synthesize concepts related to population health in: 1) implementing interventions to improve the care of populations; 2) evaluating interventions to improve care of populations?
Expected Outcome: Mean score $\geq$ Carnegie mean score

Findings

Implementing interventions
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.91; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.17   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 6.67; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.13   Target Met

Evaluating interventions
2016-2017 AY: NSU Mean – 6.91; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.17   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: NSU Mean – 6.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 6.11   Target Met

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)
	Q117 Implementing interventions	Q118 Implementing interventions
NSU	6.91	6.67
Carnegie	6.17	6.13
	Q118 Evaluating interventions	Q119 Evaluating interventions
NSU	6.91	6.67
Carnegie	6.17	6.11

Analysis. Improving the health of vulnerable populations is the focus of NSU's DNP program. Students are being prepared to improve the health of vulnerable populations in most of their DNP courses. This preparation culminates into students producing an end of program Scholarly Project. The Scholarly Project requires students to implement an evidence supported practice change that would improve the health of their chosen vulnerable population. Students are encouraged to perform assignments throughout the DNP program related to their vulnerable population of interest to be prepared to plan, implement, evaluate, and disseminate their scholarly projects. Once the practice change is implemented, students analyze the data and evaluate the impact of the intervention on practice and/or systems organization. This scholarly project has been improved upon every year since the onset of the DNP program. DNP faculty regularly attend the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) Annual DNP Education Conference to stay abreast of changes in DNP education and to network with other DNP program leaders to bring back helpful information for improvements in the program.

In 2016 NSU hired a statistician to help students analyze their data. Students worked one on one with their major professor with input from at least one committee member. Major professor/committee members consist of one faculty member prepared at the research doctorate level, either PhD or DNS, and one faculty member prepared at the practice doctorate level, DNP, to assure the students have both a research and a practice perspective.

Two Skyfactor™ questions are used to evaluate SLO 7, Measure 7.2. The first question asks student to describe the degree to which the DNP program enhanced their ability to synthesize concepts related to population health in the implementation of interventions to improve the care of populations. The second question asks students to describe the degree to which the DNP program enhanced their ability to synthesize concepts related to population health in the evaluation of interventions to improve care of populations. In the 2016-2017 assessment year, NSU's mean score for the first question was 6.91, which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.17. NSU's mean score for the second question was 6.91 also, which met the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.17. These mean scores are evidence that the DNP students believed that the DNP program enhanced their ability to synthesize concepts related to population health in the implementation and evaluation of interventions to improve care of populations. After reviewing results of data from the 2016-2017 assessment year, the DNP curriculum committee recommended 1) increasing the rigor of some of the projects, 2) rewriting the Scholarly Project Components in the Graduate School Guidelines to offer more clarity to the students, and 3) having the statistician involved with the students from inception of the scholarly projects to be sure students understood the necessary steps of implementation in order to have a more rigorous project with meaningful evaluation of data after data collection.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, all the above plans were executed.

The Skyfactor survey in 2017-2018 showed NSU's mean score was 6.67 on both questions, which exceeded the Carnegie mean scores of 6.13 and 6.11 for the questions above. (See the chart above). These mean scores are further evidence that the DNP students believed that the DNP program enhanced their ability to synthesize concepts related to population health in the implementation and evaluation of interventions to improve care of populations. Although the expected outcomes were exceeded, DNP faculty noticed that students continued to have difficulty in their doctorial defense presentations with understanding and interpretation of data analysis. Based on results of the 2017-2018 data analysis, as well as faculty discussions at the DNP curriculum committee, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) include a DNP prepared faculty member, in addition to a statistics expert, as part of the teaching team in NURG 7003 Biostatistics, 2) include data sets in NURG 7003 that are similar to the students' work in the DNP program, 3) ensure all DNP program faculty attend a minimum of one DNP Education conference annually, and 4) ensure both committee members continue involvement throughout the scholarly project. The expectation is that by following this plan, student's understanding of biostatistics as related to their scholarly project will be enhanced, and they will improve in their responses to statistics related questions in their DNP final defense presentations.

Decision: In the 2017-2018 assessment year, NSU's mean score of 6.67 on both Skyfactor™ questions exceeded the Carnegie mean scores of 6.13 and 6.11 for the questions on Measure 7.2. Based on results of the 2017-2018 data analysis, as well as faculty discussions at the DNP curriculum committee, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) include a DNP prepared faculty member, in addition to a statistics expert, as part of the teaching team in NURG 7003 Biostatistics, 2) include data sets in NURG 7003 that are similar to the students' work in the DNP program, 3) ensure all DNP program faculty attend a minimum of one DNP Education conference annually, and 4) ensure both committee members continue involvement throughout the scholarly project. The expectation is that by following this plan, student's understanding of biostatistics as related to their scholarly project will be enhanced, and they will improve in their responses to statistics related questions in their DNP final defense presentations.

SLO 8. Demonstrate advanced practice expertise, specialized knowledge, and expanded responsibility and accountability in the care, management, and evaluation of individuals, families, and communities in a specialty practice area within the domain of nursing.

Measure 8.1 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Scholarly Project Paper Completion (NURG 7012: Scholarly Project Practicum Course)
Expected Outcome: 90% of students will achieve a "Pass"

Findings

2016-2017 AY: 100% scored "Pass"   Expected Outcome: 90%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored "Pass"   Expected Outcome: 90%   Target Met

Trending
Summer 2016 – 100% (10/10)
Fall 2016   – 100% (2/2)
Spring 2017   – 100% (1/1)
Summer 2017 – 100% (5/5)

Analysis. Students begin working on their scholarly project paper in NURG 7010. NURG 7010 is the first of three courses (7010, 7011, and 7012) that guide students through identification, development, implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of their scholarly project. The scholarly project paper is composed of five chapters (Introduction, Synthesis of Evidence, Methodology, Results, and Summary/Discussion of Results). Each DNP student must successfully complete the final scholarly project paper and orally defend the project to be eligible for graduation. The paper is written in APA format and represents a synthesis of program coursework and practice application.

Analysis of 2016-2017 data revealed that 100% of the students (N=12) enrolled in NURG 7012 achieved a "Pass" on their Scholarly Project Paper. However, students expressed difficulty in understanding the formatting of the paper and how to make the paper congruent with the graduate school's formatting requirements for paper-in-lieu-of thesis. Based on 2016-2017 analysis of the results, the plan for 2017-2018 was for faculty to: 1) make revisions to the outline of the paper and create a document that specifically describes the graduate school's guidelines as they relate to the Scholarly Project, 2) create a document with frequently asked questions (FAQ) about the scholarly project paper, to help both students and faculty navigate the paper development process, and 3) change the curriculum pattern and offer NURG 7002 immediately prior to students enrolling in NURG 7010, so that a draft of the evidence appraisal chapter of the paper would already be started and students would be better prepared to begin their scholarly project papers the next semester. It was the expectation that by editing the outline to be more congruent with graduate school guidelines, creating a document that describes key points regarding the graduate school's guidelines for paper in lieu of thesis, and constructing a FAQ document, students would have less difficulty in formatting the paper. It was also anticipated that by moving NURG 7002 to immediately prior to students taking the NURG 7010 course, students would be better prepared to begin writing their scholarly project papers, and the time needed to prepare the first three chapters, receive Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, and implement the project, would be decreased.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan to edit the paper outline was completed and the revised outline was placed in the Scholarly Project Paper Guidelines and shared with students and faculty in NURG 7010, 7011, and 7012 course syllabi. Also, the FAQ document was developed to better explain specifics of the university's graduate school guidelines for the paper in lieu of thesis that students and faculty had difficulty understanding. The FAQ document was created and shared with NURG 7010

course faculty and students. Finally, as planned, the NURG 7002 was moved in the curriculum pattern to be taught immediately prior to the NURG 7010 course to better prepare the student's scholarly project papers.

Analysis of the 2017-2018 results revealed that 100% of the students (N=6) enrolled in NURG 7012 achieved a "Pass" on their Scholarly Project Paper. Because of implemented changes, students seemed to be less confused about program paper guidelines and graduate school guidelines. However, it was noted by several faculty that the rigor of the scholarly projects, and thus the quality of the scholarly project papers, appeared to be declining. Students were also having issues receiving IRB approval, for a multitude of reasons. The DNP program director contacted other DNP programs to discuss possible solutions to the numerous difficulties students were having obtaining IRB approval, and how to enhance rigor. The program director discovered that these were shared issues with many other DNP programs. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year are to: 1) have all DNP faculty attend a DNP Scholarly Project Initial Proposal Defense in the NURG 7002 course to give both the students and the major professors input into creating a rigorous and yet doable scholarly project; 2) add a new stipulation that once the project is approved, it cannot be changed without going through the committee approval process again; 3) have all DNP faculty review DNP students' IRB proposals and make recommendations to the university's IRB committee regarding "exempt status proposals" and to make recommendations to students so they are better prepared for IRB submission; and 4) develop an "exempt proposal checklist" to help students understand if their scholarly project proposal qualifies as exempt. The expectation is that by implementing these changes, the rigor of the scholarly projects, and thus the scholarly project papers, will be enhanced, and students would have less trouble navigating the IRB process.

Decision: Analysis of the 2017-2018 results revealed that 100% of the students (N=6) enrolled in NURG 7012 achieved a "Pass" on their Scholarly Project Paper Completion. Because of implemented changes, students seemed to be less confused about program paper guidelines and graduate school guidelines. However, faculty were concerned about the declining quality of the Scholarly Projects. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year are to: 1) have all DNP faculty attend a DNP Scholarly Project Initial Proposal Defense in the NURG 7002 course to give both the students and the major professors input into creating a rigorous and yet doable scholarly project; 2) add a new stipulation that once the project is approved, it cannot be changed without going through the committee approval process again; 3) have all DNP faculty review DNP students' IRB proposals and make recommendations to the university's IRB committee regarding "exempt status proposals" and to make recommendations to students so they are better prepared for IRB submission; and 4) develop an "exempt proposal checklist" to help students understand if the scholarly project proposal qualifies as exempt. The expectation is that by implementing these changes, the rigor of the scholarly projects, and thus the scholarly project papers, will be enhanced, and students would have less trouble navigating the IRB process.

Measure 8.2 (Direct-Knowledge)

Assessment Method: Scholarly Project Practicum Portfolio (NURG 7012)
Expected Outcome: 100% of students will satisfactorily complete > 1000 supervised post baccalaureate practice hours

Findings

2016-2017 AY: 100% completed requirements Expected Outcome: 100% Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% completed requirements Expected Outcome: 100% Target Met
Trending
Summer 2016 – 100% (10/10)
Fall 2016   – 100% (2/2)
Spring 2017   – 100% (1/1)
Summer 2017 – 100**%** (5/5)

Analysis: The scholarly project practicum portfolio is the students' written report of all the practicum hours they have achieved throughout the program and how those hours meet specific DNP graduate competencies. The portfolio documents achievement of scholarly project outcomes and ongoing reflection of professional and individual growth into the DNP scholar. The portfolio is organized so that the reviewer can clearly evaluate attainment of the DNP Program Outcomes, and includes a chart formatted into the following sections: (1) date hours occurred, (2) what type of clinical experience occurred, (3) where hours were earned, (4) hours earned, (5) total hours earned, (6) course objective number that the activity met, (7) program objective number that the activity met and, and (8) DNP Essential number that the activity met.

All earned clinical hours are required to correspond to the student's self-rated evaluation of needed direct practice hours to achieve proficiency of each DNP competency prior to graduation. The portfolio is graded as Pass or Fail by using the Scholarly Project Practicum Portfolio Review Rubric. The portfolio is not considered Passing unless the students have completed a minimum of 1000 direct practice hours. Because these students are master prepared, they have previously earned a number of post-baccalaureate direct practice hours in their master's program. The number of hours earned depends on the type of concentration the students were enrolled in for their MSN program. The number of clinical hours they have acquired prior to entry into the program is discussed with the student upon acceptance into the program. Students are aware of how many additional clinical hours they need to meet the 1000 hours required to graduate.

Analysis of 2016-2017 data revealed that 100% of the students enrolled in NURG 7012 achieved a "Pass" on their Scholarly Project Practicum Portfolio, which demonstrates completion of the required 1000 post baccalaureate practice hours to earn the DNP degree. The first semester many questions were asked by students and faculty, regarding what counts, and does not count, as clinical hours. Additionally, many students did not understand that the clinical hours did not have to be directly related to their scholarly project. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for the 2017-2018 assessment year was to: 1) created a Clinical Hours WebEx session for the 2017 NURG 7010 course for use by all DNP students and faculty, that better explained obtainment of the 1000 post baccalaureate practice hours and how those hours are not

required to be tied to the students' scholarly projects. It was anticipated that this WebEx would decrease student and faculty confusion regarding clinical practice hours; and 2) continue to have students document their practice hours aligned to their DNP competencies.

In 2017-2018, the planned development and execution of the Clinical Hours WebEx was semi-successful. All DNP faculty and students were given access to the WebEx, but relatively few students or faculty accessed the WebEx. Analysis of 2017-2018 data revealed that 100% of the students (N=6) enrolled in NURG 7012 satisfactorily completed a minimum of 1000 supervised post baccalaureate practice hours. Although this is an excellent outcome, and the requirement of 1000 post baccalaureate direct practice hours is dictated by national nursing accreditation agencies and national nursing certifying bodies, because students and faculty did not utilize the Clinical Hours WebEx available to them in 2016, confusion remained about what counts and does not count as direct practice hours. Additionally, faculty believe there are numerous activities that occur throughout the program in various courses, such as NURG 7007, that could count towards the student's required practice hours. Faculty discussed this issue during the end of semester DNP program curriculum committee. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is: 1) for students to count direct practice hours earned in courses throughout the program, if those hours corresponded to needed hours on the student's individualized DNP competency self-evaluation form and are approved by their major professor; 2) to present the Clinical Hours WebEx in the new DNP student orientation and post it in each major professor's Moodle shell for the NURG 7010 course; 3) for major professors to have at least weekly communication with their students in which they discuss the student's plans to obtain the required hours.

The expectation is that if students and faculty are required to view the Clinical Hours WebEx at the beginning of the program and again when placed in their individual major professor's NURG 7010 Moodle course shells, that students and faculty will better understand the requirements, and students will be better prepared to obtain the required hours. Further, the expectation is that if students perform the DNP competency self-assessment early in the program and if they can align needed DNP competency requirements to the clinical hours that are found in many DNP courses throughout the program, they will be allowed to count those hours toward their required 1000 hours.

Decision: The results for 2017-2018 data analysis results revealed that 100% of the students (N=6) enrolled in NURG 7012 satisfactorily completed a minimum of 1000 post baccalaureate practice hours. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is: 1) for students to count direct practice hours earned in courses throughout the program, if those hours corresponded to needed hours on the student's individualized DNP competency self-evaluation form and are approved by their major professor; 2) to present the Clinical Hours WebEx in the new DNP student orientation and post it in each major professor's Moodle shell for the NURG 7010 course; 3) for major professors to have at least weekly communication with their students in which they discuss the student's plans to obtain the required hours.

It is expected that by implementing these improvements to the DNP program, and specifically to the 2018-2019 offering of the scholarly practicum courses, students

and faculty will better understand the clinical hour requirements and students will be better prepared to obtain the required hours. Additionally, it is expected that if students perform a DNP competency self-assessment and can align their needed DNP competency requirements to clinical hours that are offered in DNP courses throughout the program, and have those hours approved with their major professor, they will be able to count the hours toward their required 1000 hours. Finally, it is expected that by having all major professors communicate weekly with their DNP students about their obtainment of the needed hours, students will remain focused, be less confused about obtainment of hours, and be better able to obtain the required hours.

Comprehensive summary of key evidence of improvements based on analysis of the results.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the DNP program implemented many plans to enhance student learning. Changes were made based on student evaluations, data collected as seen in the SLO measures, student feedback, faculty assessment of students, and implementation of best practices. Below are measures that were implemented in the 2017-2018 assessment year that contributed to DNP student learning and success:

- Added Audio enhanced PowerPoint for midterm review to the Moodle shell in NURG7000 Scientific Underpinnings for Practice so students unable to attend the live review via WebEx would have access to the review.
- Added Audio enhanced PowerPoint for midterm review to the Moodle shell in NURG7000 Scientific Underpinnings for Practice so students unable to attend the live review via WebEx would have access to the review.
- Set up live conferences (phone, face to face, or WebEx) with individual students to go over difficult content in several courses.
- Provided "Tips for Answering Discussion Forums" PowerPoint recorded over WebEx for student use before beginning discussion board assignments to ensure scholarly discussion.
- Moved NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course from spring semester to summer semester so students would critically analyze models to incorporate into their scholarly project/paper *immediately prior* to writing their scholarly paper in NURG 7010 DNP Scholarly Project Practicum I in the fall semester.
- Added a live WebEx (instead of recorded) to the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course to help students understand the appraisal process.
- Changed textbooks which primarily focused on research appraisal to textbooks which specifically focused on use of best evidence to develop and implement the scholarly project.
- Revised the NURG 7005 Information Systems Technology syllabus to ensure each component of the CDSS was viewed as separate so students understood grading process of each assignment
- Updated learning modules in NURG 7005 Information Systems Technology to reflect which component of the CDSS was being assigned, gave a brief synopsis

of the prior learning components, and told students what to expect in future components.

- Required students to complete a minimum of 24 clinical practice hours working with vulnerable populations, policymakers, and healthcare workers in NURG 7007 Healthcare Policy: Analysis, Advocacy, and Transformation.
- Added two live WebEx question and answer sessions to the NURG 7007 Healthcare Policy: Analysis, Advocacy, and Transformation course per student request to ensure understanding of information such as ethical assignment/debate.
- Added introductory WebEx videos to explain course syllabi, expectations, and grading criteria.
- Moved the NURG 7004 Organizational Theory and Systems Leadership from summer semester to spring semester to help students understand their expected leadership competencies prior to needing them in the subsequent courses.
- Provided an audio WebEx discussion of the various elements to be included in the leadership skills self-assessment assignment, and expectations for grading the assignment.
- Required students to include information from their leadership self-assessment evaluation in their final leadership paper assignment to add reflection and insight needed for growth.
- Revised the rubrics for the Vulnerable Population paper and Population Focused Prevention Project paper in NURG 7001 Clinical Prevention and Population Health and provided example content in each section to facilitate student understanding of the expectations of the assignments.
- Added a WebEx recorded presentation of the expectations for the Vulnerable Population paper and the Population Focused Prevention Project paper in NURG 7001 Clinical Prevention and Population Health.
- Rewrote the Scholarly Project Components in the Graduate School Guidelines to offer more clarity to the students on required components of their projects.
- Implemented statistician involvement with the DNP students from inception of the scholarly projects, rather than just at the data analysis phase, to be sure students understood the necessary steps of implementation in order to have a more rigorous project with meaningful evaluation of data after data collection.
- Added a frequently asked question section to the Scholarly Project courses' syllabi that summarized the key points of the Graduate School's Guidelines, as they relate to the Scholarly Project, to reduce difficulty for faculty and students in formatting Scholarly Project papers.
- Created a Clinical Hours WebEx session for the NURG 7010 DNP Scholarly Project Practicum I course to decrease student and faculty confusion regarding clinical practice hours competencies. This WebEx, for all DNP students and faculty, better explained the obtainment of the 1000 post baccalaureate practice hours, and how those hours are not required to be tied to the students' scholarly projects.

In addition, several graduates have published articles based on their Scholarly Project in peer reviewed nursing journals. These include:

- Utilization of a Clinical Reminder System to Increase the Incidence of Hepatitis C Screening by Jennifer Cameron, Robyn Ray
- Utilization of iPad Technology to Decrease pediatric Preoperative Anxiety by Rosaline Caldwell
- Benefits of Passive Warming on Surgical patients Undergoing Regional Anesthetic Procedures by Amy Williams

Plan of action moving forward.

Many changes will be made during the 2018-2019 assessment year based on the analysis of the 2017-2018 results. Below are plans for the 2018-2019 assessment year.

- Increase the percentage of class time in NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings devoted to teaching content which demonstrates integration of biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational sciences and decrease content which teaches philosophical concepts and precepts.
- Integrate student-course faculty phone calls to review difficult course content into student learning practices (NURG 7000)
- Find YouTube videos which enhance learning of difficult content and integrate selected videos into required readings/materials (NURG 7000)
- Post the audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm review to the Moodle shell for those who cannot attend the WebEx Midterm review (NURG 7000)
- Evaluate the continued use of Skyfactor as a measure of this SLO, especially when Skyfactor is administered one year after students take NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings, and the results were vastly different from the end of semester course evaluation results
- Incorporate a writing seminar into the DNP Course Information Moodle shell with specific modules on grammar, sentence structure, professional writing, and APA (NURG 7001)
- Discuss the importance of completing the writing modules modules prior to writing papers in the DNP orientation meeting (NURG 7001)
- Include a DNP prepared faculty member, in addition to a statistics expert, as part of the teaching team (NURG 7003 Biostatistics)
- Include data sets in NURG 7003 that are similar to the students' work in the DNP program
- Eliminate the NURG 7002 Module 1, Discussion Forum 2, and thus remove it from the assessment measure 2.1
- Have students begin writing the framework application portion of their scholarly project defense in NURG 7002 and use it as a replacement for the previous Discussion Forum 2 (NURG 7002)
- Grade the new framework application assignment in NURB 7002 with the *Framework* category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric which asks

faculty to evaluate the students' work as *Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory with Revisions,* or *Satisfactory* (NURG 7002)

- Replace measure for 2.1 with the new measure "100% of students will score *Satisfactory with Revisions* or *Satisfactory* on the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric." (NURG 7002)
- Post *Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx* recording in the first DNP course (NURG 7000)
- Evaluate student and faculty perceptions of students' having difficulty completing their scholarly project before next offering of the NURG 7002 course to see if moving the course to Summer helped them to complete their scholarly project paper development on time (NURG 7002)
- Combine the qualitative and quantitative research appraisal modules and have students only perform a single, satisfactory, research critique/appraisal, either qualitative or quantitative, rather than one qualitative critique and one quantitative critique (NURG 7002)
- Continue to utilize face-to-face individual student conferences and/or individual phone calls to explain the one research critique (NURG 7002)
- Schedule a live WebEx session to explain the appraisal process, and specific issues the students are having with the critique. (NURG 7002)
- Students to complete a review of literature in the NURG 7002 course that they can use as the basis for their completed evaluation of evidence in their next course, NURG 7010 Scholarly Project Practicum
- Develop and utilize a grading rubric which is congruent with the review of literature assignment's expectations (NURG 7002)
- Convert the current discussion forums into video discussion forums to enhance student learning. (NURG 7002)
- Add a must-read document that links the DNP essentials to the essential components in each course assignment (NURG 7005)
- Change the CDSS project to a Health Information Technology Project (NURG 7005)
- Change the Consumer E-Health Information paper to a discussion forum where students can engage each other and be exposed to more information than they would doing a paper individually. (NURG 7005)
- Develop a WebEx explaining the clinical hour requirement and how those hours can be achieved through the advocacy assignment and other course assignments (NURG 7007)
- Have the students submit a plan within the first two weeks of the course on how they plan to meet the clinical hour requirement. (NURG 7007)
- Re-structure the course assignments to ensure course assignments are inclusive of students in both concentrations. Specific to this SLO, the plan is for the ethical debate topics to be revised and include ethical dilemmas which may affect those enrolled in the OSL concentration. (NURG 7007)
- Add video discussion forums, instead of only having written discussion forums, to increase student engagement in class discussions and to improve the quality of the discussion forums (NURG 7004)
- Revise and update module quizzes (NURG 7004)

- Discuss Thomas and Kilmann's conflict management strategies to improve inter-professional collaboration skills. (NURG 7004)
- Have all DNP faculty attend a DNP Scholarly Project Initial Proposal Defense in the NURG 7002 course to give both the students and the major professors input into creating a rigorous and yet doable scholarly project
- Add a new stipulation that once the scholarly project is approved, it cannot be changed without going through the committee approval process again (program)
- Have all DNP faculty review DNP students' IRB proposals and make recommendations to the university's IRB committee regarding "exempt status proposals" and to make recommendations to students so they are better prepared for IRB submission
- Develop an "exempt proposal checklist" to help students understand if the scholarly project proposal qualifies as exempt. (NURG 7010)
- Students to count direct practice hours earned in courses throughout the program, if those hours corresponded to needed hours on the student's individualized DNP competency self-evaluation form and are approved by their major professor.
- Present the Clinical Hours WebEx in the new DNP student orientation and post it in each major professor's Moodle shell for the NURG 7010 course
- Major professors will have at least weekly communication with their students in which they discuss the student's plans to obtain the required hours. (NURG 7007)
- Provide updated rubrics and exemplars for projects.
- Ensure all DNP program faculty attend a minimum of one DNP Education conference annually,
- Continue the interventions from 2017-2018 which had a positive impact on student learning/achievement.
- Evaluate program SLO measures for effectiveness and efficiency.

The expectations are that by continuing what is working well, and incorporating new interventions based on the analysis of last year's results, that student learning will be enhanced. Below are the expectations of implementing changes based on the analysis of the results from 2017-2018:
- Increasing the rigor of the scholarly projects, and thus the scholarly project papers
- Students will have less trouble navigating the IRB process
- Students will have less problems formatting the Scholarly Project paper
- Students will improve in their ability to write
- Requirements for assignments will be clearer
- Student's understanding of biostatistics as related to their scholarly project will be enhanced
- Students will improve in their responses to statistics related questions in their DNP final defense presentations.
- By having students integrate the framework content into their scholarly project defense proposal, students will be better be able to integrate a health care

delivery model for vulnerable populations, be better prepared for the next semester, and have a portion of their scholarly project proposal written.

- By incorporating the tips for discussion forums PowerPoint WebEx recording in the first DNP course students' postings will improve on their discussion forums.
- Presenting Thomas and Kilmann's conflict management strategies, students development of leadership qualities expected in DNP graduates, such as inter-professional collaboration skills and conflict management skills will be enhanced.
- By moving NURG 7002 course to immediately before NURG 7010 where students begin constructing the paper, students will better be able to integrate a health care delivery model for vulnerable populations into their Scholarly Defense Paper and complete the scholarly project paper in a timely manner.
- By having the quantitative and qualitative modules combined, and only requiring students to complete one satisfactory research critique, either qualitative or quantitative, students will be able to focus on finding quality studies that can be used to implement an evidence-based practice change.
- By posting a WebEx about the clinical hour requirement and by having students submit a plan for meeting the requirement within the first two weeks of the course, students will not be overwhelmed trying to meet this requirement at the end of the course.
- By changing the discussion forums from written to video format, students will feel more engaged in the course, and learning via discussion
- By adding a must-read document linking course content to DNP essentials, students will better understand why they are doing certain assignments and how those assignments relate to DNP education.
- By changing the CDSS module to a Health Information Technology Project, students will choose a project that is more congruent with their current role. Finally, it is expected that changing the Consumer E-Health Information paper to a discussion forum will prompt students to engage in robust discussion with each other and be exposed to more information than they would doing a paper individually.
- By reviewing the entire course from an OSL student's perspective, including the ethical dilemmas, all students will feel the course enhances their ability to advocate for ethical policies in the all healthcare arenas.
- By having all major professors communicate weekly with their DNP students about their obtainment of the needed hours, students will remain focused, be less confused about obtainment of hours, and be better able to obtain the required hours.