Doctor of Nursing Practice Program

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

Prepared by: Dr. Connie Hale, Dr. Debra Clark   Date: 6-21-2019

Approved by: Dr. Dana Clawson, Dean   Date: 6-21-2019

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 (CON) 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 DNP program curriculum committee (PCC) 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 2017 year as 2017-2018 and 2018 year as 2018-2019.
Note[3]: For the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 assessment years, the response to the Skyfactor survey was 3 students each year. Skyfactor does not routinely give results for surveys with less than 6 responses, as the small sample size can show bias. However, Skyfactor did provide results after our request.

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

Finding. Target was met.

2016-2017 AY: 90% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% scored $\geq$ 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

2018-2019 AY: 89% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending.
Fall 2016 –   90% (9/10)
Fall 2017 – 100% (13/13)
Fall 2018 –   89% (16/18)

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

     In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for 2018-2019 was to: (1) find YouTube videos which enhanced learning of difficult content and integrate selected videos into required readings/materials, (2) integrate student-course faculty phone calls to review difficult course content that students were struggling to understand prior to them taking the midterm and comprehensive final exam, and (3) post the audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm review to the Moodle shell for those who cannot attend the WebEx Midterm review.

     In the 2018-2019 assessment year, all three action plans were implemented: (1) Two additional YouTube videos were added to better explain the philosophical content, that students traditionally have difficulty understanding; (2) Students that requested a phone call to aid in understanding difficult content, received a phone call (after scheduling a time convenient to them) from the course instructor where difficult content was reviewed. Phone calls were offered prior to the midterm examination and final examinations; and (3) The Audio Enhanced PowerPoint midterm review was posted to the Moodle shell for those who could not attend the WebEx Midterm review.

     In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 89% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on the midterm exam in NURG 7000, meeting the expected outcome. Emails from students which demonstrated students' feelings about the difficult course content and understanding, included statements such as "…I also now understand why it is so important to integrate scientific knowledge from more than just nursing-science into practice…this has been eye-opening"… and "…thank you for the phone calls to help us understand this new material, it can be a lot!".. and "thanks for exposing me to so many theories from multiple disciplines outside of healthcare… I have found an organizational theory for my scholarly project that I am sure will help me to perform a quality practice change and evaluate the outcomes… I would have never thought to look at organizational and systems theories had I not been exposed to them in this course…"

Decision. Based on the analysis of the evidence, the plan for 2019-2020 assessment year is to 1) integrate a voice over PowerPoint explaining Philosophical concepts from a content expert "guest lecturer", who teaches philosophy at the graduate level, 2) add an additional teaching-learning assignment that involves students applying one of theories

from a scientific discipline, other than nursing, to the development of an improvement plan proposal to fix one process problem identified in the student's current practice setting; and, 2) change the "phone calls" that the course faculty offered to students last year in hopes of explaining difficulty course content, to scheduled "online advising hours". Hopefully the addition of online advising hours will increase the students' opportunities to contact course faculty and not only discuss problems with understanding course content, but also any other issues/concerns/thoughts they would like to share about the course/assignments/program, etc.

Measure 1.2.
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

Finding. Target was 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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.67; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.18   Target Not 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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.33; Carnegie Mean Score - 5.80   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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – NR ; Carnegie Mean Score – 5.93   Unable to Assess

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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.33; Carnegie Mean Score - 5.97   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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.33; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.05   Target Not Met

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

Trending

Skyfactor	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)	2018-2019 (n=3)
	Q49 (ethical science)	Q50 (ethical science)	Q50 (ethical science)
NSU	6.75	6.33	5.67
Carnegie	6.21	6.12	6.18
	Q50 (biophysical science)	Q51 (biophysical science)	Q51 (biophysical science)
NSU	6.75	5.67	5.33
Carnegie	5.80	5.85	5.80
	Q51 (psychosocial science)	Q52 (psychosocial science)	Q52 (psychosocial science)
NSU	6.75	5.67	*NR
Carnegie	6.04	5.97	5.93
	Q52 (analytical science)	Q53 (analytical science)	Q53 (analytical science)
NSU	6.75	5.67	5.33
Carnegie	6.12	6.02	5.97
	Q53 (organizational science)	Q54 (organizational science)	Q54 (organizational science)
NSU	6.75	5.0	5.33
Carnegie	6.18	6.1	6.05

*NR =not reported if N<3

Analysis. The concepts for this measure are taught in NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings through discussion forums and course teaching-learning assignments.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met for Ethics and not met for the other four components. Based on the analysis of the 2017-2018 results, the plan for 2018-2019 assessment year was 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. In other words, students' responses on the current year's (2018-2019) Skyfactor assessment were actually from students who took course in the 2016 and graduated in Summer 2018. This disparity in data collection causes the action plan to not correlate to the assessment findings in measure 1.2. This gap in data collection for this measure, which occurs two years after students take the course, explains why the 2018 students' end of semester course evaluations are vastly different than the analysis of Skyfactor data obtained for the 2018-2019 assessment year; and 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.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the second action plan, to decrease the philosophical modules from four modules to two modules and increase the portion of the

course devoted to teaching content which demonstrates integration of biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational sciences, was executed.

The first action plan, to evaluate ongoing use of Skyfactor as an assessment method for this SLO, was performed. DNP faculty and assessment committee discussed the problems with using Skyfactor as a measure for this SLO include: 1) there are very few DNP students taking the Skyfactor final program assessment, because there are very few DNP students, and Skyfactor states they will not offer results for question that less than three students answered; and 2) Although for 2018-2019, the expected learning outcomes assessed by Skyfactor were not met on all questions in this measure except one; and the one question we are unable to analyze because less than three students responded, and 3) the three students who did respond to 4 of the 5 questions are describing their opinions as to what happened in the course in Fall 2016, when they took the course; not Fall 2018 when these Skyfactor results are being analyzed. Therefore, the Skyfactor results from the action plan implemented in 2018 will not be seen in the Skyfactor survey results until the Summer of 2020 or later, when the 2018 NURG 7000 students take the end-of-program Skyfactor survey at time of graduation.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results for 2018-2019, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) use the current semester end-of-course student evaluations, including student comments about achievement of SLO 1, as a second measure of this SLO, rather than Skyfactor results due to the incongruency in timing of the Skyfactor analysis; and 2) have students schematically demonstrate (in their scholarly project proposal) the linkages between key concepts from ethical, biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational theories and the concepts they are planning to integrate into their scholarly project.

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.
Assessment Method: Framework Application Assignment (NURG 7002)   New Measure
Expected outcome: 100% of students will score *Satisfactory with Revisions or Satisfactory* on the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric

Finding. Target was met.

New Measure
2018-2019 AY: 100% (13/13)

Trending.
Old Measure: Clinical Scholarship (NURG 7002) Assignment: Module 1, Discussion Forum 2; Expected Outcome: 80% of students will achieve a score of 80% or better.
Spring 2016 – 100% (6/6)
Summer 2017 – 100% (8/8)
New Measure: Framework Application portion of the Scholarly Project Proposal Presentation (NURG 7002)
Summer 2018 – 100 % (13/13)

Analysis. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, 100% of students made an 80% or higher on the Module 1 Assignment, Discussion Forum 2 in the NURG 7002 Clinical Scholarship course. Therefore, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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* and 4) replace measure for 2.1 with the new measure "100% of students will score *Satisfactory* or *Satisfactory with Revisions* on the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation Rubric." The expectation was, that by having students integrate the framework content into their scholarly project defense proposal, students would be better able to integrate a health care delivery model for vulnerable populations as required in their final program project and have a preliminary portion of their scholarly project proposal written.

In the 2018-2019 AY, the Module 1 Discussion Forum 2 was eliminated as a Measure 2.1. The old measure was replaced with the Framework portion of the Scholarly Project Proposal Presentation in NURG 7002. The Framework portion of the Scholarly Project Proposal Presentation requires students to discuss a conceptual framework in relation to the purpose, aims, and objectives of their scholarly project. This is graded based on the NURG 7002 DNP Scholarly Project Proposal Presentation rubric. In the 2018-2019 AY, 100% (13/13) of students scored *Satisfactory* or *Satisfactory with Revisions* on the Framework category of the Scholarly Proposal Presentation.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 AY is to revise course assignments to focus more on Quality Improvement and less on critiquing research. The expectation is that by changing the focus of the course assignments students will better understand translation of research to improve health outcomes, rather than the processes for critiquing and conducting original research.

Measure 2.2.
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

Finding. Unable to evaluate.

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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – NR; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.12 Unable to evaluate

Trending.

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)	2018-2019 (n= <3)
	Q116	Q117	Q117
NSU	6.82	6.67	*NR
Carnegie	6.12	6.09	6.12

*NR =not reported if N<3

Analysis. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. Faculty reported that these activities helped students in the writing and development of their scholarly projects. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, there were no scores from Skyfactor for this question due to low number of graduates/students completing the survey.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 is to: 1) revise course (NURG 7002) assignments to reflect more emphasis on quality improvement and less on critiquing research. The expectation is that students will better understand translating research to improve health outcomes, rather than conducting original research; and 2) Re-evaluate using Skyfactor as a benchmark for this SLO due to small numbers of graduating students making results less meaningful, annual class offerings, and changes that may occur in the content and delivery based on course feedback prior to graduating students taking Skyfactor survey.

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.
Assessment Method: Single Study Research Appriasal Assignment (NURG 7002)
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Previously, Measure 3.1 and 3.2 were two separate measures of a quantitative and a qualitative research appraisal. The 2018-2019 assessment year is the first year the two were combined into one measure. The previous measures had met expectations since 2015.

Finding. The target was met.

2018-2019: 100% scored >80% (13/13)

Analysis. The research appraisal asks the student to systematically appraise/critique/ evaluate a quantitative or qualitative 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 research appraisal model guides the student in the appraisal process.
        In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met for the 3.1 and 3.2 (quantitative and qualitative research appraisals). Based on analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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 were asked to perform only one complete, satisfactory research critique in the course. Additionally, the faculty were to 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 were having with the critique.
        In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. All students (N=13) scored > 80% of the Research Appraisal, exceeding the expected outcome.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 is to:
1) Increase the offerings of face-to face individual student conferences or WebEx meetings as needed to aid in student understanding of research critique.

Measure 3.2. (previously 3.3 [2017 back])
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 > Carnegie mean score

Finding. Target was not met for one part and there was no data for the second

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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 6.00; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.33   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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean - NR; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.30   Unable to Evaluate

Trending

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)	2018-2019 (n=3)
	Q71 Determine best practice	Q72 Determine best practice	Q72 Determine best practice
NSU	6.83	6.0	6.0
Carnegie	6.46	6.36	6.31
	Q72 Implement best practice	Q73 Implement best practice	Q73 Implement best practice
NSU	6.83	5.67	*NR
Carnegie	6.41	6.33	6.30

*NR =not reported if N<3

Analysis. 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 determine best practice.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was not met. The plan for 2018-2019 was for: 1) students to complete a review of literature in the NURG 7002 course that they could 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 was 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.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. The mean score for NSU for Q72 was 6.0, which did not meet the Carnegie mean score of 6.31. Therefore, the benchmark was not met. The mean score for NSU for Q73 was not reported since less than 3 students responded to that question; however, the Carnegie mean score was 6.30. Because there was no NSU mean score for Q73, faculty were unable to analyze this outcome. Although NSU's mean score for Question 72 did not meet the Carnegie mean score, faculty determined that having a score of 6 on a 1-7 scale was still very good. This is the second year in a row that the response rate for the Skyfactor survey consisted of only three graduates/students. The low number of respondents could have resulted in non-response bias. Therefore, faculty decided to change the expected outcome from the mean Carnegie score to the Skyfactor measure of "Good 75-100%" until such times that the DNP program is graduating larger numbers and there is a higher number of students responding to the survey.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 is to: 1) reset benchmarks/expected outcomes for Skyfactor questions to the Skyfactor rating of "75-100% Good," 2) Expand face-to face individual student conference offerings and/or live WebEx sessions to assist students to understand the appraisal process, and 3) re-evaluate the use of Skyfactor as a measure for this SLO.

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

Finding. Target was met.

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

Trending.
Summer 2015 – 100% (13/13)
Summer 2016 – 100% (5/5)
Summer 2017 –   91% (10/11)
Summer 2018 – 100% (13/13)

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 required readings. The course culminates in the development of a Health Information Technology (HIT) Project that can be used to help students improve vulnerable population outcomes.
    In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results the plans for 2018-2019 were to: 1) include a must-read document that linked the DNP essential related to the course and the essential components in each assignment to help students understand why they were doing certain assignments and how those assignments related to DNP education; 2) change the Clinical Decision Support System (CDSS) project to a Health Information Technology Project that allowed 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 potentially exposed to more information than with writing a paper individually.
    In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above changes were made. The HIT Project was developed. Students choose a project that was congruent with their practice role and completed the project in three parts: 1) plan development, 2) best practices

paper, and 3) a presentation. In the 2018 assessment year, 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or better. Therefore, the target was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 assessment year is to 1) update the "must read" to DNP Essential components with each assignment in the course, 2) ensure the HIT options for students to choose from are relevant and current, and 3) evaluate relevance of course discussion forums in stimulating HIT topic discussions between students.

Measure 4.2.
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

Finding. Target was not met.

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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 4.33**;** Carnegie Mean Score – 5.90   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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 4.33**;** Carnegie Mean Score – 5.88   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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.00**;** Carnegie Mean Score – 5.94   Target Not Met

Trending

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)	2018-2019 (n=3)
	Q95 Develop evaluation plan	Q96 Develop evaluation plan	Q96 Develop evaluation plan
NSU	6.64	4.67	4.33
Carnegie	5.95	5.81	5.9
	Q96 Execute evaluation plan	Q97 Execute evaluation plan	Q97 Execute evaluation plan
NSU	6.64	4.67	4.33
Carnegie	5.92	5.84	5.88
	Q97 Evaluate health resources	Q98 Evaluate health resources	Q98 Evaluate health resources
NSU	6.73	*NR	5.00

Carnegie	5.97	5.84	5.94

*NR =not reported if N<3

Analysis. 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 required readings. The course culminates in the development of a Health Information Technology (HIT) Project that can be used to help students improve vulnerable population outcomes.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the targets were not met or too few students responded for data to be reported. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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 were 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.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, all components of the plan were implemented. Faculty reported positive feedback from students during the course. Students liked having options of which project to complete.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the expected outcomes were not met. Each of the scores/measures decreased from the previous years. This is the second year in a row that the Skyfactor response rate consisted of three or fewer responses. The low number of respondents could have resulted in non-response bias. Therefore, faculty decided to change the expected outcome from the mean Carnegie score to the Skyfactor measure of "Good 75-100%" until such times that the DNP program is graduating larger numbers and there is a higher number of students responding to the survey.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) update the "must read" to DNP Essential components with each assignment in the course, 2) ensure the HIT options for students to choose from are relevant and current, 3) evaluate relevance of course discussion forums in stimulating HIT topic discussions between students, 4) re-evaluate the use of Skyfactor as a measure, and 5) change the expected outcome to "Good 75-100%"

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

Measure 5.1.
Assessment Method: Healthcare Policy Assignment (NURG 7007): Advocacy Project/Presentation
Expected Outcome: 80% of students achieve 80% or better on this assignment

Finding. Target not met.

Trending.
Spring 2016 – 100% (13/13)
Spring 2017 – 100**%** (5/5)
Spring 2018 -   75% (6/8)

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 performed self-evaluations to determine how they could improve upon the advocacy skills they used in the meeting in their future DNP role.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results presented above, the plan for 2018-2019 was 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 describing how they plan to meet the clinical hours requirement. The expectation was 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 would not be overwhelmed trying to meet this requirement at the end of the course.

In the 2018-2019 AY, a WebEx was developed explaining the clinical hours requirement and how those hours could be achieved through the advocacy assignment and other course assignments. Students submitted a plan in the first two weeks of class describing how they would obtain the required hours.

In the 2018-2019 AY 75% of students achieved a score of 98% or higher on the assignment. Two students achieved a score of 50% due to turning in only half of the project by the due date. Therefore, the expected outcome of 80% was not met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) use this measure to assess achievement of SLO 5, and 2) post reminders in the course Moodle shell announcements regarding when assessments are due, explicitly noting that there are two components to the assignment.

Measure 5.2.
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

Finding. Target not met

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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean - 6.00; Carnegie Mean Score - 6.16   Target Not Met

Trending.

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)	2018-2019 (n=3)
	Q103	Q104	Q104
NSU	6.82	6.67	6.00
Carnegie	6.18	6.08	6.16

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 the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was to re-structure the course assignments to ensure course assignments were inclusive of students in both DNP concentrations (APRN and OSL). Specific to this SLO, the plan was for the ethical debate topics to be revised and include ethical dilemmas which could affect those enrolled in the OSL concentration. The expectation was that by reviewing the entire course from an OSL student's perspective, including the ethical dilemmas, all students would feel the course enhanced their ability to advocate for ethical policies in all healthcare arenas.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, a new faculty was assigned to this course. No changes were made to assignments. In 2018-2019 the NSU mean score was 6.0 which did not meet or exceed the Carnegie mean score of 6.16 and shows a two-year downward trend, however, NSU's mean score of 6.0 was rated by Skyfactor as "Good 75-100%". This was the first time the benchmark was not met. It is noted that Skyfactor survey was completed by only three students which can result in non-response bias. Therefore, faculty decided to change the expected outcome from the mean Carnegie

score to the Skyfactor measure of "Good 75-100%" until such times that the DNP program is graduating larger numbers and there is a higher number of students responding to the survey.

Decision. In 2018-2019 the NSU mean score was 6.0 which did not meet the expected outcome of meeting or exceeding the Carnegie mean score of 6.16. Based on analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year is to: 1) ensure course ethical assignments are inclusive of students in both concentrations, as this was not integrated due to lead faculty change, 2) change the benchmarks/expected outcomes for Skyfactor questions to the Skyfactor rating of "75-100% Good," and 3) re-evaluate the use of Skyfactor as a measure.

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

Finding. Target was met.

Trending.
Summer 2016 - 100% (5/5)
Spring 2017   - 100% (11/11)
Spring 2018   - 100% (13/13)

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). In the Leadership paper, students examine a given scenario and evaluate the role of the DNP in employing leadership self-assessment findings, conflict resolution skills, and inter-professional collaboration.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results from the 2017-2018 assessment year, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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) use the current modular format to present didactic leadership content, and 3) 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 was that by continuing what was working well, but incorporating learning methods to enhance the course, the quality of student learning would improve.

In the 2018-2019 AY, the above plan was implemented. Students felt the video discussions were "engaging" and "made me feel more connected with my classmates". One hundred percent (100%) of students achieved an 80% or better on the Leadership Paper. Therefore, the expected outcome was met. This is evidence that students in NURG 7004 can examine a given scenario and evaluate the role of the DNP in employing leadership self-assessment findings, conflict resolution skills, and inter-professional collaboration.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 assessment year results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) incorporate the student's Emotional Intelligence (EI) Assessment results into the NURG 7004 Self-Assessment Paper. The expectation is that the student will self- reflect on their EI results and develop a plan for improvement of their emotional intelligence and leadership competencies. This self-assessment paper will prepare students to gain additional insight and be better equipped to write a robust Leadership Paper.

Measure 6.2.
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

Finding. Target was not met.

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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.67; Carnegie Mean Score - 5.98   Target Not Met

Trending

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)	2018-2019 (n=3)
	Q114	Q115	Q115
NSU	6.64	6.67	5.67
Carnegie	6.11	5.99	5.98

Analysis. In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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, student's development of leadership qualities expected in DNP graduates, such as inter-professional collaboration skills and conflict management skills, would be enhanced.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was implemented. According to student feedback (N=13), 100% of course objectives were met. The NSU mean score for Skyfactor question 115 was 5.67, which did not meet the expected outcome of the mean Carnegie mean score of 5.98. Therefore, the target was not met. This was the first year that the expected outcome was not met. However, NSU's mean score of 5.67 was rated by Skyfactor as "Good 75-100%".

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) enhance module quizzes with updates and revisions, 2) use content experts to discuss conflict management and resolution, and 3) consider adopting one textbook for this course rather than having multiple texts.

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

Finding. The target was met.

2016-2017 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 92.3% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met
2018-2019 AY: 100% scored > 80%   Expected Outcome: 80%   Target Met

Trending.
Fall 2016 – 100% (11/11)
Fall 2017 – 92.3% (12/13)
Fall 2018 – 100% (16/16)

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 resources, 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 to the Population Focused Prevention Project. In the Population Focused Prevention Project, 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, then discussing leadership competencies necessary for implementation of the proposed plan.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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) recommend the use of editors for students who have difficulty writing; and 4) continue with the recorded presentations of the expectations of the Vulnerable Population paper and the Population Focused Prevention Project and provide updated rubrics and exemplars.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the plan was implemented. A writing seminar was incorporated into the DNP Course Information Moodle shell with specific modules on grammar, sentence structure, professional writing, and APA. The importance of completing these modules prior to writing papers in the DNP program was emphasized in the initial student orientation meeting. It was recommended that students who have difficulty writing use editors and recorded presentations of the expectations of the Vulnerable Population paper and the Population Focused Prevention Project. Updated grading rubrics and exemplars were provided to students. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 100% of students achieved a score of 80% or better. Therefore, the expected outcome of 80% was met.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2019-2020 assessment year is to: 1) expand the content included in the writing seminar and post in the DNP course information Moodle shell with specific modules on grammar, sentence structure, professional writing, APA formatting, syntax, subject/verb agreement, and writing in active tense; 2) reiterate, in the DNP Orientation meeting, the importance of completing the posted modules prior to writing DNP assignment papers; 3) provide contact information for specific editors if students are having difficulty writing and editing.

Measure 7.2.
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

Finding. Target was not met.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.33; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.15   Target Not 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
2018-2019 AY: NSU Mean – 5.33; Carnegie Mean Score – 6.15   Target Not Met

Trending:

Skyfactor™	2016-2017 (n=12)	2017-2018 (n=3)	2018-2019 (n=3)
	Q117 Implementing interventions	Q118 Implementing interventions	Q118 Implementing interventions
NSU	6.91	6.67	5.33
Carnegie	6.17	6.13	6.15
	Q118 Evaluating interventions	Q119 Evaluating interventions	Q119 Evaluating interventions
NSU	6.91	6.67	5.33
Carnegie	6.17	6.11	6.16

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 the majority of their DNP courses. This preparation culminates in 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's (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 and specific improvements to the scholarly project.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the target was met for the two Skyfactor questions. 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 was 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 the major professor and committee members are actively involved throughout the student's scholarly project. The expectation was that by following this plan, students' understanding of biostatistics as related to their scholarly projects would be enhanced, and their responses to statistics related questions in their DNP final defense presentations would improve.

In 2018-2019 assessment year, the plan was partially implemented. The following actions were taken: 1) a DNP prepared faculty member, in addition to a statistics expert, team taught in NURG 7003 Biostatistics, 2) assigned datasets to be evaluated by the students were similar to the students' work in the DNP program, and 3) two assigned DNP program faculty attended the annual AACN DNP conference and the DNP Education conference. Student feedback was positive with regards to the statistician teaching in NURG 7003 and assisting them with their scholarly projects. Faculty noticed enhanced learning of statistics.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the NSU mean for both questions did not meet the Carnegie Mean score. This was the first time this benchmark was not met. It is noted that Skyfactor survey was completed by only three students. The low number of respondents could have resulted in non-response bias. Therefore, faculty decided to change the expected outcome from the mean Carnegie score to the Skyfactor measure of "Good 75-100%" until such times that the DNP program is graduating larger numbers and there is a higher number of students responding to the survey

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 assessment year is to 1) re-evaluate the use of Skyfactor as a measure, 2) change benchmarks/ expected outcomes for Skyfactor questions to the Skyfactor rating of "75-100% Good," 3) update datasets in NURG 7003, 4) ensure all DNP program faculty attend a minimum of one DNP Education conference annually, 5) ensure both committee members continue involvement throughout the scholarly project by asking students to evaluate how readily available their major professor and committee member(s) were or by asking each major professor to submit a list of dates that they met with their student as the "course report" at the end of the semester for NURG 7010, 7011, and 7012.

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

Finding. Target was met.

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

2017-2018 AY: 100% scored "Pass"   Expected Outcome: 90%   Target Met
2018-2019 AY: 100% scored "Pass"   Expected Outcome: 90%   Target Met

Trending.
2017 - 100% (6/6)
2018 - 100% (7/7)

Analysis. Students begin formally working on their scholarly project paper in NURG 7010. NURG 7010 is the first of three courses (7010, 7011, and 7012) that guides the student 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.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was 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.

In 2018-2019 assessment year, the plan was partially implemented. Several faculty attended the students' project proposals and offered feedback to improve both rigor and efficacy of the proposed projects. Not all faculty, however, were able to attend all presentations. There were two students who changed their scholarly projects under direction of their major professor when faculty suggested significant edits during their project proposal. During the time to submit IRB requests, the IRB chair changed, and the previously used NIH research training certificate changed to CITI training for some students, making the projected seamless transition through IRB more difficult. The scholarly project "exempt proposal checklist" was not instituted during this time, and a new proposed CON Scientific Review Committee was proposed to review DNP scholarly projects in lieu of the previously planned review committee. In the 2018-2019 assessment year, 100% of students achieved a score of 80% on their scholarly project, meeting the expected outcome of 90%.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for 2019-2020 assessment year is 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) determine a date for the Initial Proposal Defenses early so faculty and students can plan their schedules accordingly, 3) finalize development of a CON Scientific Review Committee 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, 4) develop an "exempt proposal checklist" for the scholarly project committee to use to clarify if scholarly project proposals qualify as exempt, 5) ensure that all students and faculty use CITI IRB training, and 6) provide new IRB process in-service via recorded WebEx to be placed in the NURG 7010 course.

Measure 8.2.
Assessment Method: Scholarly Project Practicum Portfolio (NURG 7012)
Expected Outcome: 100% of students will satisfactorily complete $\geq$ 1000 supervised post baccalaureate practice hours

Finding. Target was met.

2016-2017 AY: 100% completed requirements Expected Outcome: 100% Target Met
2017-2018 AY: 100% completed requirements Expected Outcome: 100% Target Met
2018-2019 AY: 100% completed requirements Expected Outcome: 100% Target Met

Trending.
2016 - 100% (12/12)
2017 - 100% (6/6)
2018 - 100% (7/7)

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 student's 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) cumulative 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 by the end of the program. Because these students are master prepared, they have previously earned several 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 told via letter on admission to the program how many additional clinical hours they need to meet the 1000 hours required to graduate.

In the 2017-2018 assessment year, the expected outcome was met. Based on the analysis of the results, the plan for the 2018-2019 assessment year was: 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 was that students and faculty were 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 would better understand the requirements, and students would be better prepared to obtain the required hours. Further, the expectation was that if students performed the DNP competency self-assessment early in the program and if they could align needed DNP competency requirements to the clinical hours that are found in many DNP courses throughout the program, they would be allowed to count those hours toward their required 1000 hours.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, the above plan was partially implemented. Actions taken included: 1) students counted 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 were approved by course faculty; and 2) presentation of the Clinical Hours WebEx in the new DNP student orientation with a copy posted in each major professor's Moodle shell for the NURG 7010 course. However, not all major professors had weekly communication with their students for three semesters.

In the 2018-2019 assessment year, all (7/7; 100%) graduating students completed 1000 supervised post baccalaureate practice hours. This met the expected outcome.

Decision. Based on the analysis of the results, the plans for 2019-2020 assessment year are: 1) to re-visit and update the PowerPoint regarding what counts as practice hours and update the clinical hours WebEx to ensure it is congruent with CCNE and AACN; 2) 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) begin using the new "narrative experience summary" form for DNP students to document their narrative summaries of their practice hour experiences in NURG 7010, 7011, and 7012; 4) for major professors to have regular communication with their students in which they discuss the student's plans to obtain the required hours, and 5) Students will email weekly reflections to their faculty member along with plans for obtaining practice hours.

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

In the 2018-2019 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 2018-2019 assessment year that contributed to DNP student learning and success:

- In the first DNP course (NURG 7000 Scientific Underpinnings), an audio enhanced PowerPoint midterm review was posted to the Moodle shell as planned. A live WebEx midterm review meeting was also offered. Individual student phone conferences were scheduled with faculty to discuss difficult material prior to the midterm and final exams.

- NURG 7000: YouTube videos which enhanced learning of difficult content were integrated into required readings/materials.

- Evaluated the continued use of Skyfactor as an accurate measure of SLO achievement, especially when Skyfactor is administered one to two years after students take courses, and the results were vastly different from the end of semester course evaluation results.

- NURG 7000: Increased the percentage of class time devoted to teaching content which demonstrates integration of biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational sciences and decrease content which teaches philosophical concepts and precepts, and decreased the number of Philosophical modules from four modules to two modules to allow increased focus on integration of biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational sciences.

- SLO 1 Measure for 2.1 was replaced with the Framework portion of the Scholarly Project Proposal Presentation Rubric in NURG 7002. This is a better measurement of student achievement of the second SLO.

- Students began writing the framework application portion of their scholarly project defense in NURG 7002, and the new framework application assignment was graded 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*. These actions were implemented to better prepare students to implement the final scholarly project.

- NURG: 7000: Posted *Tips for Answering Discussion Forums PowerPoint/WebEx* recording.

- NURG 7002: Less emphasis was placed on the number of articles critiqued and more emphasis was placed on the quality of the critique and the ability of the critique to be used in implementation of the practice change in the scholarly project.

- NURG 7002: Faculty 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 had with the critique.

- Students completed a review of literature in the NURG 7002 course that they could use as the basis for their completed evaluation of evidence in their next course, NURG 7010 Scholarly Project Practicum.

- Faculty developed and utilized grading rubrics congruent with the review of literature assignment's expectations.

- Faculty converted some discussion forums into video discussion forums to enhance student learning.

- Included a "must-read" document that linked each DNP essential related to the course and the essential components in each assignment. The "must-read" document was used to help students understand why they are doing certain assignments and how those assignments relate to DNP education

- Changed the CDSS project to the Health Information Technology Project that allows students several project options, including the CDSS. This allowed students to choose a project that was more congruent with their current practice role.

- Changed 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.

- Developed a WebEx explaining the clinical hours requirement and how those hours can be achieved through the advocacy assignment.

- Students submitted a plan within the first two weeks of clinical courses describing how they plan to meet the clinical hours requirement.

- Added video discussion forums, instead of only having written discussion forums, which increased student engagement in class discussions and improved the quality of the discussion forums

- Incorporated a writing seminar into the DNP Course Information Moodle shell with specific modules on grammar, sentence structure, professional writing, and APA and importance of completing these modules prior to writing papers in the DNP program was emphasized in the orientation meeting.

- Recommended students who had difficulty writing use editors.

- NURG 7004: Recorded presentations and updated rubrics and exemplars were provided to students and presented Thomas and Kilmann's conflict management strategies.

- NURG 7003: A content expert was added to the faculty teaching in NURG 7003 Biostatistics.

- NURG 7003: Datasets used for statistical analysis assignments were revised to be individualized to each student's role/population.

- Both assigned DNP program faculty attended a national DNP Education conference

- Students were allowed to count direct practice hours earned in many courses throughout the program, rather than just in the scholarly project practicum courses.

- Information related to clinical hours was presented in the Clinical Hours WebEx in the new DNP student orientation and posted in each major professor's Moodle shell for the NURG 7010 course.

- Major professors communicated with their students and discussed the student's plans to obtain the required hours. All (100%) of students completed 1000 supervised post baccalaureate practice hours.

Many changes will be made during the 2019-2020 assessment year based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results. It is noted the reason Skyfactor mean scores were low for 2018-2019 assessment year was because there were only 2-3 graduates completing the survey. Skyfactor usually does not give results for less than 6 students due to the results being easily skewed and less meaningful. We asked Skyfactor to give us the results with n=3. This affected results. However, the DNP faculty held a focus group meeting with two graduates from this cohort, and feedback was favorable.

Plan of action moving forward.

Below are plans for the 2019-2020 assessment year.

- Expand the use of YouTube videos and other electronic media which enhances learning of difficult content.
- NURG 7000:
    - Add a WebEx online advising session to review content and answer student questions about hours.
    - Add a content expert to teach the philosophical content
- Have students schematically demonstrate (in their scholarly project proposal) the linkages between key concepts from ethical, biophysical, psychosocial, analytical and organizational theories and the concepts they are planning to integrate into their scholarly project.
- Review each SLO and measure to ensure the measures accurately reflect each SLO.
- Re-evaluate the use of Skyfactor in Measures
- Expand the offering of face-to face individual student conferences, or live WebEx meetings as needed to aid in student understanding of the research critique.

- Expand use of the "must read" document to link the DNP Essential components with each assignment in courses and update the "Must-read" document to accurately reflect the Essential competencies.

- Ensure the HIT options for students to choose from are relevant and current.

- Evaluate the relevance of course discussion forums in stimulating HIT topic discussions between students.

- Ensure ethical assignments are inclusive of students in both DNP concentrations (APRN and OSL).

- NURG 7004

  - Incorporate the student's Emotional Intelligence Assessment results into the NURG 7004 Self-Assessment Paper.

  - Enhance module quizzes with updates and revisions

  - Use content experts to discuss conflict management and resolution

  - Consider adopting one textbook for this course rather than having multiple texts.

- Expand the content included in the writing seminar and post in the DNP course information Moodle shell with specific modules on grammar, sentence structure, professional writing, APA formatting, syntax, subject/verb agreement, and writing in active tense.

- Provide contact information for specific editors students can contact for assistance with writing and editing.

- Provide updated rubrics and exemplars for assignments.

- Expand the use of content experts in DNP courses.

- Revise/update datasets used in NURG 7003 to be similar to the role/population focus or DNP projects of students.

- Ensure DNP program faculty attend a minimum of one DNP educational conference annually

- Ensure both major professors and assigned committee members are actively involved in the student's scholarly project.

- Provide a date that supports the attendance of all DNP faculty at the DNP Scholarly Project Initial Proposal Defenses in the NURG 7002 course to give both the students and the major professors input into creating a rigorous and yet doable scholarly project.

- Finalize development of a Scientific Review Committee to 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.

- Ensure that all students and faculty use CITI IRB training.

- Provide a presentation of new IRB process(es) inservice via recorded WebEx to be placed in the NURG 7010 course with the expectation that faculty and students will review the update.

- Begin using the new "narrative experience summary" form for DNP students to document their narrative summaries of their practice hour experiences in NURG 7010, 7011, and 7012.

- Students will 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.

- Revise and 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.

- Guide Major professors in having regular communication with their students to discuss the student's plans to obtain the required hours and guide scholarly project/paper development.