

School of Nursing
Doctorate of Nursing Practice
Program Assessment Plan

Program learning outcomes:

For the purpose of program assessment, a set of nine broad program learning outcomes have been developed. The successful student will be able to:

1. Synthesize theoretical knowledge and research evidence in designing primary care delivery for diverse populations across the lifespan in rural contexts
2. Collaborate with multidisciplinary professions, multisectoral agencies and lay communities to influence social and health policies impacting rural population health
3. Assume leadership role in organizational systems to improve rural population health in local and regional communities
4. Promote adherence to professional and ethical-legal standards of practice by individual professionals and organizations
5. Integrate cultural competence and social justice in addressing health disparities in rural populations
6. Examine research evidence in design and implementation and evaluation of policies and programs for population health in rural communities
7. Use best practices and technology to improve care delivery for diverse individuals, families and communities within the continuum of primary, secondary and tertiary care
8. Create educational programs to develop culturally competent practice and education of the nursing workforce
9. Design educational programs and evaluation programs and evaluation to enhance rural community empowerment for health

Typical course learning objectives:

Candidates for the DNP in Nursing must present evidence of having met a number of specific performance objectives; each of these aligns with one or more of the nine program learning outcomes. These outcomes are found in various course syllabi.

1. Learn how to apply research findings (PLO1)
2. Examine theoretical perspectives on health of individuals and communities (PLO 1)
3. Incorporate best evidence in designing health promotion programs for rural populations (PLO 1, 9, 2)
4. Develop clinical competencies in advanced practice (PLO 1, 2, 4, 5)
5. Evaluate types and hierarchy of evidence (PLO 7,6)
6. Select appropriate approaches for organizational implementation and outcomes evaluation of Evidence based practice (PLO 1,6,7,9)
7. Develop a capstone project that meets the program outcomes (PLO 9)

Indirect Assessment:

We plan to include three surveys as a method of indirect evaluation. (Drafts of these surveys are attached to the Educational Effectiveness section of the substantive change proposal). One survey will be distributed to students at the end of the first year, where students will be asked to comment of the strengths and weaknesses of the program and to suggest improvements. The assessment committee

will provide a mechanism of ongoing formative assessment by review of the survey and will present a report and recommendations for program improvement. As new recommendations are made and/or modified, as appropriate these will be implemented and assessed for effectiveness.

The second survey will be taken by students in their last semester, and a third summative evaluation survey will be sent to alumni graduates two years after they have completed the DNP degree. The assessment committee will review the surveys and present a report and recommendations to the full faculty. Where actions are assessed in need of improvement in respect to program outcomes, they will be addressed and evaluated.

The UH Hilo School of Nursing's existing Baccalaureate Nursing Program is approved by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC). In addition, we will be notifying the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) of the intent to offer a DNP upon approval from the University and WASC with the plan to apply for accreditation and schedule a site visit after the first year, approximately FY 2014.

Direct Assessment:

The progress of each student will be assessed and monitored throughout their academic experience through examinations, written reports, online and face-to-face participation, and other performances in each class. Additionally, assessment of program quality will be ascertained by student performances in signature assignments from select courses with progress towards examining at least 2 or more program learning goals each year.

Systematic scheduled assessment of student achievement of program learning goals is the responsibility of all core faculty who teach program courses and whom advise student project inquiry course work. A curriculum committee comprised of five core faculty will review student work on the following schedule:

Every January and May, results of these reviews will be reported to the faculty by the assessment committee with recommendation for specific changes in pedagogy/curriculum intended to address significant deficiencies. Modifications will be introduced and their effects monitored during the following academic year.

The schedule below is tentative in terms of the specific courses and signature assignments to be included in program assessment. As the program is launched, we anticipate that changes will need to be made.

| Year | PLOs Addressed | Semester, Courses, Signature Assignments (to be selected) |
|-------------|---------------------------|--|
| 2011-2012 | 1, 5 2, 3, 5 | NURS 501 NURS 506, 506L |
| 2012-2013 | 6, 7 8,9 | NURS 512 NURS 513 |
| 2013-2014 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 | NURS 517 Practice Inquiry/Project |

Program Review

The University of Hawaii at Hilo has a seven-year cycle for program review, including external review. Units like ours, the School of Nursing, that have external accreditation agencies submit self-study reports to the VCAA that were submitted to their external agency in lieu of a report following UH Hilo's template. These reports are submitted to the VCAA on the schedule set by the external agency, which in our case is with the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission. Following submission of the report, the VCAA meets with the dean and the program faculty to come to agreement on next steps; these are formalized in a memorandum of agreement.

The School of Nursing has contacted the accrediting agency the Commission on Collegiate on Nursing Education as an additional reviewer. Plans are for an initial site visit after the second semester of implementation of the DNP program.

The DNP integrates student learning assessment throughout the program and anticipates having much data to present in its program review reports.

Draft Rubrics

Attached are three master rubrics which will be adapted by the curriculum committee and individual faculty to the requirements of specific courses, consistent with course outcomes and appropriate program outcomes.

1. Oral Presentation
2. Proposal
3. Scientific Writing

Generalized Assessment Rubric for Oral Presentations

Name: _____

Date: _____

| Score | Level | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | Assessed Item | 1 Emerging* | 2 Developing | 3 Proficient | 4 Insightful |
| Content Score _____ Max. 20 | Significance Justified | <input type="checkbox"/> Not justified | <input type="checkbox"/> Not fully justified | <input type="checkbox"/> Justified | <input type="checkbox"/> Justified in sophisticated manner |
| | Reference to Others' Work | <input type="checkbox"/> Fails | <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Fluently |
| | Ideas or Synthesis Original | <input type="checkbox"/> Not original | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat original | <input type="checkbox"/> Original | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly original |
| | Represents Sophisticated Knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> Much inaccurate | <input type="checkbox"/> Some inaccurate | <input type="checkbox"/> Accurate | <input type="checkbox"/> Accurate and highly sophisticated |
| | Relationship to Task/Audience | <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> Not entirely appropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly appropriate |
| Organization Score _____ Max. 20 | Logical and Clear | <input type="checkbox"/> Not | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Exceedingly |
| | Effective Slides | <input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective | <input type="checkbox"/> Some ineffective | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely effective |
| | Clear Purpose and Hypothesis | <input type="checkbox"/> Inaccurately stated | <input type="checkbox"/> Weakly stated | <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated | <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly and precisely stated |
| | Effective Time Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Poor overall— does too much or too little | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly effective |
| | Balance of Time Allocation to Topic Areas | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacking | <input type="checkbox"/> Not always balanced | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly effective |
| Delivery Score _____ Max. 20 Total: _____ | Student Comfort | <input type="checkbox"/> Uncomfortable | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat poised, relaxed & comfortable | <input type="checkbox"/> Poised, relaxed and comfortable | <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely poised, relaxed & comfortable |
| | Engagement of Audience | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacking | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely well |
| | Clear and Concise | <input type="checkbox"/> Not | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Exceedingly |
| | Effective Response to Questions | <input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective | <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely Effective |

*Line Item Scoring: Emerging 1; Developing 2; Proficient 3; Insightful 4

Generalized Assessment Rubric for Written Scientific Proposals

Name: _____

Date: _____

| Score | Level | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Assessed Item | 1 Emerging* | 2 Developing | 3 Proficient | 4 Insightful |
| Originality Score _____ Max. 12 | Novel Hypothesis | <input type="checkbox"/> Not novel | <input type="checkbox"/> Aspects are novel | <input type="checkbox"/> Novel | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly novel |
| | Innovative Research Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks innovation | <input type="checkbox"/> Aspects are innovative | <input type="checkbox"/> Innovative | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly innovative |
| | Connection to Literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Unrelated to that which has been reported | <input type="checkbox"/> Most aspects are unimaginative extensions | <input type="checkbox"/> Most aspects are imaginative extensions | <input type="checkbox"/> Well beyond what is current and breaks new ground |
| Significance Score _____ Max. 8 | Scientific Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks potential | <input type="checkbox"/> Some potential | <input type="checkbox"/> Clear potential | <input type="checkbox"/> High potential |
| | Advances Science | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks potential | <input type="checkbox"/> Some potential | <input type="checkbox"/> Clear potential | <input type="checkbox"/> High potential with significance |
| Approach Score _____ Max. 24 | Ties to Hypothesis | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks connection | <input type="checkbox"/> Some connection | <input type="checkbox"/> Driven by | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly driven by |
| | Clear and Incisive | <input type="checkbox"/> Not | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat | <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and incisive | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly |
| | Outcomes Clear | <input type="checkbox"/> Not clear nor evident | <input type="checkbox"/> Some clear and evident | <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and evident | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly developed & evident |
| | Interpretation of Findings Objective | <input type="checkbox"/> Subjective and unscientific | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat subjective and scientific | <input type="checkbox"/> Objective and scientific | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly objective and scientific |
| | Identifies Potential Pitfalls | <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | <input type="checkbox"/> Some identified | <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly identified | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly insightful in identifying potential pitfalls |
| | References to Literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacking | <input type="checkbox"/> Some | <input type="checkbox"/> Grounded in the literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Insightfully grounded in the literature |
| Writing Score _____ Max. 14 | Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacking | <input type="checkbox"/> Some | <input type="checkbox"/> Organized | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly |
| | Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Not well done | <input type="checkbox"/> Some well done sections | <input type="checkbox"/> Well done | <input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively done |
| | Clear & Understandable | <input type="checkbox"/> Not | <input type="checkbox"/> Some sections | <input type="checkbox"/> Understandable | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly clear, understandable |
| | Format Guidelines | <input type="checkbox"/> Does not follow | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat follows | <input type="checkbox"/> Follows with 1 to 2 errors | <input type="checkbox"/> Follows Completely |
| Ethics Score _____ Max 8 Total: _____ | Accurate Primary Data | <input type="checkbox"/> Not accurately represented | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat inaccurate | <input type="checkbox"/> Accurate representation | <input type="checkbox"/> Accurate representation |
| | Citations of Others' Ideas and Methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacking | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat clear | <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate |

*Line Item Scoring: Emerging 1; Developing 2; Proficient 3; Insightful 4

Generalized Assessment Rubric for Scientific Writing

Presenters Name: _____

Date: _____

| Score | Level | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Assessed Item | 1 Emerging* | 2 Developing | 3 Proficient | 4 Insightful |
| Organization Score _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Overall Logical Organization <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas Connected <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions Clear <input type="checkbox"/> Introductions & Conclusions Related <input type="checkbox"/> Title & Abstract Represent Work | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks logic <input type="checkbox"/> Disjointed <input type="checkbox"/> Not clear <input type="checkbox"/> Unrelated to the whole <input type="checkbox"/> Do not reflect the main points of the paper | <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently not logical <input type="checkbox"/> Not consistently linked <input type="checkbox"/> Some unclear and ineffective <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely related to the whole <input type="checkbox"/> Do not represent all of the work appropriately | <input type="checkbox"/> Generally logical <input type="checkbox"/> Linked <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and effective <input type="checkbox"/> Well related to the whole <input type="checkbox"/> Represent the work appropriately | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly logical <input type="checkbox"/> Tightly linked <input type="checkbox"/> Smooth and highly effective transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Effective in relating to the whole <input type="checkbox"/> Highly representative of the work |
| Scholarship Score _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Research Problem & Hypothesis Connected <input type="checkbox"/> Assertions Supported <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation of Findings Objective <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporates Relevant Literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Not placed in context of the state of the field <input type="checkbox"/> Lacking evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Subjective and unscientific <input type="checkbox"/> Ignored and/or misinterpreted | <input type="checkbox"/> Some connection to the state of the field <input type="checkbox"/> Some lacking evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat subjective and scientific <input type="checkbox"/> Only part is recognized | <input type="checkbox"/> Linked to the state of the field <input type="checkbox"/> Supported by evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Objective and scientific <input type="checkbox"/> All is acknowledged | <input type="checkbox"/> Insightfully linked to the state of the field <input type="checkbox"/> Insightfully supported by evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Highly objective and scientific <input type="checkbox"/> Fully acknowledged , insightfully & integrated with results |
| Data Presentation (tables & figures) Score _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Selection Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Data Format Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Data Presentation Clear | <input type="checkbox"/> Misrepresents findings <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate choices <input type="checkbox"/> Impossible to follow | <input type="checkbox"/> Partially represents findings <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate but inconsistent choices <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat clear | <input type="checkbox"/> Generally represents findings <input type="checkbox"/> Generally acceptable choices <input type="checkbox"/> Clear | <input type="checkbox"/> Effectively represents findings <input type="checkbox"/> Highly effective choices <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely clear and self-explanatory |