

DNP Project Oral Presentation Rubric

Student: _____ **Date:** _____

Project Title: _____

Committee Members: _____

Criteria	1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Below Avg 3 = Average 4 = Above Avg 5 = Excellent N/A
1. Title Slide	
2. Acknowledgements	
3. Introduction & significance with needs justification	
4. Purpose/Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of project purpose and how it addressed problem 	
5. Review of Literature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of literature search (search strategies, keywords, inclusion/exclusion criteria) ▪ How findings support the need for the project, including gap identification & need for proposed practice change 	
6. Theoretical/conceptual framework or process model	
7. Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design ▪ Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agency description – Congruence of project to selected agency's mission/goals/strategic plan – Description of stakeholders – Site-specific facilitators and barriers to implementation (if applicable) ▪ Sample <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Describe target population (inclusion/exclusion criteria) ▪ Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – IRB approval – Description of intervention (if applicable) – Measures and instruments – Data Collection – Data Analysis 	
8. Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demographics & findings - Present results of each aim and/or measure (use table, figures or narrative) 	
9. Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion of findings as it relates to existing literature ▪ How project impacted project site/agency and plans for sustainability/next steps 	
10. Implications for practice, education, policy and research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Address implications for practice, education, policy and research ▪ Address cost implications and benefit analysis ▪ Address translation of findings 	
11. Limitations related to sample size, design, data collection	
12. Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summarize project and discuss value to healthcare and practice 	
13. References	

Criteria	1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Below Avg 3 = Average 4 = Above Avg 5 = Excellent N/A
AVERAGE	

Strengths/Weaknesses Observed

Comments

Candidate's Rating (average overall scores on the items above)

 Unsatisfactory
 (<3.0)

 Average
 (3.0 - 3.9)

 Above Average
 (4.0 - 4.9)

 Excellent
 (5.0)

If candidate is unsatisfactory, state committee recommendations:

Determinants of DNP Project Presentation Rating

<p>1 = UNSATISFACTORY</p> <p>Student's presentation did not address the some components of the criteria or were inaccurate. Has difficulty answering questions and answers do not demonstrate that the student has the knowledge one would expect after having completed the DNP project. The student has difficulty articulating and relating presentation to appropriate references, theory, process model/theoretical/conceptual model and project outcomes as appropriate. Is not able to articulate the impact of the project and future steps to build on project work. An unsatisfactory rating in any category, for the majority of committee members, results in failure to pass the presentation.</p>	<p>2 = BELOW AVERAGE</p> <p>Student's presentation and responses to questions includes the majority of the components of the criteria, but elaboration is minimal. With faculty prompting, the student is able to answer questions. Knowledge of topic is present but not well integrated. Limited citing of references, theory, process model/theoretical/ conceptual model, or project outcomes as appropriate. Is not able to clearly articulate impact of project and future steps to build on project work. An average of below average rating results in failure to pass the presentation.</p>
<p>3 = AVERAGE</p> <p>Student's presentation and responses to questions are comprehensive, but include minimal elaboration. Addresses all required components identified in the criteria, but could provide more detail for one or two criteria. Answers questions thoroughly; with minimal prompting student elaborates in more detail. Knowledge of topic and focus is apparent, but includes limited analysis and synthesis. With minimal prompting is able to cite references, theory, process model/theoretical/conceptual model and project outcomes as appropriate. An overall average rating will be considered passing.</p>	<p>4 = ABOVE AVERAGE</p> <p>Student's presentation and responses to questions are comprehensive and student addressed all components identified in the criteria. Demonstrates depth of knowledge through answers to questions. Requires no faculty prompting about presentation content and very minimal prompting when answering questions. Readily cites references, theory, process model/theoretical/ conceptual model and project outcomes as appropriate. Describes impact of project, plans for future work and next steps as an outcome of the project.</p>
<p>5 = EXCELLENT</p> <p>Student's presentation and responses to questions are very comprehensive of all components identified in the criteria. Elaborates about components with illustrations and examples. Demonstrates depth of knowledge through answers to questions and interprets the findings within the scope of existing evidence. Requires no faculty prompting during presentation. Readily</p>	

cites references, theory, process model/theoretical/conceptual model and project outcomes as appropriate and provides additional clarifying information. Clearly describes impact of project, plans for future work and next steps as an outcome of the project.