

DNP Project Paper Rubric

The DNP project paper needs to be in final draft before the student can complete DNP project oral presentation. By approximately 4 weeks prior to the student’s proposed DNP project presentation date, the DNP paper needs to be near the **final draft** (from the faculty advisor’s perspective). At this time, student is to email their **final draft** to committee members, along with a copy of this rubric. Committee members should read the paper, complete this rubric and respond to the student within 10 days (copied to advisor). Response should include edits/recommendations for paper and a copy of this completed rubric. Student will incorporate feedback from committee members into paper. Student should submit this revised paper to their advisor/chair by 2 weeks before their proposed presentation date. If the advisor determines that the paper is in **final draft**, the student will be given approval by the advisor to proceed with presentation. The below rubric **will be** used by the advisor to determine that the paper is in the **final draft**. To be final, all sections of the paper must be rated at least “Average” or 3. Advisor will return a copy of this completed DNP Final Manuscript rubric form, along with the exam card, to Kathy Collins after the student's presentation.

Student: _____ **Date:** _____

Project Title: _____

Committee Members: _____

Criteria	1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Below Avg 3 = Average 4 = Above Avg 5 = Excellent N/A
1. Title Page	
2. Abstract	
3. Acknowledgements	
4. Dedication (optional)	
5. Table of Contents	
6. Background and Significance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Problem statement (introduction to problem) ▪ Context, scope and consequences of the problem ▪ Current evidence-based interventions/strategies targeting the problem 	
7. Purpose/Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of project purpose and how it addressed problem 	
8. Review of Literature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of literature search (search strategies, keywords, inclusion/exclusion criteria) ▪ How the literature supports the need for the project, including gap identification and need for proposed practice change 	
9. Theoretical/Conceptual Framework or Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion of the framework and how it guided/informed your project 	
10. 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) 	

Criteria	1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Below Avg 3 = Average 4 = Above Avg 5 = Excellent N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – IRB approval – Description of evidence-based intervention (if applicable) – Measures and instruments – Data collection – Data analysis (if applicable) 	
11. Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demographics & findings - Present results of each aim and/or measure (use table, figures or narrative) 	
12. 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 	
13. 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 	
14. Limitations related to sample size, design, data collect	
15. Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summarize project and discuss value to healthcare and practice 	
16. References	
17. Tables	
18. Figures	
19. Appendices	
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 Paper Rating

1 = UNSATISFACTORY

Student's manuscript did not address the components of the criteria or were inaccurate. The student did not clearly describe meeting project objectives. The manuscript does not provide evidence of student knowledge of subject matter. Methods are not clear or valid. The manuscript lacks appropriate references, theory, process model/theoretical/conceptual model and project outcomes as needed. It is not clear what the impact of the project is or 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 written examination.**

2 = BELOW AVERAGE

Student's manuscript includes the majority of the components of the criteria, but elaboration and clarity are minimal. The student meets most of the project objectives, but not all. One or more objectives are not measurable. Knowledge of topic is evident; however, not all conclusions are supported by evidence. Supporting evidence is not well integrated in the manuscript. Limited citing of references, theory, process model/theoretical/conceptual model or project outcomes as needed. Is not able to clearly describe impact of project and future steps to build on project work. **A below average rating results in failure to pass the written examination.**

3 = AVERAGE

Student's manuscript is comprehensive, and includes minimal elaboration of details of background, purpose, methods and outcomes. Addresses **all** required components identified in the criteria but could provide more detail for one or two criteria. Meets project objectives. Knowledge of topic and focus is apparent but includes limited analysis and synthesis. Minimally cites supporting references, theory, process model/theoretical/conceptual model and project outcomes as appropriate. **An overall average rating will be considered passing.**

4 = ABOVE AVERAGE

Student's manuscript is comprehensive of **all** components identified in the rubric criteria. Manuscript demonstrates above average depth of knowledge of existing literature/evidence pertaining to project purpose, process and outcomes. 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.

5 = EXCELLENT

Student's manuscript is comprehensive of all components identified in the rubric criteria. Meets all project objectives. Elaborates about components with supporting evidence, illustrations and/or examples as indicated. Manuscript demonstrates expert level/depth of knowledge of existing literature/evidence. Project findings are interpreted within the scope of existing evidence. Within the manuscript, the student cites references, theory, process model/theoretical/conceptual model, project outcomes as appropriate, and provides additional clarifying information. Clearly describes evidence-based impact of project, plans for future work and next steps as an outcome of the project.