

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.

NOTE: The format of your written project paper may vary based on the specifications of the author guidelines described for the journal within which you plan to publish your DNP project paper. Thus, adaptations to the rubric may be made accordingly.

Student: _____ **Date:** _____

Project Title: _____

Committee Members: _____

CRITERIA	1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Below Avg 3 = Average 4 = Above Avg 5 = Excellent
1. Title Page	
2. Abstract	
3. Background and Significance ▪ Problem statement (introduction, context, scope) ▪ Current evidence-based interventions/strategies targeting the problem ▪ Current supportive literature	
4. Purpose/Objectives ▪ Overview of project purpose and how it addressed problem	
5. Methods ▪ Design and IRB approval or Non-Human Research Determination ▪ Setting ▪ Sample ▪ Procedure ▪ IRB Approval – Description of evidence-based intervention (if applicable) – Measures and instruments – Data collection – Data Analysis (if applicable)	
6. Results ▪ Demographics ▪ Findings - Present results of each aim and/or measure (NOTE: Present results in order of variable presentation in procedures)	

CRITERIA	1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Below Avg 3 = Average 4 = Above Avg 5 = Excellent
7. Discussion - Findings as it relates to existing literature - Future related scholarship	
8. Implications for practice, education, policy and research (as applicable for paper)	
9. Limitations related to sample size and design	
10. Conclusion - Summarize final conclusions from project - Discuss value to healthcare and practice	
11. References	
12. Tables / Figures / 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.