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BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:
Data used to generate this report are stored at the University on the MSHP shared drive and in files on the chair’s and faculty computers. There are hard copies of preceptor evaluations, student journals, and papers in locked cabinets in the main office of the MSHP. Data are accessible to only faculty and staff.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year’s catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.
Marymount’s Doctor of Nursing Practice (D.N.P.) Program provides the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to negotiate and improve the health care system. Acquired skills include those needed to develop evidence-based practice protocols, develop and utilize databases, and apply epidemiological methods. Students will endeavor to develop new models of care delivery and to become expert in a specific area of nursing. Further, students will expand their knowledge of health care policy and finance so as to better negotiate and influence the health care delivery system and to advocate for improved care for individuals and aggregates. Graduates with this terminal degree will be prepared for roles in direct care or indirect, systems-focuses care.

List all of the program’s learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Year of Last Assessment</th>
<th>Assessed This Year</th>
<th>Year of Next Planned Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. DEVELOP NEW APPROACHES TO ADVANCED NURSING PRACTICE AND HEALTH CARE DELIVERY BASED ON SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE AND THEORIES OF NURSING AND OTHER DISCIPLINES</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. DESIGN METHODS FOR EVALUATING CLINICAL OUTCOMES TO DIRECT EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE FOR IMPROVING HEALTH CARE</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe briefly how the program's outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan (generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points):

The curriculum and the program outcomes of DNP program are developed, implemented, and revised as needed to be congruent with and support the school and University mission, vision, and strategic plan. The University’s mission emphasizes academic excellence, a liberal arts foundation, career preparation, and personal and professional development. Congruent with this mission, the aim of the MSHP is to foster the individual development of each student and enable students to become competent advanced practice health professionals prepared to contribute and respond to society’s changing health needs. Every effort is made to meet the individual learning needs and foster the individual development of each student, while providing a foundation for advanced nursing practice at the doctoral level. The DNP program directly supports Marymount’s strategic plan of offering a rigorous graduate curriculum that produces superior graduates able to succeed in their positions and communities.

The DNP program outcomes support the acquisition and enhancement of the knowledge, skills, and abilities to negotiate the health care system as an advanced practice nurse, develop evidence-based practice protocols, and design methods for evaluating clinical outcomes to direct evidence-based practice. Scholarship, leadership, service, and ethics, which are the hallmarks of a Marymount education are reflected in the program outcomes. The program enables students to become health care professionals who have the necessary skills for advanced practice and who will contribute to the body of knowledge that supports best practices through education, scholarship, and service. Strongly linked to Marymount’s hallmark of leadership, the goals of the program focus on preparing graduates to lead inter-professional teams in the analysis of complex practice and organizational issues,
demonstrate clinical, organizational, and systems-level leadership through the design of innovative models of caring and demonstrate leadership in health policy at the state, local, and federal level.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements to the process, and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment (generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points):
The Department of Nursing has a robust and cyclical assessment process which is a major component of the accreditation process. In early 2013 the Department of Nursing submitted a self-study report to the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) accreditation program as part of the re-accreditation process. The self-study examined the curriculum, teaching and learning practices and program effectiveness based on student and faculty outcomes. In fall 2013, a site visit was completed and all nursing programs were granted full accreditation status (10 years, with a 5 year interim report due to CCNE). The documents used for this assessment specific to the DNP program included the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) Essentials of Doctoral Education for Advanced Nursing Practice (2011). Information from the annual learning outcomes assessments is included in these accreditation reports. Additional program review is completed annually in the full faculty systematic evaluation meeting in the spring semester (May).

Each fall the nursing assessment committee and the faculty choose the learning outcomes and outcome measures to be evaluated during the upcoming academic year. Throughout the academic year the department chair and assessment committee collaborate with the faculty to assure that data are collected using specific measures/standards in their courses. In the past academic year, faculty remained involved to assure compliance with University, School and accreditation standards. A continuing challenge for the program has been the small number of students enrolled in the program. This limits the selection of direct and indirect measures that accurately reflect achievement of program outcomes by students. The program suspended admissions for the academic year 2014-2015. Recruitment of students continued and a cohort of 5 students enrolled beginning with the academic year 2015-2016. A 5 year program review was conducted during the academic year 2015-2016 and submitted in winter 2017. The review and subsequent response to comments from the Dean and APBP are included in the discussions that follow.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Planned Improvement</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop New Approaches to Advanced Nursing Practice and Health Care Delivery Based on Scientific</td>
<td>A course assignment review will be conducted for academic year 2017-2018. A recommendation to include evaluation and interpretation of theoretical models linked to topical areas be added to at least one assignment rubric per course. Student’s perception of learning objective</td>
<td>Course rubric for NU 700 reflects assignment of evaluation of theoretical models reflecting nursing theory or organizational change theories used in evidence based practice. There was a strategic hire of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Planned Improvement</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Theories of Nursing and Other Disciplines.</td>
<td>achievement through group discussion will be added to an evaluation session at all executive sessions.</td>
<td>new faculty member teaching at the graduate level with an expertise in nursing theory. Although presently teaching a graduate nursing role and theory course for master students, she will update theory module content in the NU 700 course for Spring 2019. Students were queried in group discussion at the December 2017 and May 2018 executive sessions. Verbal feedback was positive, students were open to increasing the depth of content moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Ethical Analysis When Generating Policy, Research, and Practice.</td>
<td>Although this benchmark was met, the faculty struggle with assuring the validity of the assessment due to low cohort size. This assessment is a written assignment. Roles associated with DNP’s often involve verbal reporting in a variety of settings. The ability to discuss policy, research or practice issues framed in ethical analysis is a skill developed through practice. Students are given this opportunity through “elevator speech” presentation in the Policy and Advocacy in Health Care course. It will be recommended that this learning outcome measure be added to the rubric in that course presentation. Additionally, inclusion of guest lecturers with an expertise in ethical problem analysis are being added to learning opportunities for graduate nursing students during the fall 2017 semester. Evaluation of this offering will be a portion of group evaluation discussion at end of semester Executive Session. A discussion of student perception of learning objective achievement will be added to the evaluation session at all Executive Sessions.</td>
<td>This improvement was planned to occur in December 2017. This change did not occur. During the fall semester 2018, the Graduate chair met with a new Marymount faculty member with a background in bioethics. A meeting will be established before the semester’s end to review course syllabi, specifically leadership, policy and organizational theory courses. A new assignment for each course will be created in collaboration with this content expert. At least one guest lecture by this faculty member is planned for academic year 2018-2019. A discussion of student perception of learning objective achievement will be added to the evaluation session at all Executive Sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Conceptual and Analytical Skills in Evaluating the Links Among Practice.</td>
<td>In December 2017, DNP students enrolled in the first distance platform cohort will complete the program. This gives faculty an opportunity to review all courses with a scholarly project focus through direct scholarly work (written or oral). Graduating students will be surveyed electronically and in face to face discussion groups about their level of competence surrounding this learning outcome. Although course work related to the scholarly project logically builds through the evidence-based practice course sequence, faculty strives to improve areas where further scaffolding may be required for optimal student outcome. One such anecdotal example was identified in faculty project team meetings during the 2016-2017 academic year. Faculty believed students struggled with creating project aims linking synthesizing recommendations from the</td>
<td>Due to the departure of key faculty teaching graduate students, the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) project guide was not updated. Beginning Fall 2018, faculty teaching in the graduate school began meeting monthly to review student project progress and are gathering rubrics for deliverables in each portion of the scholarly project with DNP project guide update the intended deliverable by Spring 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Planned Improvement</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature. Assignment revisions in the introductory evidence-base practice course offered during Fall 2017 reflect this concern. Faculty during the 2017-2018 academic year will review key deliverables in all project related courses surrounding this learning outcome and will make suggestions for any needed changes. An expanded DNP project guide is planned for students. This will include all assignment rubrics for scholarly project related courses, project management templates and required dates for completion of written scholarly paper and oral presentation ensuring graduation during the fall or spring semester.</td>
<td>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:**

Comment:

**Task 1 – Respond to the Dean’s Letter/ Response:**

Dear Dean Matthews,

Thank you and the APBP Committee for examining the Program Review for the DNP program and comments made by an external expert reviewer during the spring of 2017. Below find a response to your letter dated May 2, 2016.

Input from the APBP Committee:

**Viability**: Post-master’s students enrolled in the DNP program continue low (n=2 fall 2017). The number of post-baccalaureate students enrolled in the Family Nurse Practitioner program designating the DNP track increased with the Fall 2017 admission cycle (n=2 New students making a total of 5 currently enrolled). Total new enrollment in the DNP program for fall 2017 (combining post-baccalaureate and post-master’s students) was 4. Spring 2019 enrollment numbers (current and incoming fall 2018 students) combined with student response (via electronic survey) to content and format changes will be submitted to Dean Matthews and the APBP Committee for review. Viability of the program will be determined based on number of designated post-baccalaureate to doctor of nursing practice students and number of post-master’s students enrolled in the program. Streamlining the post-baccalaureate to doctor of nursing practice program to eliminate content redundancy as well as change in delivery platform are efforts to enhance program viability.

**Commendations**: The nursing faculty is actively engaged in streamlining program content. Several graduate nursing classes with instruction previously in an on-ground delivery platform are being piloted as hybrid offerings during the fall 2017 semester. Additionally, since spring 2017, master’s students are offered an introductory Evidence-Bases Practice course at the doctoral level. Experienced on-line faculty educators serve as mentors to colleagues new to this delivery platform.
The DNP program continues collaborative offerings with the School of Business and the Department of Health and Human Performance (HHP). For example, professors such as Dr. Jennifer Tripken, from HHP lead the DNP Epidemiology course. Students from these concentrations take several DNP courses as graduate level electives. Adjunct instructors, such as Suzanne Miyamoto, PhD, RN, FAAN, Chief Policy Officer for the American Association of Colleges of Nurses, lend expertise in the doctoral health policy course.

The nursing faculty, while assuring alignment with professional regulatory and accreditations recommendations, strives to meet market place forces. Efforts to enhance a virtual presence are in progress. Website updates are underway. Strategic planning meetings with admission enrollment and Dr. Jason Craig (Director of Graduate Student Academic Success) will be held by September 30, 2017. A plan for workload dissemination in creating website changes is in place. The nursing faculty will be available for virtual student recruitment/retention activities and will partner with marketing creating real-time “twitter” and “Facebook” feeds. With piloted curricular changes fall 2017, students will be surveyed at midterm and semester’s end for feedback regarding the program platform. Faculty continues face-to-face recruitment efforts via interaction with our community health care partners. Reciprocal benefits with large medical systems such as INOVA or VHC are seen as faculty serve on system-wide research committees (e.g., Graduate Chair member of INOVA Evidence-Based Practice Research Committee) or position student leads in evidence-based practice projects benefiting the organization (e.g., doctoral students leading quality improvement projects identified by VHC and INOVA systems). Community participation raises awareness of MU graduate programs. Anecdotally, students report hearing of our programs through these partnerships and word of mouth communication with students working within these organizations.

Recommendations/requests:

1. As noted above, “spring 2019 enrollment numbers (current and incoming fall 2018 students) combined with student response (via electronic survey) to content and format changes will be submitted to Dean Matthews and the APBP Committee for review.

2. Commencing fall 2017, a monthly DNP project team lead meeting was established. Open to all DNP committee members, this is a forum for idea exchange, discussion of student mentoring issues and consensus building when discussing appropriate project topic selection, templated project presentation rubrics, and time-line for presentation/final paper submission for graduation in each term. With addition of faculty peer mentoring, 8 students (enrolling in the program from 2012-2016) are scheduled for graduation December 2017 or May 2018.

3. The nursing faculty continues to follow recommendations from the accreditation review. Program updates include opportunities for growth identified in a winter 2017 external review. Annual assessment of student learning outcomes is conducted. It is through this iterative process of assessment, review and change implementation that the curriculum evolves continuing best practices in DNP education.

Many thanks again for the opportunity to work with such talented and committed faculty, students and staff.

Sincerely,

Maureen Moriarty DNP, ANP-BC
## Outcomes Assessment 2017-2018

### Learning Outcome 1: Design methods for evaluating clinical outcomes to direct evidence-based practice for improving health care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct measure:</strong> NU 800 (Scholarly project proposal course) Discussion board assignment requiring students to post “your project AIMS/OUTCOMES with detailed steps for achievement. Respond meaningfully to two peers. Include critique of measurements, achievability of results”</td>
<td><strong>100% of students must achieve a score of 20/20 on the discussion board post.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data collected and evaluated by the instructor against a rubric provided to students at the beginning of the semester. The student population were enrolled in the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) program. This is the third evidence-based practice course in project proposal development.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The instructor used a rubric for evaluation (Appendix 1). 100% of students in the course during Spring 2017 (n = 3) achieved the performance standard.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct measure:</strong> NU 800 or NU 899 (Scholarly project proposal course or independent study course focusing on DNP project) Faculty evaluation of DNP student oral presentation of project proposal</td>
<td><strong>90% of students will successfully defend DNP project proposal on first presentation to faculty.</strong></td>
<td><strong>DNP students are provided the rubric for this assignment at the beginning of the semester. All doctorally prepared nursing faculty are invited to attend presentations. Following presentation, faculty, as a group, privately evaluate student performance using the rubric. The DNP program director, meeting with the presenting DNP student, one to one shares the outcome of this faculty discussion.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The faculty used a rubric for evaluation (Appendix 2). During this assessment cycle 75% of students (n = 4) during their first DNP project proposal presentation gained faculty approval. The performance standard was not achieved.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpretation of Results
Describe the extent to which this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):
On the discussion board assignment detailing DNP scholarly project outcomes and aims, the standard was achieved. The standard for the second direct measure, “90% of students will successfully defend DNP project proposal on first presentation to faculty” was not, as only three of four students participating in this learning activity (75%) met this benchmark.

Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:
The ability to design methods in evaluating clinical outcomes is central in developing evidence-based quality improvement projects. Our program introduces this concept in incremental steps through a series of three evidence-based practice courses. The last course in the sequence gives students an opportunity to write Aims and Outcome measures linked to their scholarly project. Although successful in crafting these deliverables in a discussion board format, the standard was not achieved when students translated this information into an oral scholarly project proposal presentation to faculty. The majority of students (3 out of 4) met the benchmark and with numbers this small interpretation of data is limited. However, this does present a potential gap in student achievement of this outcome. There is an opportunity to redefine learning activities associated with construction of this portion of the scholarly project.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:
The NU 800 course module addressing development of AIMS/OUTCOMES will be reviewed and updated. Additional learning activities focused on appropriate measurements, creation of SMART objectives, and steps in creating a robust, achievable project plan will be created. This may involve use of templates found in scholarly literature addressing DNP projects.
Prior to DNP project presentations, a proposal executive summary will be circulated to all doctorally prepared nursing faculty. If rubric elements are found omitted from the summary, the presentation will be deferred. The DNP program director will notify the student of delays associated with incomplete executive summary. The DNP director will also review faculty comments (negative/positive) with students privately following oral proposal presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome 2: Lead inter-professional teams in the analysis of complex practice and organizational issues.</th>
<th>Assessment Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Measures</strong></td>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Standard</strong></td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct measure: NU 899 (terminal) DNP students will successfully implement their completed quality improvement project as evidenced by documentation of methods in their final DNP paper.</strong></td>
<td>100% of students will successfully implement a quality improvement project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DNP students in the final semester complete a paper and present an overview of their scholarly project. Each student is assigned two team “readers” following a DNP project proposal presentation accepted by faculty. These readers evaluate the scholarly paper using a rubric. This rubric is provided toFaculty “team readers” worked with students in this iterative process until a deliverable meeting all rubric elements was produced (Appendix 3). Completion of 7 projects in one academic year is a major milestone for students and mentoring faculty.</strong></td>
<td>100% of students (n=7) met the standard. All students implemented a quality improvement project and created an original manuscript documenting their work. Faculty “team readers” worked with students in this iterative process until a deliverable meeting all rubric elements was produced (Appendix 3). Completion of 7 projects in one academic year is a major milestone for students and mentoring faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome Measures**

*Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Define and explain acceptable level of student performance. | Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population. | 1) Describe the analysis process.  
2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable. |

**Direct measure:** A written assignment in NU 801, a DNP course aimed at assessing the clinical site where the quality improvement project will occur was chosen. Students were to incorporate this information (including barriers/facilitators to project implementation) into the DNP scholarly project proposal.

100% of students will score an 85% or above on the assignment, “DNP project proposal” sections 1-3.

Data collected and evaluated by the instructor against a rubric provided to students at the beginning of the semester. The student population were enrolled in the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) program. The instructor used a rubric for evaluation (Appendix 4). 67% of students in the course during Summer 2017 (n = 3) achieved the minimal passing score of 85% on this written assignment. The performance standard was not met.

**Interpretation of Results**

Describe the extent to which this learning outcomes has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

Prior to completion of the program, 100% of DNP students achieve this learning outcome as measured directly with completion of a scholarly paper describing project background (literature review), development, implementation, and evaluation. Metrics designed to gauge student progress towards this goal (such as the written assignment in NU 801) were not achieved during this assessment cycle. It is difficult to determine the result significance given such small cohort size (n = 3).

**Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:**

This program is designed to step learners through the process of a quality improvement project identification, implementation and evaluation. Three courses sequentially scaffold project content as students first learn problem identification, an evidence-based evaluative process for literature review, critique and synthesis, project implementation and finally evaluation. Seven students successfully completed the program during this assessment cycle. Several students lingered in the program for four or more years and finished with a cohort that began within the last 24 months. This speaks to the strength in our updated program design that imbeds deliverables linking to the final project in each evidence-based practice course.

Identifying an opportunity for improvement linked to lack of outcome achievement by one student (2 out of 3 achieved the standard) is difficult if not impossible. Although not reflected in the outcome measures identified for this learning objective, the program director spoke with each faculty member involved in DNP project teams. Difficulty with scholarly writing is identified as a core issue related to multiple manuscript iterations. This was managed in some cases through the use of editors (hired by students). Exploration of university resources in scholarly writing support may provide a more readily available and affordable option.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:**

The addition of an increased number of writing assignments early in the evidence-based practice course sequence will assist in earlier identification of students at risk. As mentioned above, exploration of university resources for scholarly writing assistance will be explored. As previously mentioned, development of the scholarly project and paper is an iterative process. The program director will review all assignments related to development of this deliverable. Written, oral and discussion board work will be mapped to
each portion of the project. If deficient areas are identified, assignments enhancing learning around a specific concept (such use of personal leadership style to mitigate barriers to project implementation) will be added.

**Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate leadership in health policy at the state, local, and federal level.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct measure:** Students in NU 706, a doctoral nursing course with a health policy focus, will provide a written discussion board response to the question, “How does the profession maximize political power?”

100% of students will score 17/20 or above on a discussion board post addressing the question, “How does the profession maximize political power?”

Data collected and evaluated by the instructor against a rubric provided to students at the beginning of the semester. The student population were enrolled in the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) program.

The instructor used a rubric for evaluation (Appendix 1, 5). 100% of DNP students (n = 5) in the course Fall 2017 met the standard with a score of 17/20 (85%) or above. Although numbers are small, the performance standard was achieved.

**Indirect measure:** Prior to graduation, all DNP students are to complete an electronic journal. Included are reflections on each DNP essential established by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) and supporting coursework and assignments enabling achievement. Additionally, a reflection on mastery level surrounding each essential is included. The assignment is given in NU 801, a DNP course aimed at assessing the clinical site where the quality improvement project will occur. This course considers potential challenges in project implementation with emphasis on processes/procedures to minimize failure risk. Journal reflection on the essentials is required prior to graduation. As such, students in the program who had not previously

100% of students will reflectively journal on the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN), DNP Essential V, Health Care Policy for Advocacy in Health Care.

DNP students submit an electronic journal to the program director for review. The program director looks for inclusion of reflections on DNP Essential V, Health Care Policy for Advocacy in Health Care as an evaluation.

The program director used the assignment instructions (Appendix 6) in her review of 10 DNP students. Seven students completed the assignment during the terminal semester, 3 students completed an initial submission during NU 801 in the Summer of 2017. 100% of students met this performance standard. Although numbers are small, the performance standard was achieved.
Outcome Measures
Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.

Performance Standard
Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.

Data Collection
Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population.

Analysis
1) Describe the analysis process.
2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.

completed this assignment did so as part of NU 899 (an independent study credit used to complete the scholarly project) in the terminal semester.

Interpretation of Results

Describe the extent to which this learning outcomes has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

This learning outcome was achieved by direct and indirect measure results.

Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:
The adjunct nursing professor who architected and teaches this course (NU 706) is a Robert Wood Johnson Fellow and lobbyist for AACN. The professional expertise brought to the course by this individual is reflected in achievement of this learning objective by direct and indirect measures. The geographical proximity of our campus to the nation’s capital provides an opportunity for health policy residency hours. Currently, residency hours in this course are limited to one day observation on the floor of the House or Senate. Some semesters, given Congressional schedules, this has not occurred.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:
Direct observation and participation in health policy at local, state and federal levels would provide students an experiential opportunity for intellectual growth surrounding this learning objective. The program director will discuss this with the adjunct nursing professor (or substitute) prior to the next offering of this course. An experiential learning activity will be created aligning with this learning outcome.

Appendices