Program Assessment Plan

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program:	**PhD Program in Nursing: Program Outcome Assessment**
Department:	**Nursing**
College/School:	**Nursing**
Date:	**Updated Plan, October, 2017; revised and approved January 25, 2018**
Primary Assessment Contact:	**Joanne Schneider**

Program Learning Outcomes What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program?	**Assessment Mapping** specific courses (or experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed	**Assessment Methods** What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? *Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.* Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	**Use of Assessment Data** How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes *made in previous years*?
1. Articulate multiple perspectives on knowledge development and a broad understanding of research methods. Addresses University-wide graduate-level learning outcomes #2: Apply the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in the field(s) of study.	**NURS 6800:** Theory development in nursing (substruction rubric) **NURS 6809:** Quantitative methods of nursing research (final proposal rubric) **NURS 6810:** Qualitative methods in nursing research **NURS 6813:** Knowledge Development in Nursing	**Direct:** a. Substruction presentation: In NURS 6800, 80% of students will present a substruction of a theoretical framework to variables used in research to achieve at least 80% on the grading rubric (attached). b. Theory Paper: In NURS 6800, 80% of students will write either an analysis, synthesis, or derivation of a concept, statement, or theory (or some other approved theoretical focus) to achieve at least 70% on the grading rubric (attached). c. Specific aims writing assignment: In NURS 6809, 80% of students will write a specific aims section to include a succinct introduction of the problem, purpose statement that flows from the introduction, specific aims that are consistent with the purpose, and a payoff/significance that also is consistent to achieve at least 75% on the NURS 6809 rubric (attached). d. Final proposal: In NURS 6809, 80% of students will synthesize the literature, incorporate a theoretical framework and explain specifically how the framework will guide their study, and discuss the significance of their study to achieve at least 75% on the theory and measures sections on NURS 6809 rubric (attached). e. Family Meal Study: In NURS 6810, 80% of students will write a qualitative research report of the family meal to achieve at least 80% on the NURS 6810 final paper rubric (attached). f. Final synthesis paper: In NURS 6813, 80% of students discuss the philosophical perspective on a topic of their choice to achieve at least 80% on the NURS 6813 rubric (attached). g. At their dissertation defense, 80% of students will demonstrate above average [score ≥3 (1=not at all and 5=very)] on items #5 and #6 of the of *Faculty Review of Dissertation* form: the student demonstrates beginning skills in knowledge development and research methods.	**Direct:** -Course faculty will be responsible for aggregating data for their courses yearly and revise their assignments for the upcoming year to maintain or improve outcome. -Course faculty will supply the program director with aggregate data yearly. -Aggregate results will be analyzed and compared with trends from previous course offerings. If aggregate results are less than 80% of students achieving the specified grade on the assignment, results and analysis, with recommendations for improvement, will be shared at the dedicated PhD program committee with all of the PhD faculty and a representative student member. Recommended changes will be implemented into the curriculum the following

		Indirect: End-of-program survey: 90% of graduates score agree or strongly agree on items #1 - #4: After completing the nursing PhD program, I have gained the knowledge and skills to: #1. Understand and identify the broad philosophical traditions that shape nursing science. #2. Critique the different perspectives and approaches to knowledge development and the conduct of research. #3. Select and apply appropriate research designs in developing research studies. #4. Manage and analyze data to conduct research studies.	academic year and changes will be evaluated at the next annual dedicated PhD program committee meeting. -Program director will aggregate dissertation review form data. PhD committee will review aggregate data yearly and make recommendations. **Indirect:** -PhD committee will aggregate data for trends and make curricular recommendations. If one student rates an item <4 on the End-of-program survey, the PhD program committee will review the curriculum with regards to that item.

Program Learning Outcomes What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program?	**Assessment Mapping** -specific courses (or experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed	**Assessment Methods** What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? *Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.* Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	**Use of Assessment Data** How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes *made in previous years*?
2. Critique and synthesize nursing and interdisciplinary knowledge in a substantive area of inquiry. Addresses University-wide graduate-level learning outcomes #1: Assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in the field(s) of study.	**NURS 6801:** Research Issues in Health Promotion and Protection and Vulnerable Populations **NURS 6804:** Research issues in the care of acutely and chronically ill populations	**Direct** a. Integrative Review: In NURS 6801, 80% of students write an integrative review, in a publishable format, describing their search, critical examination, and synthesis of the health sciences literature in a selected area of research related to their dissertation and the course topics; to achieve at least 80% on the NURS 6801 rubric (attached). b. State-of-the-science paper: In NURS 6804, 80% of students will write a state-of-the-science paper with a problem stated unambiguously and easy to identify; paragraphs that support the purpose; literature review that is up-to-date and based mainly on primary sources and is synthesized; to achieve at least 80% on the NURS 6804 rubric (attached). c. Critiques of research-based approaches: In NURS 6804, 80% of students in NURS 6804 will participate in weekly critiques of research-based approaches to improve symptom management in acutely and chronically ill patients to achieve at least 80% on the NURS 6804 rubric (attached). d. At their dissertation defense, students demonstrate above average [score ≥3 (1=not at all and 5=very)] on items #7 and #8 of the of *Faculty Review of Dissertation* form: the student demonstrates beginning skills in critiquing and integrating science. **Indirect** End-of-program survey: 90% of graduates score agree or strongly agree (4 or 5) on items #5 through #7:	**Direct:** -Course faculty will be responsible for aggregating data for their courses yearly and revise their assignments for the upcoming year to maintain or improve outcome. -Course faculty will supply the program director with aggregate data yearly. -Aggregate results will be analyzed and compared with trends from previous course offerings. If aggregate results are less than 80% of students achieving the specified grade on the assignment, results and analysis, with recommendations for improvement, will be shared at

		After completing the nursing PhD program, I have gained the knowledge and skills to: #5. Analyze and articulate the state of scientific knowledge in my area(s) of study. #6. Apply theoretical/scientific underpinnings of nursing and other disciplines to my area(s) of study. #7. Plan research to generate new knowledge in my area(s) of study.	the dedicated PhD program committee with all of the PhD faculty and a representative student member. Recommended changes will be implemented into the curriculum the following academic year and changes will be evaluated at the next annual dedicated PhD program committee meeting. -Program director will aggregate dissertation review form data. PhD committee will review aggregate data yearly and make recommendations. **Indirect:** -PhD committee will aggregate data for trends and make curricular recommendations. If one student rates an item <4 on the End-of-program survey, the PhD program committee will review the curriculum with regards to that item.

Program Learning Outcomes What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program?	**Assessment Mapping** -specific courses (or experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed	**Assessment Methods** What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? *Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.* Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	**Use of Assessment Data** How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes *made in previous years*?
3. Generate and disseminate nursing knowledge through research that is innovative, rigorously conducted, ethically sound, and culturally sensitive. Addresses: University-wide graduate-level	**NURS 6809:** Quantitative methods of nursing research **NURS 6802:** Measurement of Nursing Variables **NURS 6812:** Issues of Scientific Integrity in Nursing and	**Direct** a. <u>Final research proposal assignment</u>: In NURS 6809, 80% of students will write a thorough research methods section to include design, setting, participants, recruitment/sampling plan, measures/instruments, procedures, sample size estimation, potential problems, limitations, data analysis, and innovation to achieve at least 80% on NURS 6809 rubric. (attached). b. <u>Group instrument development project</u>: In NURS 6802, 80% of students will complete a group project to develop an instrument to measure a nursing variable to achieve at least 80% on the group project rubric (attached). c. <u>Individual instrument development project:</u> In NURS 6802, 80% of students will complete an individual project in which they design a study to test the new instrument and will achieve at least 80% on the individual project rubric (attached).	**Direct:** -Course faculty will be responsible for aggregating data for their courses yearly and revise their assignments for the upcoming year to maintain or improve outcome. -Course faculty will supply the program director with aggregate data yearly. -Aggregate results will be analyzed and compared with trends from previous course

learning outcomes #4: Articulate arguments or explanations to both a disciplinary or professional audience and to a general audience, in both oral and written forms. University-wide graduate-level learning outcomes #5: Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.	Research **NURS 6806:** Multivariate/ Multivariable Statistics in Nursing Research	d. Final Integrity Issues paper. In NURS 6812, 80% of students will achieve at least 80% (based on a grading rubric) by identifying 4 relevant issues in scientific integrity, relating the problem to an ethical principal, and describing an approach to managing each issue that they may encounter (rubric attached). e. Final statistics project: In NURS 6806, 80% of students will complete a databased project to achieve 44 out of 55 possible points on NURS 6806 rubric (attached). f. At their dissertation defense, 80% of students will demonstrate above average [score ≥3 (1=not at all and 5=very)] on items #1 through #4 of the of *Faculty Review of Dissertation* form: that the dissertation work was rigorously conducted, ethically sound, culturally sensitive, and innovative. **Indirect** End-of-program survey: 90% of graduates score agree or strongly agree (4 or 5) on items #8 through #12: After completing the nursing PhD program, I have gained the knowledge and skills to: #8. Apply research ethics in the conduct of research and writing for publication. #9. Integrate principles of cultural competence in working with different populations and ethnic groups in development and dissemination of nursing research. #10. Prepare a manuscript for publication. #11. Prepare a proposal and conduct a nursing research study. #12. Articulate implications of research for the public, nursing practice, and health policy.	offerings. If aggregate results are less than 80% of students achieving the specified grade on the assignment, results and analysis, with recommendations for improvement, will be shared at the dedicated PhD program committee with all of the PhD faculty and a representative student member. Recommended changes will be implemented into the curriculum the following academic year and changes will be evaluated at the next annual dedicated PhD program committee meeting. -Program director will aggregate dissertation review form data. PhD committee will review aggregate data yearly and make recommendations. **Indirect:** -PhD committee will aggregate data for trends and make curricular recommendations. If one student rates an item <4 on the End-of-program survey, the PhD program committee will review the curriculum with regards to that item.

Program Learning Outcomes What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program?	**Assessment Mapping** -specific courses (or experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed	**Assessment Methods** What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? *Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.* Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	**Use of Assessment Data** How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes *made in previous years*?
4. Steward the discipline by serving as leaders in health care and academic settings.	**NURS 6803:** Nursing issues & leadership strategies	**Direct** a. Leadership paper: In NURS 6803, 80% of students will identify an unresolved nursing research question and it significance to nursing practice policy for their final course paper to achieve at least 80% on the Leadership Paper Grading Rubric. b. At their dissertation defense, 90% of students demonstrate above average [score ≥3 (1=not at all and 5=very)] on items #9 and #10 of the of *Faculty Review of Dissertation*	**Direct:** -Course faculty will be responsible for aggregating data for their courses yearly and revise their assignments for the upcoming year to

Addresses University-wide graduate-level learning outcomes #3: Apply knowledge from the field(s) of study to address problems in broader contexts.		form: the student demonstrates beginning leadership skills in presenting professionally and their future plans. **Indirect** a. End-of-program survey: 90% of graduates will score agree or strongly agree (4 or 5) on item #13: After completing the nursing PhD program, I have gained the knowledge and skills to apply advocacy and leadership strategies to influence health policy and practice in my area of interest. b. Within two years of graduation, graduates hold either a faculty position, leadership position in an organization, or a position on an editorial board.	maintain or improve outcome. -Course faculty will supply the program director with aggregate data yearly. -Aggregate results will be analyzed and compared with trends from previous course offerings. If aggregate results are less than 80% of students achieving the specified grade on the assignment, results and analysis, with recommendations for improvement, will be shared at the dedicated PhD program committee with all of the PhD faculty and a representative student member. Recommended changes will be implemented into the curriculum the following academic year and changes will be evaluated at the next annual dedicated PhD program committee meeting. -Program director will aggregate dissertation review form data. PhD committee will review aggregate data yearly and make recommendations. **Indirect:** -PhD committee will aggregate data for trends and make curricular recommendations. If one student rates an item <4 on the End-of-program survey, the PhD program committee will review the curriculum with regards to that item.

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the above-noted program learning outcomes? *(It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)*

1) Responsibilities: Director of the PhD Nursing Program is responsible for leading this assessment plan.
2) Timeline:
   a) AY 2016-2017: Student Learning Outcome 1
   b) AY 2017-2018: Student Learning Outcome 2
   c) AY 2018-2019: Student Learning Outcome 3
   d) AY 2019-2020: Student Learning Outcome 4
   e) AY 2020-2021: Student Learning Outcome 1
   f) AY 2021-2022: Student Learning Outcome 2
   g) AY 2021-2022: Student Learning Outcome 3
   h) AY 2021-2022: Student Learning Outcome 4
3) Process for implementing this assessment plan:
   a) Director of the PhD Nursing Program will collect direct/indirect data through course faculty members
   b) End-of-program survey will be sent out every 2 years. Data will be compiled every 4 years with the 4-year cycle.
   c) Faculty attending dissertation defenses will complete an evaluation of the research. The director will compile the results.

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

1) **How did program faculty contribute to this plan?** The draft items were developed by respective faculty and compiled and edited by the director. Then, the PhD faculty revised and approved the plan at a PhD program committee meeting.
2) **How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.** A current PhD student serves on the PhD program committee that established the assessment of the outcomes and reviewed the document to provide feedback regarding revisions of the curriculum.
3) **What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?** *AACN's The Research-Focused Doctoral Program in Nursing: Pathways to Excellence.* Our first draft was reviewed by an external paid consultant who is an HCL reviewer.
4) **Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel.** The plan is manageable with current resources.

3. On what schedule/cycle will faculty review and, if needed, modify this assessment plan?

At the beginning of every academic year, the PhD program committee will review the outcomes that have been selected for review for that year. Any changes in the planned approach will be discussed and revisions will be made for the upcoming academic year. The assessment cycle has been developed to allow one outcome to be assessed each year. Evaluation of outcomes will be discussed each fall at a PhD program committee meeting. Recommended changes will be implemented into the curriculum the following academic year and changes will be evaluated the next year.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any assessment rubrics (as noted above) along with this report.

Substruction Presentation Rubric NURS 6800

Name _____

The objective of this presentation is to analyze selected concepts and theoretical models of nursing. (course objective #3)

1. Choose a research article **with a theory** used in your area.

2. Post the citation in BlackBoard for your colleagues to read before class.

3. Consider depicting your substruction diagram by drawing it in Powerpoint. Present it to the class while encouraging class participation. You only have 5 minutes!!!

Your presentation should include engaging your classmates in a discussion of the model/theory (from your article) for as many of the following as possible:

Theoretical definition of the constructs (or concepts) from the article. (5 points)

Concepts of the model/theory. (5 points)

Referentials for the concepts. (5 points)

Referents from the referentials. (5 points)

Relationships between the concepts (propositions). (5 points)

Hypotheses that can come from the model/theory. (5 points)

Name:

NURS 6800: Theory paper rubric

Thesis	Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, crystal clear.	10	
	Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality.	7	
	May be unclear (contain many vague terms), appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new; provides little around which to structure the paper.	4	
	Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.	0	
Structure	Evident, understandable, appropriate for thesis. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences.	10	
	Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences.	7	
	Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences.	4	
	Unclear, often because thesis is weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences.	0	
Use of evidence	Primary source information used to buttress every point with at least one example. Examples support mini-thesis and fit within paragraph. Excellent integration of quoted material into sentences.	10	
	Examples used to support most points. Some evidence does not support point, or may appear where inappropriate. Quotes well integrated into sentences.	7	
	Examples used to support some points. Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate (often because there may be no clear point). Quotes may be poorly integrated into sentences.	4	
	Very few or very weak examples. General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement. Quotes not integrated into sentences; "plopped in" in improper manner.	0	
Analysis	Author clearly relates evidence to mini-thesis; analysis is fresh and exciting, posing new ways to think of the material.	10	
	Evidence often related to mini-thesis, though links perhaps not very clear.	7	
	Evidence occasionally related to the mini-thesis, argument has lapses, occasional links made.	4	
	Very little or very weak attempt to relate evidence to argument; may be no identifiable argument, or no evidence to relate it to.	0	
Logic and argumentation	All ideas in the paper flow logically; the argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. Author anticipates and successfully defuses counter-arguments; makes novel connections to outside material (from other parts of the class, or other classes) which illuminate thesis.	10	
	Argument of paper is clear, usually flows logically and makes sense. Some evidence that counter-arguments acknowledged, though perhaps not addressed. Occasional insightful connections to outside material made.	7	
	Logic may often fail, or argument may often be unclear. May not address counter-arguments or make any outside connections. May contain logical contradictions.	4	
	Ideas do not flow at all, usually because there is no argument to support. Simplistic view of topic; no effort to grasp possible alternative views. Many logical contradictions, or simply too incoherent to determine.	0	
Mechanics	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style; minimal to no spelling errors; absolutely no run-on sentences or comma splices.	10	
	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation style often used correctly. Some (minor) spelling errors; may have one run-on sentence, sentence fragment, or comma splice.	7	
	Problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction (usually not major). Errors in punctuation, citation style, and spelling. May have several run-on sentences or comma splices.	4	
	Big problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Frequent major errors in citation style, punctuation, and spelling. May have many run-on sentences and comma splices.	0	
Total			

Rubric for NURS 6809, Final proposal

Name: _____ Date: _____ Key: FFPNT-for full points next time

Format Instructions
Font (size, color, type density) and Line Spacing **Font size**: must be 11 points or larger (smaller text in figures, graphs, diagrams and charts is acceptable as long as it is legible) **Type density**: must be no more than 15 characters per linear inch (including characters and spaces) **Line spacing**: must be no more than six lines per vertical inch **Text color**: must be black (color text in figures, graphs, diagrams, charts, tables, footnotes and headings is acceptable) We recommend the following fonts, although other fonts (both serif and non-serif) are acceptable if they meet the above requirements: Arial, Garamond, Georgia, Helvetica, Palatino Linotype, Times New Roman, Verdana.
RESEARCH PLAN PART 1: Specific Aims (possible 8 points): The purpose of the specific aims is to describe concisely and realistically the goals of the proposed research and summarize the expected outcome(s), including the impact the proposed research will exert on the research fields involved. **Recommended Length: No more than 1 page**. Content: The specific aims should cover: • broad, long-term goals; • the specific objectives and hypotheses to be tested; • summarize expected outcomes; and • describe impact on the research field. This is the most important page of the entire application because it may be the only section the unassigned reviewers read to understand approach, impact, and innovation. **Suggestions for total points**: 1) **Introduction:** Generally, the Specific Aims section should begin with a brief narrative [leading up to and] describing the long-term goals or objectives of the research project. Brief introduction to orient the reader to the topic and the need for this research in the field. Build up to the purpose of the study. Add only what is needed to support the purpose and aims. Includes defining terms used in the purpose or specific aims. (make it clear, interest grabbing, define terms)—**2 points.** 2) **Purpose statement:** Suggest using this terminology, "The purpose of this study is to…" A **fatal flaw** would be if the purpose statement does not follow logically from introduction—**2 points**. 3) **Specific Aims:** List succinctly the specific objectives of the research proposed, e.g., to test a stated hypothesis, create a novel design, solve a specific problem, challenge an existing paradigm or clinical practice, address a critical barrier to progress in the field…. Make sure your specific aims & hypothesis are clearly stated, testable, and adequately supported by citations & preliminary data. Be as brief and specific as possible. For clarity, each aim should consist of only one sentence. Most successful applications have 2-4 specific aims. List specific aims, include hypotheses as possible. A **fatal flaw** would be if the specific aims do not follow logically from purpose statement—**2 points**. 4) **Payoff:** Include a brief statement of the overall impact of the research studies. Payoff: What is the payoff, expected outcome, significance summary—**2 points.**

1)Introduction:	
2)Purpose Statement	
3)Specific Aims	
4)Payoff	

RESEARCH PLAN PART 2: Significance and Innovation (possible 8 points):

This section should explain the importance of the problem or describe the critical barrier to progress in the field. Explain how the proposed research project will improve scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice in one or more broad fields. Describe how the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field will be changed if the proposed aims are achieved. **Recommended Length: Approximately 2 pages.**

Content: This section should cover:

- the state of existing knowledge, including literature citations and highlights of relevant data;
- rationale of the proposed research;
- explain gaps that the project is intended to fill; and
- potential contribution of this research to the scientific field(s) and public health.

Suggestions for total points:

1. **Background:** Make a compelling case for your proposed research project. Why is the topic important? Why are the specific research questions important? Establish significance through a careful review of published data in the field, including your own. Avoid outdated research. Use citations not only as support for specific statements but also to establish familiarity with all of the relevant publications and points of view. Use of subtitles is effective ways to lead readers along. Review what is known and what needs to be known (be consistent with objectives and synthesize the literature)—**2 points**
2. **Theoretical Framework:** Highlight why this research is important beyond this specific project i.e., theoretically. Provide a theoretical framework and **specifically** describe how it will be used in this project.—**2 points**
3. **Significance:** Highlight why research findings are important beyond the confines of a specific project i.e., how can the results be applied to further research in this field or related areas. Clearly state public health implications. Explain the importance of this project and how it will contribute to the field (must be strong and convincing). Suggest that in a separate section, start your sentences like this: This study in significant because…—**2 points**
4. **Innovation** Explain how the application challenges and seeks to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms. Describe any novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions developed or used, and any advantage over existing methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions. Explain any refinements, improvements, or new applications of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions. Content: The innovation section could (and should if at all possible) include the following:
    - Explain why concepts and methods are novel to the research field.
    - Focus on innovation in study design and outcomes.
    - Summarize novel findings to be presented as preliminary data in the Approach section.

    Describe how the application differs from current research or clinical practice paradigms. Provide a careful review of the current literature to support the innovative methodologies, approaches, or concepts of your research. Demonstrate familiarity with novel methodologies by citing your publications or your collaborator's publications. Be very direct by starting your sentences like this "This study is innovative because…"—**2 points**

1)Background	
2)Theoretical Framework	
3)Significance	
4)Innovation	

RESEARCH PLAN PART 3: Approach (possible 24 points):

Approach The purpose of the approach section is to describe how the research will be carried out. This section is crucial to how favorably an application is reviewed. Recommended Length: 5-10 pages. Content: The research design and methods section should include the following:

- PI's preliminary work/studies, data, and experience relevant to the application and the experimental design;
- the overview of the experimental design;
- a description of methods and analyses to be used to accomplish the specific aims of the project;
- a discussion of potential difficulties and limitations and how these will be overcome or mitigated;
- expected results, and alternative approaches that will be used if unexpected results are found;
- a projected sequence or timetable (work plan);
- if the project is in the early stages of development, describe any strategy to establish feasibility, and address the management of any high risk aspects of the proposed work;
- a detailed discussion of the way in which the results will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted;
- a description of any new methodology used and why it represents an improvement over the existing ones.

Content: The research design and methods section should include the following (not necessarily in this order):

1. **PI's preliminary work**/studies, data, and experience relevant to the application and the experimental design;

Alternatively, integrate preliminary work/data with the methods description for each Specific Aim. Preliminary work can be an essential part of a research grant application and helps establish the likelihood of success of the proposed project. Include the research team here and the role and the expertise/prior work each member brings to the project. —**2 points**

2. **Overview of the experimental design** including rationale, briefly restate aims and design to address them—**2 points**;

Describe the methods and analyses to be used to accomplish the specific aims of the project:

3. **Setting** [description including number of patients who might qualify for this project & rationale for setting]—**2 points**
4. **Participants** [description, with inclusion/exclusion criteria & rationale; mention race, gender, and children]—**2 points**
5. **Recruitment/sampling plan** [description & rationale]—**2 points**
6. **Measures/instruments** [connect each to the aims and/or theory directly; rationale for each; description of measure including sample items and subscales, scoring method/calibration (what do high scores mean), validity & reliability or specificity & sensitivity (actual values); for samples see good quality published research]—**2 points**
7. **Procedures** [very detailed with rationale as needed; include assignment technique and how data will be collected; include hazardous situations and precautions planned]—**2 points**
8. **Sample size calculations** [description & rationale]—**2 points**
9. **Data Analysis**: Discuss in detail the way in which the results will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted; Data analysis should be organized by specific aim [specify independent & dependent variables and covariates for each test]—**2 points**
10. **Timetable**: Projected the sequence or timetable (work plan) for completing the study [description & rationale]—**2 points**;
11. **Alternate Strategies**: Develop **alternative strategies** for potential problems. Potential problems, think about things that might go wrong that you can do something about, have a backup plan, such as not being able to recruit enough participants. Discuss potential difficulties and how these will be overcome or mitigated; Potential problems, think about things that might go wrong that you can do something about, have a backup plan, such as not being able to recruit enough participants. Point out any procedures or situations that may be hazardous and precautions to be exercised. These can be incorporated throughout, not in a separate section. [discuss alternative strategies and benchmarks for success]—**2 points**
12. **Limitations**, things you cannot do something about (describe each and plan for minimizing each). Include how this project has value in spite of these limitations.—**2 points**

Suggestions for total points:

- Number the sections in this part of the application to correspond to the numbers of the Specific Aims.
- Avoid excessive experimental detail by referring to publications that describe the methods to be employed. Publications cited should be by the applicants, if at all possible. Citing someone else's publication establishes that you know what method to use, but citing your own (or that of a collaborator) establishes that the applicant personnel are experienced with the necessary techniques.
- If relevant, explain why one approach or method will be used in preference to others. This establishes that the alternatives were not simply overlooked. Give not only the "how" but the "why."
- If employing a complex technology for the first time, take extra care to demonstrate familiarity with the experimental details and potential pitfalls. Add a co-investigator or consultant experienced with the technology, if necessary.
- Explain how the research data will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted as well as any resource sharing plans as appropriate.

RESEARCH PLAN PART 3: Approach continued:	
1)PI and team	
2)Overview of design	
3)Setting	
4)Participants	
5)Recruitment	
6)Measures	
7)Procedures	
8)Sample Size	
9)Data Analysis	
10)Timetable	
11)Alternate Strategies	
12)Limitations	

RESEARCH PLAN PART 1: Specific Aims (possible 8 points):	
RESEARCH PLAN PART 2: Significance and Innovation (possible 8 points):	
RESEARCH PLAN PART 3: Approach (possible 24 points):	
TOTAL (possible 40 points):	

NURS 6810 Family Meal Study rubric:

Research Report: The final paper will present the student's analysis of the complete set of data on family dinner routines. The student must select a specific qualitative approach for analyzing the data and will organize the paper according to the standard approach for reporting a study (with a very brief background section). The student must demonstrate understanding of the selected qualitative method and beginning analytic skills in analyzing all student-generated data. Students will discuss their emerging analysis and the development of a codebook with classmates at the last class. The final paper is due at the last class. The following rubric will be used to evaluate the final paper**,** which will count for 40% of the course grade.

Evaluation of Research Report: 40% of grade

Abstract		2 points
Introduction		2 points
Study design		10 points
Findings		10 points
Discussion		8 points
Conclusion		2 points
Mechanics of writing and APA format		3 points
Codebook	Attach as appendix to paper	3 points

NURS 6813 Final Synthesis Paper and Rubric:

Final paper: Students can select among the following paper topics for the final paper. An alternative paper topic may be suggested by a student but must be approved in advance by the faculty member. The final paper is due on December 7.

Select several studies related to your potential dissertation topic and describe the prevailing view of knowledge that is implicit in this research. Discuss these findings in light of an alternative view (e.g., Heideggerian, critical theory, feminist, Merleau-Pontian, Aristotelian) for developing knowledge for nursing practice.

Nurse scientists have deplored the gap that exists between nursing research, theory, and clinical practice. Nurse researchers who hold this view believe that clinicians, for a variety of reasons, do not apply the results of nursing studies in their practice. After describing the major reasons for this gap, as described in the literature, develop an argument that agrees or disagrees with nurse researchers by drawing on the thought of one of the philosophers we studied in class. Discuss how this philosophical perspective supports or challenges the way that nurse scientists describe the gap between research/theory and practice.

Descartes described the body as a machine while Merleau-Ponty provided the foundations for understanding the lived body. Compare and contrast these two views of the body. What are the implications of each view for nursing science and practice? Provide specific examples from your specialty area of nursing practice.

Select a clinical problem and describe the implications of the lived body versus a mechanical body

for how the clinical problem would be addressed. For example, how would the notion of the lived

body and the mechanical body shape the care of patients with asthma, or with heart disease, or

with some other illness or condition? Also describe the implications of both understandings of the

body for how you would conduct a study on the clinical problem.

Select a nursing textbook from your specialty area and describe its implicit assumptions regarding the knowledge needed for nursing practice. Then select another perspective on knowledge development (e.g., empiricist, feminist, Foucaultian, critical theory, Heideggerian, lived body etc) and describe how the textbook would look different from this perspective. Provide specific examples. Also describe the implications of such a shift for socializing students into nursing, including the gains and losses for learning and practicing nursing.

Should nursing be understood as a practice discipline? As a research-based discipline? Or something else? Describe the implications of your position for advancing nursing practice and knowledge development for your nursing specialty or research interest.

Describe the major characteristics and premises of the current discourse on evidence based practice. Identify the philosophical tradition or traditions which appear to be most closely associated with what counts as evidence in EBP. Also describe the strengths and limitations of the current discourse on EPB for advancing nursing practice. Finally, how would you propose to strengthen or extend EBP (draw on philosophical traditions discussed in class).

Nursing practice, at its best, integrates knowledge of the particular (knowledge of the specific person, family, community) with knowledge of the general (knowing that). Discuss this issue and its significance for generating nursing knowledge by nurse researchers. You may respond to this issue in a variety of ways. You may address how the issue has evolved historically; how it is addressed by contemporary scholars; how these forms of knowledge are addressed in nursing education; and the

relevance of the issue for evidence based practice. You can take a stance on the validity and usefulness of one or both kinds of knowledge for guiding nursing practice. You can draw on research and practice examples to support your argument. Your response needs to demonstrate an understanding of how philosophers have discussed these forms of knowledge.

Evaluation of final paper: 40% of grade: see below

GENERAL EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR PAPERS

Thesis	Easily identifiable, plausible, novel, sophisticated, insightful, crystal clear.	16	
	Promising, but may be slightly unclear, or lacking in insight or originality.	13	
	May be unclear (contain many vague terms), appear unoriginal, or offer relatively little that is new; provides little around which to structure the paper.	10	
	Difficult to identify at all, may be bland restatement of obvious point.	7	
Structure	Evident, understandable, appropriate for thesis. Excellent transitions from point to point. Paragraphs support solid topic sentences.	16	
	Generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. May have a few unclear transitions, or a few paragraphs without strong topic sentences.	13	
	Generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Few or weak transitions, many paragraphs without topic sentences.	10	
	Unclear, often because thesis is weak or non-existent. Transitions confusing and unclear. Few topic sentences.	7	
Use of evidence	Primary source information used to buttress every point with at least one example. Examples support mini-thesis and fit within paragraph. Excellent integration of quoted material into sentences.	16	
	Examples used to support most points. Some evidence does not support point, or may appear where inappropriate. Quotes well integrated into sentences.	13	
	Examples used to support some points. Points often lack supporting evidence, or evidence used where inappropriate (often because there may be no clear point). Quotes may be poorly integrated into sentences.	10	
	Very few or very weak examples. General failure to support statements, or evidence seems to support no statement. Quotes not integrated into sentences; "plopped in" in improper manner.	7	
Analysis	Author clearly relates evidence to mini-thesis; analysis is fresh and exciting, posing new ways to think of the material.	16	
	Evidence often related to mini-thesis, though links perhaps not very clear.	13	
	Quotes appear often without analysis relating them to mini-thesis (or there is a weak mini-thesis to support), or analysis offers nothing beyond the quote.	10	

	Very little or very weak attempt to relate evidence to argument; may be no identifiable argument, or no evidence to relate it to.	7	
Logic and argumentation	All ideas in the paper flow logically; the argument is identifiable, reasonable, and sound. Author anticipates and successfully defuses counter-arguments; makes novel connections to outside material (from other parts of the class, or other classes) which illuminate thesis.	16	
	Argument of paper is clear, usually flows logically and makes sense. Some evidence that counter-arguments acknowledged, though perhaps not addressed. Occasional insightful connections to outside material made.	13	
	Logic may often fail, or argument may often be unclear. May not address counter-arguments or make any outside connections. May contain logical contradictions.	10	
	Ideas do not flow at all, usually because there is no argument to support. Simplistic view of topic; no effort to grasp possible alternative views. Many logical contradictions, or simply too incoherent to determine.	7	
Mechanics	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style; minimal to no spelling errors; absolutely no run-on sentences or comma splices.	16	
	Sentence structure, grammar, and diction strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation and citation style often used correctly. Some (minor) spelling errors; may have one run-on sentence, sentence fragment, or comma splice.	13	
	Problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction (usually not major). Errors in punctuation, citation style, and spelling. May have several run-on sentences or comma splices.	10	
	Big problems in sentence structure, grammar, and diction. Frequent major errors in citation style, punctuation, and spelling. May have many run-on sentences and comma splices.	7	
Style	Follows style nearly perfect	4	4
	Follows style part of the time; has a number of errors	2	
	Does not follow style at all	0	
Total			%

NURS 6801

Research Issues in Health Promotion and Protection of Vulnerable Populations - Integrative Review Paper Grading

Section		Points	Score/Comments
1. Introduction - formulate an appropriate research problem for an integrative review	Identify purpose of review	5	
2. Methods/Search - use a defined and appropriate search method ; identify inclusion/ exclusion criteria/analysis methods	Appropriate to address purpose with rationale for decisions, description of the analysis method. Flow diagram describes search	10	
3. Findings - present the findings from reviewed studies. Summarize what the researchers have found by key themes.	The findings section includes; an organized, well synthesized presentation of findings by themes/topics. Includes table(s) to help reader understand the findings. What is consistent or inconsistent? Answers the question: 4. What do we know?	25	
4. Discussion - analyze the studies critiquing the designs, methods, analysis techniques, etc. Make conclusions about the quality of what has been done	This section provides your critique and conclusions about the findings. Put the findings in the context of prior reviews/papers. This should flow logically from the findings. Address the limitations of your review. 5. Answers the question: What is the quality of what we know?	25	
5. Discussion - Identify gaps in the literature and make recommendations for future research	Describe what is missing needs to be done to overcome the limitations of current research and add to the state of the science 6. What do we need to know?	20	

	7. Where do we go next?		
6. Writing style and organization	Organization, style and clarity of writing	10	
7. Use of APA, references	Appropriate references and use of APA format	5	
		Total	

NURS 6804: Rubrics for Research issues in the care of the acutely and chronically ill populations.

Grading Rubric for State of Science Paper, NURS 6804	
Component	Possible points
Clearly stated question or problem	5
Appropriate selection of key search words	5
Organization of paper according to author guidelines	4
Appropriate selection of articles reviewed	5
Logical synthesis of findings	5
Logical conclusions	6
Grammar and clarity of writing	5
Total	35

Note: State of Science Paper represents 35% of the final grade (35 of 100 points).

Grading Rubric for Peer Review of State of Science Paper, NURS 6804	
Component	Possible Points
Significance of problem; does it answer the 'so what' question?	2
Did the author use reliable sources for the review?	2
Was there a logical flow of ideas that focused on the identified problem?	2
Was the paper clearly written and easy to follow?	2
Did the conclusions match the reported findings?	2
Total	10

Note: The rubric will be applied for each peer review performed; an average of the scores will be calculated. The calculated score will represent 10% of the final grade (10 of 100 points).

NURS 6802: Group Instrument development project rubric

Introduction: Describes the test conceptualization and clearly define the construct. Describe the purpose of the measure and population of interest.	2-3 paragraphs/2 points	
Literature review: Describe the relationship of the construct and other existing variable and measures. Literature provided to support to test conceptualization.	2 pages/4 points	
Item Writing and administration: Include items to assess all dimensions of the construct. Describe the number of items initially developed and , how items were developed and the rational for the scaling and scoring,	2 pages/5 points	
Methods: SME's presented with a clear definition of construct. SME's informed of items scoring and scaling instructions for their task. Include a list of the items presented to the SME panel.	2 pages/5 points	
Results: Includes a Statistical Analysis of SME rating. Includes a decision for dropping or adding items based on analysis. Additional items identified by SME's. Include a list of the final items.	2 pages/5 points	
Discussion: Description of the implications of pilot testing of the instrument. Describe potential positive/negative implications of the scale. Describe the implication for nursing.	2-3 paragraphs/5 points	
Clarity of thought	2 points	
Compliance with APA standards	2 points	
total	30	

Please include the lists of items in Appendixes.
10 page limit exclusive of reference and appendixes.

NURS 6802: Measurement Individual Project Grading Rubric

Criterion-Relate and Construct Validity	
Practical, relevant and reliable process for assessing criterion-related validity described	2
Rational for criteria for validating scale provided	2
Describe whether the proposed criteria would be concurrent, predictive or post-predictive	2
Provided recommendations for measures of convergent validity	2
Provided recommendations for measures of discriminant validity	2
Test Manual Development	
Clearly defined the construct	2
Identified the number of SME's and how they were identified	2
Described the steps of the instruments development	2
Justify the decision made in the scale development	2
Describe how the instrument was revised from conceptualization to content validity testing	2
Discuss the proposed validation of the scale	2
Identify limitations of the proposed validation plan	2
Described the theoretical and practical implications of the measure you've developed	2
Included the initial and final version of the scale	2
Reflection on the measurement development process	2
Total Points	30

NURS 6812 Final Integrity Issues Paper

Student:	Student Score	Comments
Issue 1 – Ethical principle(s) and actions – (16)		
Issue 2 - Ethical principle(s) and actions – (16)		
Issue 3 - Ethical principle(s) and actions – (16)		
Issue 4 - Ethical principle(s) and actions – (16)		
Clarity of expression - (20)		
References/ APA - (16)		

NURS 6806: Final statistics project

In consultation with your professor, each student will identify an existing dataset to pose research questions to and then answer using methodology discussed in this course. ***Do not*** plan on collecting your own data for this project. We only have the length of the semester to complete the entire project and the process of getting IRB approval and collecting enough data for multivariate analysis requires more time than the duration of a regular semester. Rather, students are expected to use a publicly available dataset for secondary analysis. Publicly available datasets for secondary data analyses do not require extensive data collection (if any) and IRB approval is typically achieved in less than a week. See examples of secondary and/or publicly available datasets provided below.

The graded form of your final project will be an oral presentation of your research poster and a poster summary abstract submitable to a professional poster session (See http://guides.nyu.edu/posters for guidance on constructing your poster). Hence, part of developing your poster will involve identifying a conference (e.g., MNRS) you could potentially submit the completed poster to and comply with their poster expectations (e.g., http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/convention/call-for-submissions/rules-guidelines#.VLVT4CvF8Ro).

Additionally, all students are expected to meet all IRB expectations/requirements (IRB main webpage: http://www.slu.edu/division -of-research-administration-home/ institutional- review-board-%28irb %29).

(1) It is ***required*** that students complete CITI's Biomedical Research training modules at https://www.citiprogram.org/ if they have not done so already.

(2) It is ***required*** that each poster developed will have undergone review with IRB using at a ***minimum*** SLU IRB Human Subjects Research Determination form on the following link: http://www.slu.edu/division-of-research-administration-home/institutional-review -board-(irb)/getting-started.

Examples of secondary and/or public dataset sources:
http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/How-to-Use-DATA2020
https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/landing.jsp
http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/surveys.htm
http://nces.ed.gov/
http://fcon_1000.projects.nitrc.org/indi/abide/

Final Project Topic Summary (Note, rubric below does NOT apply):
Students are expected to email a one paragraph summary of their topic of interest to the professor (See course calendar for due date). The summary is worth five (5) points and is graded as pass/fail. The student is not awarded the 5 points until a satisfactory summary is submitted. The maximum number of attempts on submitting a satisfactory summary is three (3). The summary is the initiation of a dialogue between the student and professor in regards to the final project. The summary is expected to contain (1) a sentence or two introducing the topic, (2) rationale behind selecting the topic, (3) major themes you are aware of in the literature on your topic, and (4) a search strategy to identify publically available datasets.

Final Project Dataset Identified (Note, the rubric below does NOT apply):
Students are expected to email to the professor a one paragraph summary describing the dataset they have identified for their final project (See course calendar for due date). The summary is worth five (5) points and is graded as pass/fail. The student is not awarded the 5 points until a satisfactory summary is submitted. The maximum number of attempts on submitting a satisfactory summary is three (3). The summary is a continuation of the dialogue between the student and professor in regards to their final project. The summary is expected to contain a (1) sentence or two describing the dataset, (2) description

of the variables of interest to the student including their level(s) of measurement and experimental design and (3) two research questions you intend to pose to the data. *Note, **do NOT** send the professor the dataset but **Do** include a weblink to the dataset if possible.*

Rubric

Scoring	***0***	***1***	***2***	***3***	***4***	***5***
Professionalism - Follows APA style. - Maintains research ethics consistent with the profession [2]. - Design (e.g., color, borders, pictures) does not detract away from the content. - Evidence of compliance with IRB. - Completion of CITI Biomedical research training modules.	Little evidence of compliance with professional standards [1].	Errors in this criteria are such that the level of professionalism detracts away from the presentation.	Three or more issues raise concern.	Generally meets expectations but 1 or 2 issues raise concern.	Overall meets expectations with no more than one weakness.	Meets Expectations
Organization - Sections of the poster are congruent in content and form. - Content is not crowded and can be viewed at a distance of 3 or more feet consistent with event expectations.	Errors in this criteria are such that the poster is difficult to follow and understand.	Errors in this criteria are such that entire an section (or sections) is difficult to follow and understand.	Three or more problems reduce the quality of the poster.	Generally meets expectations but 1 or 2 weaknesses raise concern.	Overall meets expectations with no more than one concern.	Meets Expectations
Compliance - An event to submit the poster to is identified and expectations delineated by the event are complied with. - Copy of the event expectations are turned in.	Criteria are not addressed.	Few elements of this criteria are met.	Three or more weaknesses are present and/or 3 or more elements are missing	Generally meets expectations but 1 or 2 weaknesses are present and/or 1 or 2 elements are missing	Overall meets expectations with no more than one concern.	Meets Expectations
Writing - Writing is clear and connected with one or two, if any, errors in grammar, spelling, APA style, and/or punctuation.	Errors in this criteria are such that the poster is difficult to follow and understand.	Errors in this criteria are such that entire an section (or sections) is difficult to follow and understand.	Three or more problems reduce the quality of the writing.	Generally meets expectations but 1 or 2 problems reduce the quality of the writing.	Overall meets expectations with no more than one concern.	Meets Expectations
Figures/Tables - Clear - Accurate - Succinct - Summary enhances the poster	Criteria was not addressed.	The figure is such it detracts away from the poster.	The figure does not contribute to the poster.	Generally meets expectations but 1 or 2 weaknesses raise concern.	Overall meets expectations with no more than one concern.	Meets Expectations
Content	***0***	***1 to 3***	***4 to 5***	***6 to 7***	***8 to 9***	***10***
Poster Abstract - Content of the poster is contained in the abstract. - Writing is clear and connected with one or two, if any, errors in grammar, spelling, APA style, and/or punctuation.	Criteria was not addressed.	Few elements of this criteria are met and/or errors make the handout difficult to follow and understand.	Three or more problems reduce the quality of the writing and/or utility of the summary.	Generally meets expectations but 1 or 2 weaknesses raise concern.	Overall meets expectations with no more than one concern.	Meets Expectations
Analyses	Analyses are	Errors in this	Errors in this	Generally	Overall	Meets

- Techniques employed are those covered in this course. - Appropriate inferential statistics are provided (e.g., effect size). - Appropriate descriptive statistics are provided - Analyses are complete (e.g., this is not a proposal). - Displays thoughtful application of course material.	missing	criteria, are such that the validity of the study is unreasonable to assume.	criteria, are such that the validity of the study is seriously in doubt.	meets expectations but 1 or 2 weaknesses are present and/or 1 or 2 elements are missing	meets expectations with no more than one concern	Expectations
Research Questions/Hypotheses - Inquiries follow logically from the introduction. -Answers to the research inquiries are congruent with the analyses implemented and the inquiries themselves. - Displays thoughtful application of course material.	Research questions and/or hypotheses are missing.	Errors in this criteria are such that the validity of the study is unreasonable to assume.	Errors in this criteria are such that the validity of the study is seriously in doubt.	Generally meets expectations but 2 or 3 weaknesses are present and/or 2 or 3 elements are missing.	Overall meets expectations with no more than one concern.	Meets Expectations.

1. Note, if professional standards are violated, this may warrant rejection of the poster for a grade (e.g., plagiarism).
2. *Resources for further clarity:* http://www.slu.edu/division-of-research-administration-home/institutional-review-board- (irb)/regulations/ethical-codes

NURS 6803 Course Paper Grading Rubric

Name:

Criteria	Points Possible	Points Earned
Identify an important unresolved nursing research question and its significance to nursing practice policy. (2 paragraphs)	20 points	
Review the pertinent literature to characterize the current state of knowledge, focusing on the limitations in that research that leave the question unresolved. Choose a sufficiently specific question that there is a manageable quantity of pertinent literature. Reference your literature review appropriately. (2-3 pages)	30 points	
Identify the appropriate methodology that should be used to resolve your question and describe the reasons for this approach (1-2 page)	25 points	
Summarize the strengths and limitations of your approach with special emphasis on its generalizability, advancement of nursing science, and implications for nursing practice. (1page)	25 points	
12 point font size, double spacing, 5 page limit, and adheres to APA format	10 points	
Grammar and clarity	10 points	
Total	120 possible	
		Total:

Faculty Review of Dissertation

Student Name: _____ Date: _____

Please rate the extent to which the dissertation met the outcomes below.

The dissertation work was:

1) Rigorously conducted	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very
2) Ethically sound	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very
3) Culturally sensitive	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very
4) Innovative	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very

The PhD candidate demonstrated beginning skills in:

5) Knowledge development	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very
6) Research methods	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very
7) Critiquing science	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very
8) Integrating science	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very
9) Presenting professionally	1	2	3	4	5
(Leadership)	Not at all				Very
10) Leadership: future plans	1	2	3	4	5
	Not at all				Very

Comments:

End-of-Program Survey QUESTIONNAIRE – PhD PROGRAM IN NURSING

Please respond to each statement by selecting the number that best reflects your opinion, from 1 for *Strongly Disagree* to 5 for *Strongly Agree*. If a particular question does not apply, please circle N/A (not applicable). We appreciate your taking additional time to add comments.

1. My PhD nursing program provided me with sufficient formal and informal learning experiences to build scientific depth in my area of study. (Examples: course work, MNRS, research conferences)

2. As a result of my doctoral nursing education, I am able to appreciate the history and philosophies of science including ways of knowing and habits of the mind. (Examples: course work, readings)

3. My PhD program provided me with beginning expertise to critique and integrate different science perspectives in the conduct of research. (Examples: course work, assignments, MNRS, research conferences)

4. I believe my doctoral education provided me ways to generate new ideas based on critical evaluation of existing knowledge. (Examples: course work, assignments, MNRS, research conferences)

5. Through my PhD nursing program, I developed beginning skills in advanced research design and statistical methods. (Examples: course work, readings, dissertation research)

6. As a result of my PhD nursing program, I am able to use professional and research ethics and judgment in the conduct of research and for writing for publication. (Examples: course work, assignments, dissertation research)

7. My PhD nursing program provided me ways to manage, process, and analyze data, information, and knowledge. (Examples: quantitative and qualitative course work, statistics courses)

8. As a result of my PhD nursing education, I can assume leadership in the conduct of culturally competent scholarship to improve nursing practice. (Examples: course work, dissertation research)

9. I believe my doctoral education informed me how to prepare research grants and manuscripts for publication. (Example: course work, assignments)

10. Because of my PhD nursing program, I can communicate research findings to lay and professional audiences and identify implications for policy, nursing practice, and the profession. (Examples: course work, assignments, MNRS, research conferences)

11. I believe my doctoral education provided me with theoretical/scientific underpinnings of nursing and other disciplines relevant to my area(s) of interest. (Examples: course work, dissertation research)

12. My doctoral nursing education provided practice knowledge that informs nursing science and its application. (Examples: course work, dissertation research)

13. My PhD nursing program incorporated leadership strategies to influence health policy and professional issues in my areas of interest. (Examples: course work, assignments, MNRS, research conferences)