Criteria	Excellent = 4 points	Satisfactory = 3 points	Marginal = 2 points***	Unacceptable = 0	Comments	Score
APA format Title page References Appendices, as appropriate Theoretical model Concept map IRB approval Data collection instruments Letters of support	 APA format is correctly utilized. Reference list inclusive and written appropriately. Appendices included, as appropriate. 	 APA format is utilized with some errors. Reference list with some errors. Appendices with some errors. 	 APA format is utilized with frequent errors. References with frequent errors. Appendices with frequent errors. 	 APA format is not utilized. References not cited. Appendices not utilized 		
Writing Scholarship	 Professional written communication used. Correct grammar is used. 	Some errors in written communication.Some errors in grammar.	 Frequent errors in written communication. Frequent errors in grammar. 	Written communication and grammar lack professionalism.		
Introduction	Introduction clearly stated and discussed.	Introduction stated with some discussion.	Introduction stated with minimal discussion.	Introduction not included.		
Problem statement	Problem clearly stated and discussed.	Problem stated with some discussion.	Problem stated with minimal discussion.	Problem statement not included.		
Purpose/aims/objectives	Purpose/ aims/ objectives clearly stated.	Purpose/ aims/ objectives can be inferred but are not explicit.	Purpose/ aims/ objectives unclear.	Purpose/ aims/ objectives not included.		
Background	Background and context of problem clearly stated and discussed	Background and context of problem stated with some discussion.	· ·	0.7	CHOOL OF NUI	

Troposarraper Grading Rushic						
Criteria	Excellent = 4 points	Satisfactory = 3 points	Marginal = 2 points***	Unacceptable = 0	Comments	Score
Significance Significance to health care, nursing, advanced practice		Significance stated with some discussion.	Significance implied but minimal discussion.	Significance not included.		
System or Population Impact	System/population impact clearly stated and discussed.	System/population impact stated with some discussion.	System/population impact stated with minimal discussion.	System/ population impact not included.		
Synthesis Synthesis of Evidence Appraisal Strengths/weaknesses Gaps/limitations	 Comprehensive appraisal of evidence. Evidence is synthesized. Comprehensive discussion of strengths, weaknesses, gaps and limitations. 	 Adequate appraisal of evidence. Evidence is analyzed but not synthesized. Adequate discussion of strengths, weaknesses, gaps and limitations. 	 Evidence is identified but not analyzed. Discussion of strengths, weaknesses, gaps and limitations is limited. 	Evidence not included.		
Concepts Concepts/definitions	Concepts clearly identified and comprehensively defined.	Concepts identified, adequately defined.	Concepts identified but poorly defined.	Concepts not identified.		
Framework Conceptual/theoretical framework	Conceptual framework comprehensively discussed in relation to purpose/aims/objectives.	Conceptual framework identified. Congruency between conceptual framework purpose/aims/objectives adequately articulated.	Conceptual framework identified. Congruency between conceptual framework purpose/aims/objectives poorly articulated.	0.7	SCHOOL OF NU	

Criteria	Excellent = 4 points	Satisfactory = 3 points	Marginal = 2 points***	Unacceptable = 0	Comments	Score
Project Design	 Project design supports identified problem. Project design is comprehensive. Project design has logical flow. 	 Project design marginally supports identified problem. Project design is sufficient but not comprehensive. Logical flow is inconsistent. 	 Project design does not support identified problem. Project design has limited or no logical flow. 	Project design not identified.		
Data Collection Tools	 Data collection tools comprehensively described. Tools selected appropriate to project design. 	 Data collection tools adequately described. Tools selected relate to project design. 	 Data collection tools described. Tools selected poorly relate to project design. 	Data collection tools not described.		
Data Analysis	 Plan for data analysis appropriate to methodology Plan for data analysis comprehensively described. 	 Plan for data analysis appropriate to methodology Plan for data analysis adequately described. 	 Plan for data analysis inappropriate to methodology Plan for data analysis poorly described. 	Plan for data analysis not included.		
Resources Needed/Budget Justification	Comprehensive identification of resources needed for project and budget is included.	Identification of resources needed for project and budget is included.	Resources needed for project and proposed budget incomplete.	Resources and budget not included.	SCHOOL OF NU	JRSING

To calculate rubric score:

#REF!

Total number of earned points in all fifteen categories / total number of possible points = grade percent Example: 52/60 = .883 = 88.3% = B + = 3.3

***All criteria must be met at the Marginal level or higher and a score greater than B-/2.7 for student to progress.

Students must earn a B- or higher to progress within the DNP program.

All final course grades of X.5 or higher will be rounded to the next highest whole number (example: 89.5 would become 90, A-).

Criteria	Excellent = 4 points	Satisfactory = 3 points	Marginal = 2 points***	Unacceptable = 0	Comments	Score
----------	----------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	------------------	----------	-------

A grade of X.49 would not round up (89.49 would remain a B+).

<u>Grade</u>	Quality Points	<u>Grade</u>	Quality Points
97-100 = A+	4	80-82 = B-	2.7
93-96 = A	4	77-79 = C+	2.3
90-92 = A-	3.7	73-76 = C	2
87-89 = B+	3.3	70-72 = C-	1.7
83-86 = B	3	<69 = F	0



Revised 12/5/14