DNP Project Proposal Evaluation Tool

Each DNP Project Committee Member will complete and submit an evaluation tool within 24 hours of the completion of a student's proposal defense. Passing requires an overall score of 80% or greater from two or more committee members. If two or more committee members score the proposal less than 80% the proposal defense is a failure. The student must upload a copy of the completed defense forms from all three committee members into their DNP portfolio.

Date *

Month Day Year

Students Name *

First Name Last Name

Students Email *

example@example.com

Committee Members Name *

First Name Last Name

Committee Members Email *

example@example.com

Introduction:

Unsatisfactory = 1 Satisfactory = 2 Excellent = 3

Title *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ○ ○ ○ Excellent

Criteria: Summarizes DNP project topic and is less than or equal to 12 words

1. Title is not clear or not included or is >12 words
2. Title is somewhat clearly written to reflect the DNP Project topic and is < 12 words
3. Title is clearly written to reflect the DNP Project topic and is < 12 words
Introductory Paragraph *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: Paragraph that introduces DNP project topic

1. Inaccurate, unfocused, or no introductory paragraph provided.
2. Overview of project, purpose is clear within paragraph
3. Intro paragraph. Overview of project. Project purpose is clear in first 2 sentences

Background Knowledge-1 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: Problem statement and significance

1. Background not included.
2. Background and context of problem stated with some discussion.
3. Background, context, and importance of problem clearly presented using relevant data.

Background Knowledge-2 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: Use of literature to show relevant data using literature that supports project idea

1. Literature not used or does not show need or possible solutions, no synthesis of literature
2. Literature somewhat used to show need and/or possible solutions, synthesis somewhat included
3. Literature synthesized to support need for the DNP project's focus and discuss possible solutions to the problem.

Background Knowledge-3 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: Significance to health care, advanced practice nursing clearly stated and discussed

1. Significance not included.
2. Significance to healthcare and/or advanced practice nursing stated with some supportive data.
3. Significance to health care and advanced practice nursing of appropriate specialty clearly stated and supported using relevant data.
Local Problem-1 *

Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○  Excellent

Criteria: Local problem identified & stakeholders identified

1. Local problem not identified & stakeholders not discussed
2. Local problem superficially identified and/or some relevant stakeholders discussed.
3. Local problem identified and clearly described. Relevant stakeholders clearly discussed, including role.

Local Problem-2 *

Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○  Excellent

Criteria: Thorough description of a needs assessment, objective data, etc.

1. Not addressed or not addressed enough to understand how this occurred
2. Clearly stated with some support of how the problem was identified
3. Clearly discussed how the local problem was identified and supported with compelling and objective and/or subjective data.

Intended Improvement:

Unsatisfactory = 1  Satisfactory = 2  Excellent = 3

Project Purpose *

Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○  Excellent

Criteria: Project question related to purpose and clear rational for conducting the project

1. Purpose not included or not clearly discussed.
2. Vague or minimally supported purpose provided.
3. Purpose clearly stated.

Project Question *

Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○  Excellent

Criteria: Project question clearly stated

1. Project question not included or not related to project purpose.
2. Question stated, not clearly related to purpose.
3. Practice improvement-related question clearly stated, including site for implementation.
Project Objective(s) *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ☐  ☐  ☐  Excellent

Criteria: Project objective(s) clearly stated utilizing SMART

1. Objectives not included or not well defined.
2. Objective(s) discussed and match the project purpose and question utilizes SMART criteria
3. Objective(s) clearly described and closely align with the project purpose and utilize SMART criteria.

Theoretical Framework:

Unsatisfactory = 1  Satisfactory = 2  Excellent = 3

Theoretical Framework-1 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ☐  ☐  ☐  Excellent

Criteria: Theoretical Framework guiding the project:

1. Appropriate theoretical framework is not described
2. Theoretical framework is clearly described and indicates understanding
3. Theoretical Framework is thoroughly described and is related to the project.

Theoretical Framework-2 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ☐  ☐  ☐  Excellent

Criteria: Theoretical Framework is related to the project purpose:

1. Theoretical framework not identified or not effectively applied to the purpose of the project.
2. Relationship between theoretical framework and project purpose and objectives described.
3. Theoretical framework is clearly linked to the project’s purpose and objectives.

Theoretical Framework-3 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ☐  ☐  ☐  Excellent

Criteria: Illustration of Theoretical Framework implementation:

1. Illustration not used or not customized to project.
2. Illustration customized to project in a clear and effective way with the Theoretical Framework.
3. Illustration effectively demonstrates understanding of the Theoretical Framework and clearly links it to the project.
Theoretical Framework-4 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ◯ ◯ ◯ Excellent

Criteria: Concepts & Definitions identified:

1. Concepts not identified within the body of the text or as an appendix
2. Concepts identified, adequately defined within the body of the text or as an appendix. No hyperlinks
3. Concepts clearly identified and defined within the body of the text or as an appendix. Using hyperlinks

Literature Synthesis:

Unsatisfactory = 1 Satisfactory = 2 Excellent = 3

Evidence Search-1 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ◯ ◯ ◯ Excellent

Criteria: Research search terms described

1. Did not clearly address, any or all, databases used. Some or all not included: Inclusion criteria, types of subjects, journals, & parameters.
2. Adequately addressed databases used, inclusion criteria types of subjects, types of journals, journal parameters.
3. Appropriate and comprehensive search terms for project topic used. Databases used, inclusion criteria, types of subjects, journals, and journal parameters identified.

Evidence Search-2 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ◯ ◯ ◯ Excellent

Criteria: Results of search described

1. Did not discuss of results of search or did not complete an adequate search
2. Adequately stated results of search including number of articles, how search was narrowed, final number of selected studies.
3. Clearly stated results of search, including number of articles, how search was narrowed, final number of selected studies, and why those studies were chosen.
**Evidence Search-3**

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

**Criteria:** Flow diagram or a discussion of selection criteria

1. Flow diagram or discussion absent or does not show appropriate selection of articles
2. Flow diagram or discussion addresses appropriate selection criteria for articles used in synthesis
3. Flow diagram or discussion is detailed and clearly shows appropriate selection criteria for articles included in synthesis.

---

**Synthesis-1**

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

**Criteria:** Comprehensive appraisal of up to date evidence

1. Evidence not included or articles are reviewed and described but not synthesized.
2. Adequate appraisal of evidence and articles are synthesized
3. Comprehensive appraisal of evidence articles are fully synthesized

---

**Synthesis-2**

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

**Criteria:** Strengths of evidence

1. Strengths not addressed or inadequately addressed
2. Adequate discussion of strengths including synthesis
3. Comprehensive discussion of strengths showing clear support of the project

---

**Synthesis-3**

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

**Criteria:** Weakness of evidence

1. Weakness not addressed or inadequately addressed
2. Adequate discussion of weakness including synthesis
3. Comprehensive discussion of weakness showing clear support of the project
Synthesis-4 *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ○ ○ ○ Excellent

Criteria: Gaps and limitations of evidence

1. Gaps and limitations not addressed or inadequately addressed
2. Adequate discussion of gaps and limitations including synthesis
3. Comprehensive discussion of gaps and limitations

Methods:

Unsatisfactory = 1 Satisfactory = 2 Excellent = 3

Methods Introduction *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ○ ○ ○ Excellent

Criteria: Methods introductory paragraph

1. The methods introduction does not closely align with the projects purpose or not included
2. Clear and incomplete introduction of the methods section that aligns with the purpose
3. Clear and complete introduction of the methods section that closely aligns with the purpose

Model for Implementation *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ○ ○ ○ Excellent

Criteria: Discussion of the model for implementation including the PDSA cycle

1. Does not utilize the model or does not state how it guides implementation
2. Utilizes the model and PDSA cycle to fully describe project implementation
3. The implementation is comprehensive and incorporates all elements of the model into the project

Setting & Stakeholders *

1 2 3

Unsatisfactory ○ ○ ○ Excellent

Criteria: Description of setting used for project implementation and description of stakeholders

1. Does not address or clearly describes setting or stakeholders
2. Describes setting with limited details and stakeholders discussed in a clear manner.
3. Describes setting with high level of detail and stakeholders discussed in a comprehensive manner.
Planning the Intervention *

1  2  3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: A detailed step by step guide for project implementation.

1. Implementation steps not identified or adequately discussed.
2. Implementation steps are complete with sufficient level of detail and clearly organized.
3. Implementation steps are comprehensive with excellent level of detail and organized with precision

Recruitment and Participants *

1  2  3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: Description of recruitment of participants and the inclusion / exclusion selection criteria for participants

1. Recruitment not addressed or does not adequately state inclusion / exclusion selection criteria
2. Recruitment clearly addressed adequately states inclusion / exclusion selection criteria
3. Recruitment addressed in detail and precise detailed inclusion / exclusion selection criteria

Consent and Ethical Considerations *

1  2  3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: Discussion of consent process and ethical considerations related to the project

1. Consent process not addressed or does not adequately address ethical considerations
2. Consent process addressed adequately addresses ethical considerations
3. Consent process addressed in detail and comprehensive discussion of ethical considerations

Data Collection *

1  2  3

Unsatisfactory  ○  ○  ○  Excellent

Criteria: Discussion of data collection process and data collection tool used for the project

1. Data collection process not addressed or does not adequately discuss data collection tool
2. Data collection process addressed adequately, and data collection tool described
3. Data collection process addressed in detail and comprehensive discussion of data collection tool
Data Analysis *

1 2 3
Unsatisfactory 〇 〇 〇 Excellent

Criteria: Discussion of data analysis process for the project
1. Data analysis process not addressed or does not adequately discuss data analysis process
2. Data analysis process addressed adequately
3. Data analysis process addressed in detail

Scholarly Writing:

Unsatisfactory = 1 Satisfactory = 2 Excellent = 3

APA Formatting *

1 2 3
Unsatisfactory 〇 〇 〇 Excellent

Criteria: APA formatting is adhered to thought-out the document
1. APA formatting is not followed or is followed in up to 79% of the document
2. APA formatting is correctly followed in 80% or more of the document
3. APA formatting is precisely followed in 95% or more of the document

Writing & Grammar *

1 2 3
Unsatisfactory 〇 〇 〇 Excellent

Criteria: Professional writing and correct grammar is adhered to thought-out the document
1. Professional writing and correct grammar is not followed in up to 79% of the document
2. Professional writing and correct grammar is correctly followed in 80% or more of the document
3. Professional writing and correct grammar is precisely followed in 95% or more of the document