Doctor of Nursing Practice
DNP Proposal Paper
Grading Rubric

Project Title:
Student Name:
First reader/advisor:
Second reader:
Date:

Criteria and Points	Unacceptable 0	Below expectations 2	Meets Expectations 4	Exceeds Expectations 5	Total and Comments
Executive Summary	Executive summary absent	Student presents an executive summary that is missing one or more of the following: problem/focus, significance, setting, purpose, process and outcome objectives, plan and methods.	Student includes all of the following:. problem/focus, significance, setting, purpose, process and outcome objectives, plan and methods. However, one or more areas are vague or excessively wordy.	Student presents a clear and succinct summary of the problem/focus, significance, setting, purpose, process and outcome objectives, plan and methods.	/5
Problem /focus	Problem statement is not included	Problem /focus is poorly developed. Need/problem is not supported by data from current and relevant literature, key stakeholders, organization/site, population assessment. Local, regional/national data not included.	Relevant data from current literature, key stakeholders, organization/site, population assessment are included. Local and regional/national data are presented. Data are presented with minimal analysis to define and substantiate the problem.	Relevant data from relevant literature, key stakeholders, organization/site, population assessment are presented. Local and regional/national data are presented. Data are critically analyzed to define and substantiate the problem.	/5
Purpose	Purpose statement not included	Purpose statement is vague and is not well-aligned with the problem.	Purpose statement is incomplete in that it missing the intended outcome, population or general strategy. The purpose aligns with the problem statement.	Purpose is a comprehensive statement that includes the intended outcome, population and general strategy. The purpose statement aligns with the problem statement.	/5
Background/ Significance	No literature cited	Minimal literature cited to substantiate the significance and strategies. Relevant literature missing. Literature over 5 years old (unless it is a classic study or paper). Serial citations with no synthesis.	Literature cited that substantiates the significance and strategies. Most of the literature cited is current and relevant to the project. Use of literature shows some synthesis.	Literature cited that substantiates the significance and strategies. Literature cited is current and relevant to the project. Literature cited is well synthesized.	/5

Environment al Context	Environmental context not included	Environmental context is missing one or more salient characteristics (see guidelines). SWOT or other environmental context analysis is missing major factors and/or factors are not accurately categorized.	Salient characteristics (see guidelines) are described. SWOT or other environmental context analysis is superficial. Factors are accurately categorized.	Salient characteristics (see guidelines) of the environment are well-described. SWOT or other environmental context analysis is comprehensive and factors are accurately categorized.	/5
Risk Analysis	Risk analysis absent	Risk analysis is missing important factors that might influence the success of the project. Plans to mitigate risk are vague, incomplete or not feasible.	Risk analysis covers major factors that might influence the success of the project. Plans to mitigate the risk are brief, but feasible.	Risk analysis covers all relevant factors hat might influence the success of the project. Well described and feasible plans to mitigate risk.	/5
Project objectives	Project objectives not included	Poor connection between problem and process and outcome objectives. Poor connection between process objectives and activities and outputs. Objectives are not written in SMART format. Proposed change is not realistic. Proposed change does not reflect the unique characteristics of the population and/or project site	Process and outcome objectives are connected to the problem. Process objectives are connected to the major activities and outputs. Process and outcome objectives are mostly written in SMART format. Proposed change is realistic. Proposed change minimally reflects and understanding of the unique characteristics of the population and/or project site.	Process and outcome objectives are connected to the problem. Process objectives are connected to the activities and outputs. All process and outcome objectives are written in SMART format. Proposed change is realistic. Proposed change reflects an analysis of the unique characteristics of the population and/or project site.	/5
Framework(s)	Implementation/conce ptual or evaluation framework not included	Implementation/conce ptual or evaluation framework(s) not well described and/or do not guide the selection of methods used in the project.	Basic description of the implementation/conce ptual or evaluation framework. Framework loosely guides the selection of methods used in the project.	Thorough description of the implementation/conce ptual or evaluation framework. Framework clearly guides the selection of the methods used in the project.	/5
Methods (Implementat ion and Evaluation Plan)	Implementation and/or evaluation plan not included. Human subjects issues not addressed Data collection issues not addressed (if present) Feasibility and/or sustainability factors	Implementation and evaluation plan are poorly described or missing one or more important elements listed in the guidelines. Weak linkages between activities and outputs.	Implementation plan is superficial, but contains all elements from the guidelines. Adequate linkage between elements in implementation and evaluation plan. Human subjects issues addressed.	Detailed implementation and evaluation plan includes all elements from the guidelines. Strong linkages between activities, outputs, and all elements in the implementation and	/5

	not addressed. No literature cited to support methods.	Human subjects issues not adequately addressed. Feasibility and/or sustainability issues are poorly addressed. Missing important current and relevant literature to support methods.	Feasibility and sustainability factors are superficially addressed. Minimal use of current and relevant literature to support methods.	evaluation plan. Human subjects issues addressed. Feasibility and sustainability factors are well addressed. Current and relevant literature cited and synthesized and gives good support for the methods.	
Timeline	Timeline not included	Timeline is unreasonable or missing important elements.	Timeline includes major elements, but parts of the timeline may not be complete and/or feasible.	Timeline is complete, feasible and includes all relevant activities.	/5
Budget	Budget not included	Budget is vague or inaccurate. Rationale for resources, revenues, and expenditures not clearly articulated. Funding sources not clearly addressed.	Budget is adequate. Brief rationale given for resources, revenues, and expenditures. Funding sources addressed.	Budget accurately depicts the resources needed to implement the project within the stated timeline. Strong rationale for resources, revenues, and expenditures. Funding sources are clearly described.	/5
Evidence table	No evidence table	Evidence table is presented, but is not logically connected to the paper.	Literature evidence table is presented, but elements are briefly described	Literature evidence table is complete.	/5
APA and writing style	APA format not used References not cited	Paper is poorly organized. Grammatical, reference/citation, and APA style errors substantially detract from the paper. References not complete Copyrights not included (if applicable)	Paper is fairly well organized. Minimal grammatical or APA issues. References complete. Copyrights included (if applicable)	Ideas are clearly and logically written to support project purpose. Grammar and APA format used correctly throughout paper, with clear attribution and appropriate citations. References complete. Copyrights included (if applicable)	/5
Total					/65

In order to pass the course, students must achieve 80% (52/65) or better on the written proposal and the student must achieve *Meets Expectations* (4) or higher in every category.

Grading scale:
90 – 100 (58.5- 65) = A
80 – 89.4 (52 – 58) = B
70 – 79.4 (45.5 – 51.4) = C
Below 70 (<45) = F