Grades for Jennifer Anderson

Course **Arrange By**

Population Health Epidemi | Due Date | Apply

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF	
Academic Writer	May 3, 2020 by 11:59pm		0	0	
Week 1: Discussion - Exercise and Discussion Questions from Curley Text Book	May 10, 2020 by 11:59pm		59	60	
Week 2: Discussion - Epidemiological Methods	May 17, 2020 by 11:59pm		59	60	
Week 2: Healthy People 2020 Impact Paper	May 17, 2020 by 11:59pm		122	125	(https://chamberlain.instructure.com/courses/61582/assignments/1

SCORE DETAILS

Mean: 116.87 *High: 124* *Low: 90.5*

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
NR503_HP2020_SEPT19				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			
Assignment Content Possible Points = 100 Points view longer description	**5 pts** **Excellent** All bullet items (content) included with depth and consistent connection, validation, by evidence.	**4 pts** **V. Good** All content included but limited clarity or depth OR Content is missing one critical element.	**3 pts** **Satisfactory** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements Or 2. Writing lacks clarity, depth	**2 pts** **Needs Improvement** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements 2. Clarity 3. Problem is unsupported 4. Writing is largely unsupported
Discussion: Overview, Background and Significance of the Problem view longer description	**25 pts** **Excellent** All critical elements (content) included with depth and consistent connection, validation by evidence.	**23 pts** **V. Good** All content included but limited clarity or depth OR Content is missing one critical element.	**21 pts** **Satisfactory** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements Or 2. Writing lacks clarity, depth	**12 pts** **Needs Improvement** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements 2. Clarity 3. Writing is largely unsupported
Epidemiological Analysis of the Problem view longer description	**30 pts** **Excellent** All critical elements (content) included with depth and consistent connection, validation by evidence	**27 pts** **V. Good** All content included but limited clarity or depth OR Content is missing one critical element.	**25 pts** **Satisfactory** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements Or 2. Writing lacks clarity, depth	**15 pts** **Needs Improvement** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements 2. Clarity 3. Writing is largely unsupported
Application of HP 2020 view longer description	**20 pts** **Excellent** All critical elements (content) included with depth and consistent connection, validation by evidence	**18 pts** **V. Good** All content included but limited clarity or depth OR Content is missing one critical element.	**17 pts** **Satisfactory** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements Or 2. Writing lacks clarity, depth	**10 pts** **Needs Improvement** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements 2. Clarity 3. Writing is largely unsupported
Population Level Planning Interventions view longer description	**20 pts** **Excellent** All critical elements (content) included with depth and consistent connection, validation by evidence	**18 pts** **V. Good** All content included but limited clarity or depth OR Content is missing one critical element.	**17 pts** **Satisfactory** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements Or 2. Writing lacks clarity, depth	**10 pts** **Needs Improvement** Content missing: 1. Two critical elements 2. Clarity 3. Writing is largely unsupported
Assignment Format Possible Points = 25 Points view longer description	**15 pts** **Excellent** No APA errors	**14 pts** **V. Good** 1-2 APA errors	**12 pts** **Satisfactory** 3-4 APA errors	**8 pts** **Needs Improvement** 5-6 APA errors
Grammar, Syntax, Spelling view longer description	**10 pts** **Excellent** Written work is free of grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	**9 pts** **V. Good** Written work is largely free of grammatical, spelling or syntax errors. (Approximately 1-2).	**8 pts** **Satisfactory** Written work includes some grammatical, spelling or syntax errors that distract the reader. (Approximately 3-4).	**5 pts** **Needs Improvement** Written work contains numerous grammatical, spelling or syntax errors that distract the reader (Approximately 5-6).

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
NR503_HP2020_SEPT19				

CRITERIA	RATINGS	
Late Penalty Deductions view longer description	**0 pts** **Deduction of points**	**0 pts** **Deduction of points**

Week 3: Discussion-Epidemiological Methods and Measurements	May 24, 2020 by 11:59pm		54	60
Week 4: Midterm Quiz	May 31, 2020 by 11:59pm		80.83	100
Week 4: Open Forum Discussion	May 31, 2020 by 11:59pm	LATE	✓	0
Week 5: Infectious Disease Paper	Jun 7, 2020 by 11:59pm		124	125

(https://chamberlain.instructure.com/courses/61582/assignments/1

SCORE DETAILS

Mean: 114.21 *High: 125* *Low: 79*

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

NR503_WEEK 5 INFECTIOUS DISEASES PAPER_SEPT19

CRITERIA	RATINGS			
Assignment Content Possible Points =110 Points view longer description	**15 pts** **Excellent** Comprehensive description of the communicable disease (causes, symptoms, mode of transmission, complications, treatment) and the demographic of interest (mortality, morbidity, incidence, and prevalence). Integrate at risk aggregate populations.	**14 pts** **V. Good** Adequately identifies the communicable disease (causes, symptoms, mode of transmission, complications, treatment) and the demographic of interest (mortality, morbidity, incidence, and prevalence). Integration of at-risk aggregate populations.	**12 pts** **Satisfactory** Limited description of the communicable disease (causes, symptoms, mode of transmission, complications, treatment) and the demographic of interest (mortality, morbidity, incidence, and prevalence). Integration of at-risk aggregate populations scantly present.	**8 pts** **Needs Improvement** Unclear description of the communicable disease (causes, symptoms, mode of transmission, complications, treatment) and the demographic of interest (mortality, morbidity, incidence, and prevalence). Integration of at-risk aggregate populations inaccurately discussed/not related.
Determinants of Health view longer description	**40 pts** **Excellent** Robust identification and description of the determinants of health with explanation of how those factors contribute to the development of this disease. Evidence supports background.	**36 pts** **V. Good** Identification of determinants is complete but lack depth in an area or overall, presents risk factors, disease impact and at least one set of incidence and prevalence statistics which are presented and supported by evidence.	**33 pts** **Satisfactory** Description of determinants is missing one or more key points. Limited presentation of the contributing factors. Lack of evidence to support writing may be present or evidence may be inconsistent throughout.	**20 pts** **Needs Improvement** Determinants missing depth in general and more than one key point and lack of contributing factors There is may be no evidence or evidence may be present inconsistently or without relationship to writing.
Epidemiological Triad view longer description	**30 pts** **Excellent** Comprehensive review of the epidemiological triad (host factors, agent factors (presence or absence), and environmental factors). Writing includes examples that expand content beyond a definition into application. Full integration of evidence, sources.	**27 pts** **V. Good** Adequate review of the epidemiological triad (host factors, agent factors (presence or absence), and environmental factors.) Examples may be omitted. There is integration of evidence in the majority of the writing.	**25 pts** **Satisfactory** Limited review of the epidemiological triad (host factors, agent factors (presence or absence), and environmental factors.) Examples may be omitted. There is integration of evidence in the writing, which may be inconsistent.	**15 pts** **Needs Improvement** Minimal or unclear review of the epidemiological triac (the host factors, agent factors (presence or absence), and environmental factors.) There are no examples. Evidence is present but may not be consistent throughout.

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

NR503_WEEK 5 INFECTIOUS DISEASES PAPER_SEPT19

CRITERIA	RATINGS			
Role of the NP view longer description	**25 pts** **Excellent** Succinctly defines the role of the nurse practitioner according to a national nurse practitioner organization (Board of Nursing, AANP, for example) and synthesizes the role to the management of infectious diseases (surveillance, primary/secondary/tertiary interventions, reporting, data collecting, data analysis, and follow-up). Writing includes integration of a model of practice which supports the implementation of an evidence-based practice. References support all writing.	**23 pts** **V. Good** An adequate, but not fully comprehensive review	**21 pts** **Satisfactory** A limited review	**13 pts** **Needs Improvement** Minimal or unclear
Assignment Format Possible Points =15 Points view longer description	**10 pts** **Excellent** APA is accurate throughout the paper.	**9 pts** **V. Good** There are 1-3 APA errors.	**8 pts** **Satisfactory** There are 4-5 APA errors.	**5 pts** **Needs Improvement** There are 6-7 APA errors.
Spelling/grammar/ voice view longer description	**5 pts** **Excellent** No errors in spelling, grammar, and voice	**4 pts** **V. Good** There are 1-3 errors	**3 pts** **Satisfactory** There are 4-5 errors	**2 pts** **Needs Improvement** There are 6-7 errors
Late penalty deductions view longer description	**0 pts** **Minus Points**			**0 pts** **Minus Points**

Week 5: Open Discussion Forum	Jun 7, 2020 by 11:59pm	✓	0	
Week 6: Epidemiological Analysis: Chronic Health Problem	Jun 14, 2020 by 11:59pm	185	200	**(https://chamberlain.instructure.com/courses/61582/assignments/1**

SCORE DETAILS

Mean: 177.32 *High: 198* *Low: 0*

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

NR503_WEEK 6 CHRONIC HEALTH_SEPT19

CRITERIA	RATINGS			
Assignment Content Possible Points = 185 Points view longer description	**15 pts** **Excellent** Comprehensively and succinctly states the problem/concern. Clear presentation of the problem as well as the significance with a scholarly overview of the paper's content.	**14 pts** **V. Good** Identifies the problem/concern with adequate but not in-depth presentation.	**12 pts** **Satisfactory** Identification of problem/concern is limited.	**8 pts** **Needs Improvement** Improvement- Identificatio of problem/concern is unclear.
Background/Significance	**30 pts** **Excellent** Background and significance is complete, presents risks, disease impact and includes a review of incidence and prevalence of the disease within the student's state compared to national data. Evidence supports background. A student created table is included.	**27 pts** **V. Good** Background is complete, presents risk, disease impact and at least one set of incidence and prevalence statistics supported by evidence, for instance state data or national data is presented, but not both. Or, full data is presented but student table is not included.	**26 pts** **Satisfactory** Background missing one or more key points and at least one set of incidence and prevalence statistics are presented. Lack of evidence or limited presentation of the background. A table is included which may or may not be student created; may be limited in data.	**15 pts** **Needs Improvement** Background missing more than one key point and at least one set of incidence and prevalence statistics are presented, or there is no supported evidence. Unclear conclusions or presentation. No student created table is included; or if included is limited in scope or is not student created.
Surveillance and Reporting	**30 pts** **Excellent** Current state and national disease surveillance methods are reviewed along with currently gathered types of statistics and information on whether the disease is mandated for reporting. All writing is supported by evidence.	**27 pts** **V. Good** State and national disease surveillance methods are reviewed, currently gathered types of statistics is scant, reporting requirements discussed. All writing is supported by evidence.	**26 pts** **Satisfactory** State or national surveillance statistics are discussed as an overview, lacking detail / depth. Mandated reporting may be absent. Writing is supported by evidence but may be inconsistent.	**15 pts** **Needs Improvement** One of either state or national disease surveillance methods reviewed; currently gathered types of statistics may be missing or information on whether the disease is mandated for reporting is missing. There is a lack of depth with inconsistent use of evidence.
Descriptive Epidemiology	**35 pts** **Excellent** Comprehensive review and analysis of descriptive epidemiological points for the chronic health problem. The 5 W's of epidemiological analysis should be fully identified. Supported by scholarly evidence.	**32 pts** **V. Good** Review and analysis has depth in general but may be missing one of the 5 W's OR may be scant in one area of the 5 W's. All writing is supported by evidence.	**29 pts** **Satisfactory** Review and analysis superficial in all of the 5 W's OR may be scant or missing 2 or more of the W's. Evidence is present but may not be throughout all content areas.	**18 pts** **Needs Improvement** Review and analysis is missing depth throughout all of the content areas. Evidence may or may not support the writing.

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

NR503_WEEK 6 CHRONIC HEALTH_SEPT19

CRITERIA	RATINGS			
Screening, Diagnosis, Guidelines	**30 pts** **Excellent** Comprehensive review of current guidelines for screening and diagnosis. Screening tool statistics related to validity, predictive value, and reliability of screening tests are presented.	**27 pts** **V. Good** Adequate review of guidelines for screening, diagnosis, and statistics related to validity, predictive value, and reliability of screening tests is presented.	**26 pts** **Satisfactory** Limited review of guidelines for screening, diagnosis, and statistics related to validity, predictive value, and reliability of screening tests.	**15 pts** **Needs Improvement** Minimal or unclear review of guidelines for screening diagnosis, and statistics related to validity, predictive value, and reliability of screening tests. There is a lack of depth with inconsistent use of evidence.
Plan	**30 pts** **Excellent** Integrating evidence, provide a plan of how a nurse practitioner will address this chronic health condition after graduation. Provide three specific interventions that are based on the evidence and include how you will measure outcomes (how will you know that the interventions have utility, are useful?) Note: Consider primary, secondary, and tertiary interventions as well as the integration of health policy advocacy efforts. All interventions should be based on evidence – connected to a resource such as a scholarly piece of research.	**27 pts** **V. Good** An adequate, but not fully comprehensive, plan of action specific to the problem, and the geographic area is presented with 3 evidenced based actions that will be taken to address the impact, outcomes, or prevalence of the disease.	**26 pts** **Satisfactory** A limited plan of action specific to the problem, and the geographic area, outcomes, or prevalence of the disease. Three actions or less may be presented with limited or little evidence.	**15 pts** **Needs Improvement** Minimal or unclear review of guidelines for screening diagnosis, and statistics related to validity, predictive value, and reliability of screening tests. Actions are minimal or unclear, or lack specificity, are not supported directly by evidence or are not direct actions the student can take in practice. There is a lack of depth with inconsistent use of evidence.
Summary/Conclusion = 185 Points	**15 pts** **Excellent** The conclusion thoroughly, clearly, succinctly, and logically presents major points of the paper with clear direction for action. Includes scholarly references.	**14 pts** **V. Good** The conclusion adequately and logically presents major points of the paper with clear direction for action, but lacks one major point or is not succinct. Includes scholarly references.	**12 pts** **Satisfactory** The conclusion is a limited review of key points of the paper, is not succinct, or lacks one or more major points of the paper or clear direction for action. Scholarly references may or may not be included.	**8 pts** **Needs Improvement** Conclusion is unclear or significantly limited in overview of the paper. Scholarly references may or may not be included.
Assignment Format Possible Points =15 Points view longer description	**10 pts** **Excellent** APA is consistently utilized according to the 6th edition throughout the paper.	**9 pts** **V. Good** One or two errors in APA format	**8 pts** **Satisfactory** Three-Five errors in APA format	**5 pts** **Needs Improvement** Six errors in APA format

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

NR503_WEEK 6 CHRONIC HEALTH_SEPT19

CRITERIA	RATINGS			
Grammar, Syntax, Spelling	**5 pts** **Excellent** There are no grammar, unscholarly context or “voice” errors in the paper and spelling is accurate throughout.	**4 pts** **V. Good** One or two errors	**3 pts** **Satisfactory** Three-five errors	**2 pts** **Needs Improvement** Six errors
Late penalty deductions view longer description	**0 pts** **Minus Points**			**0 pts** **Minus Points**

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
Week 6: Open Forum Discussion	Jun 14, 2020 by 11:59pm	LATE	×	0
Week 7: Discussion- bal and Environmental Health	Jun 21, 2020 by 11:59pm		58	60
Week 7: Reflection on Achievement of Outcomes Concept Map	Jun 21, 2020 by 11:59pm		50	50
Week 8: Discussion - Health Policy and Ethics	Jun 27, 2020 by 11:59pm		60	60
Week 8: Final Quiz	Jun 27, 2020 by 11:59pm		75	100
ASSIGNMENTS			**92.68%**	926.83 / 1,000.00
TOTAL			**92.68%**	**926.83 / 1,000.00**