

MLM1 – MLM1 TASK 1: EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICE AND APPLIED NURSING RESEARCH

EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICE AND APPLIED NURSING RESEARCH – C361

PRFA – MLM1

TASK OVERVIEW

SUBMISSIONS

EVALUATION REPORT

COMPETENCIES

724.8.5: Foundations of Inquiry

The graduate differentiates between quality improvement processes, evidence based practice, and research.

724.8.6: Literature Review and Analysis

The graduate demonstrates knowledge of the process and outcomes of conducting a literature review.

724.8.7: Ethics and Research

The graduate demonstrates understanding of the ethics of nursing research, particularly human subjects' protections, informed consent, and alignment with patient and family values and preferences.

724.8.8: Patient Outcomes

The graduate discriminates between identified standards and practices that do not provide improvements in patient outcomes utilizing relevant sources of evidence and the application of nursing theory.

724.8.9: Data Collection, Analysis, and Documentation

The graduate describes the process of data collection, analysis and implementation of evidence that can improve clinical practice from an interprofessional perspective.

INTRODUCTION

Evidence-based literature comes from many sources. The discipline of nursing has an abundance of research data and resources to guide clinical decisions. Therefore, it is of pivotal importance to understand the basic tenets of critical appraisal of such evidence for its use in interprofessional healthcare practices.

In this task, you will identify a healthcare problem, develop an evidence-based practice (EBP) question, and review selected research and non-research evidence to find answers to that question.

Note that while you will be analyzing only one research-based and one non-research-based article in this task, an actual evidence-based practice change would require the support of many high-quality research studies.

REQUIREMENTS

Your submission must be your original work. No more than a combined total of 30% of the submission and no more than a 10% match to any one individual source can be directly quoted or closely paraphrased from

sources, even if cited correctly. The originality report that is provided when you submit your task can be used as a guide.

You must use the rubric to direct the creation of your submission because it provides detailed criteria that will be used to evaluate your work. Each requirement below may be evaluated by more than one rubric aspect. The rubric aspect titles may contain hyperlinks to relevant portions of the course.

Tasks may **not** be submitted as cloud links, such as links to Google Docs, Google Slides, OneDrive, etc., unless specified in the task requirements. All other submissions must be file types that are uploaded and submitted as attachments (e.g., .docx, .pdf, .ppt).

A. Discuss the impact of a clinical practice problem on the patient(s) and the organization it affects.

1. Identify the following PICO components of the clinical practice problem:

- patient/population/problem (P)
- intervention (I)
- comparison (C)
- outcome (O)

2. Develop an evidence-based practice (EBP) question based on the clinical practice problem discussed in part A and the PICO components identified in part A1.

Note: Refer to "Appendix B: Question Development Tool" for information on the creation of an EBP question.

B. Select a research-based article that answers your EBP question from part A2 to conduct an evidence appraisal.

1. Discuss the background or introduction (i.e., the purpose) of the research article.

2. Describe the research methodology.

3. Identify the level of evidence using the Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice (JHNEBP) model.

Note: The article you select should not be more than five years old.

Note: Refer to "Appendix E: Research Evidence Appraisal Tool" for information on how to level a research-based article.

4. Summarize how the researcher analyzed the data in the article.

5. Summarize the ethical consideration(s) of the research-based article. If none are present, explain why.

6. Identify the quality rating of the research-based article according to the JHNEBP model.

Note: Refer to "Appendix E: Research Evidence Appraisal Tool" for information on how to establish the quality rating.

7. Analyze the results or conclusions of the research-based article and explain how the article helps answer your EBP question.

C. Select a non-research article from a peer-reviewed journal that helps to answer your EBP question from part A2 to conduct an evidence appraisal.

1. Discuss the background or introduction (i.e., the purpose) of the non-research article.

2. Describe the type of evidence (e.g., case study, quality improvement project, clinical practice guideline).

3. Identify the level of evidence using the JHNEBP model.

Note: The article you select should not be more than five years old.

Note: Refer to "Appendix F: Non-Research Evidence Appraisal Tool" for information on how to level the non-research-based article.

4. Identify the quality rating of the non-research-based article according to the JHNEBP model.
5. Discuss how the author's recommendation(s) in the article helps to answer your EBP question.

D. Recommend a practice change that addresses your EBP question using both the research and non-research articles you selected for Part B and Part C.

1. Explain how you would involve **three** key stakeholders in supporting the practice change recommendation.
2. Discuss **one** specific barrier you may encounter when implementing the practice change recommendation.
3. Identify **one** strategy that could be used to overcome the barrier discussed in part D2.
4. Identify **one** outcome (the O component in PICO) from your EBP question to measure the recommended practice change.

E. Acknowledge sources, using APA-formatted in-text citations and references, for content that is quoted, paraphrased, or summarized.

F. Demonstrate professional communication in the content and presentation of your submission.

File Restrictions

File name may contain only letters, numbers, spaces, and these symbols: ! - _ . * ' ()

File size limit: 200 MB

File types allowed: doc, docx, rtf, xls, xlsx, ppt, pptx, odt, pdf, txt, qt, mov, mpg, avi, mp3, wav, mp4, wma, flv, asf, mpeg, wmv, m4v, svg, tif, tiff, jpeg, jpg, gif, png, zip, rar, tar, 7z

RUBRIC

A:CLINICAL PRACTICE PROBLEM

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not identify a clinical practice problem or does not include a discussion of the impact of a clinical practice problem on the patient(s) and the organization it affects.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a discussion of the clinical practice problem but does not logically address its impact on the patient(s) and the organization it affects.

COMPETENT

The submission includes a discussion of the clinical practice problem that logically addresses its impact on the patient(s) and the organization it affects.

A1:PICO COMPONENTS

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include *each* of the given PICO

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes *each* of the PICO components of the

COMPETENT

The submission includes *each* of the given PICO components of

components of the clinical practice problem.

clinical practice problem, but 1 or more of the given components are inaccurate or incomplete.

the clinical practice problem. Each of the given components is accurate and complete.

A2:EVIDENCE-BASED QUESTION

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include an EBP question.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes an EBP question, but the EBP question does not appropriately address the clinical practice problem or does not include *all* the PICO components.

COMPETENT

The submission includes an EBP question that appropriately addresses the clinical practice problem and includes *all* the PICO components.

B:SELECTION OF A RESEARCH-BASED ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

An article selection is not provided.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The selected article is not research based or does not answer the EBP question from part A2.

COMPETENT

The selected article is research based and answers the EBP question from part A2.

B1:BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION OF THE RESEARCH-BASED ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a discussion of the background or introduction.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission does not accurately address a discussion of the background or introduction of the research-based article.

COMPETENT

The submission accurately addresses a discussion of the background or introduction of the research-based article.

B2:RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a description of the research methodology.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a description but inaccurately describes the research methodology.

COMPETENT

The submission includes a description that accurately describes the research methodology.

B3:LEVEL OF EVIDENCE IN THE RESEARCH-BASED ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not identify a level of evidence for the research-based article.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission identifies a level of evidence that is not accurate according to the JHNEBP model.

COMPETENT

The submission accurately identifies a level of evidence that is based on the JHNEBP model.

B4:ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a summary of data analysis.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a summary of data analysis, but the summary does not accurately describe how the researcher analyzed the data in the article.

COMPETENT

The submission includes a summary that accurately describes how the researcher analyzed the data in the article.

B5:ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a summary of ethical considerations. Or, the submission does not include an explanation of why no ethical considerations are present if the research-based article contains none.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a summary of ethical considerations, but the summary does not logically describe the ethical consideration(s) of the research-based article. Or, if no ethical considerations are present in the research-based article, the submission does not logically explain why none are present.

COMPETENT

The submission includes a summary that logically describes the ethical consideration(s) of the research-based article. Or, if no ethical considerations are present, the submission includes a logical explanation of why none are present.

B6:QUALITY RATING OF THE RESEARCH-BASED ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not identify a quality rating of the research-based article.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission identifies a quality rating that is not accurate according to the JHNEBP model.

COMPETENT

The submission accurately identifies a quality rating according to the JHNEBP model.

B7:RESULTS/CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESEARCH-BASED ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include an analysis of the results or conclusions of the research-based article.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes an analysis of the results or conclusions, but the analysis does not logically evaluate the results or conclusions of the research-based article. Or the analysis does not appropriately explain how the results or conclusions helps answer the EBP question.

COMPETENT

The submission includes an analysis that logically evaluates the results or conclusions of the research-based article and appropriately explains how the results or conclusions helps answer the EBP question.

C:SELECTION OF A NON-RESEARCH-BASED ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

An article selection is not provided.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The selected article is not a non-research article or does not answer the EBP question from part A2.

COMPETENT

The selected article is a non-research article and answers the EBP question from part A2.

C1:BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION OF THE NON-RESEARCH ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a discussion of the background or introduction.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a discussion that does not accurately address the background or introduction of the non-research-based article.

COMPETENT

The submission includes a discussion that accurately addresses the background or introduction of the non-research-based article.

C2:TYPE OF EVIDENCE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a description of a type of evidence.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a description of a type of evidence, but the description does not accurately describe the

COMPETENT

The submission includes a description that accurately describes the type of evidence used in the article.

type of evidence used in the article.

C3: LEVEL OF EVIDENCE IN THE NON-RESEARCH ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not identify a level of evidence for the non-research-based article.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission identifies a level of evidence that is not accurate according to the JHNEBP model.

COMPETENT

The submission accurately identifies the level of evidence according to the JHNEBP model.

C4: QUALITY RATING OF THE NON-RESEARCH ARTICLE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not identify a quality rating for the non-research-based article.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission identifies a quality rating that is not accurate according to the JHNEBP model.

COMPETENT

The submission accurately identifies the quality rating according to the JHNEBP model.

C5: AUTHOR'S RECOMMENDATION

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a discussion of the author's recommendation(s) that helped answer the EBP question.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a discussion, but the discussion does not logically explain how the author's recommendation(s) helped answer the EBP question.

COMPETENT

The submission includes a discussion that logically explains how the author's recommendation(s) helped answer the EBP question.

D: RECOMMENDED PRACTICE CHANGE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a practice change recommendation.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a practice change recommendation, but the recommendation does not appropriately address the EBP question. Or, the recommendation does not accurately utilize both the

COMPETENT

The submission includes a practice change recommendation that appropriately addresses the EBP question and accurately utilizes both the research and non-research articles to show how the change should be made.

research and non-research articles to show how the change should be made.

D1: INVOLVEMENT OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include an explanation of 3 key stakeholders.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes an explanation of 3 key stakeholders' involvement, but the explanation does not describe how 1 or more of the stakeholders would appropriately support the practice change recommendation.

COMPETENT

The submission includes an explanation of how 3 key stakeholders would appropriately support the practice change recommendation.

D2: BARRIER OF IMPLEMENTING THE PRACTICE CHANGE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not include a discussion of a specific barrier that might be encountered when implementing the practice change recommendation.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes a discussion of a specific barrier that might be encountered, but the barrier discussed is not appropriate for the practice change recommendation, or the barrier discussed would not feasibly be encountered during implementation.

COMPETENT

The submission includes a discussion of a specific barrier that might feasibly be encountered during implementation, and the barrier discussed is appropriate for the practice change recommendation.

D3: STRATEGY FOR OVERCOMING THE BARRIER

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not identify a strategy that could be used to overcome a barrier.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission identifies a strategy for overcoming a barrier, but that strategy would not logically be used to overcome the barrier discussed in part D2.

COMPETENT

The submission identifies a strategy that could logically be used to overcome the barrier discussed in part D2.

D4: OUTCOME TO MEASURE THE RECOMMEND PRACTICE CHANGE

NOT EVIDENT

The submission does not identify 1 outcome for measuring the recommended practice change.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission identifies 1 outcome from the EBP question, but the outcome does not appropriately measure the recommended practice change.

COMPETENT

The submission identifies 1 outcome from the EBP question that appropriately measures the recommended practice change.

E:APA SOURCES**NOT EVIDENT**

The submission does not include in-text citations and references according to APA style for content that is quoted, paraphrased, or summarized.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The submission includes in-text citations and references for content that is quoted, paraphrased, or summarized but does not demonstrate a consistent application of APA style.

COMPETENT

The submission includes in-text citations and references for content that is quoted, paraphrased, or summarized and demonstrates a consistent application of APA style.

F:PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION**NOT EVIDENT**

Content is unstructured, is disjointed, or contains pervasive errors in mechanics, usage, or grammar. Vocabulary or tone is unprofessional or distracts from the topic.

APPROACHING COMPETENCE

Content is poorly organized, is difficult to follow, or contains errors in mechanics, usage, or grammar that cause confusion. Terminology is misused or ineffective.

COMPETENT

Content reflects attention to detail, is organized, and focuses on the main ideas as prescribed in the task or chosen by the candidate. Terminology is pertinent, is used correctly, and effectively conveys the intended meaning. Mechanics, usage, and grammar promote accurate interpretation and understanding.

WEB LINKS

[Appendix B: Question Development Tool](#)

[Appendix E: Research Evidence Appraisal Tool](#)

[Appendix F: Non-Research Evidence Appraisal Tool](#)

