NURSING 5150
Project Development Seminar
Spring 2017

Instructor	Kathy Haight	**Office:** M3129
Phone	403.394.3947	**Email:** katherine.haight@uleth.ca
Office Hours	By appointment: please call or email to arrange	

Subject Librarian	David Scott	**Email:** david.scott@uleth.ca	**Phone** 403.329.5178

Course Description
This course is for students who have selected the project route. Participants will engage in student-led dialogue and debate about the process and components of developing and executing a project. Included will be key issues such as project format standards, time management, interdisciplinary integration of knowledge, and knowledge-to-action strategies. Students will participate in peer review and presentation activities in a blended learning format.

Prerequisites
Admission to the M.N. program

Intent
The intent of this course is to provide students with the opportunity to apply their cumulative understanding and skills to a specific practice situation. The project does not entail the collection of new (or pre-existing) data from individuals or groups. Rather, the project is the practical application of nursing evidence into a form that can be utilized by nurses.

Learning Objectives:
- Application of theoretical and methodological knowledge in the development of a feasible and meaningful contribution to the profession of nursing;
- Synthesis and critique of relevant interdisciplinary evidence;
- Development of a realistic plan for the project with specific strategies;
- Effective, professional communication of ideas and feedback;
- Respectful acceptance and integration of feedback from peers and;
- Enhanced understanding of the overall process of conducting a project and communicating findings.

Required Resource
McKenzie, J., Neiger, B., & Thackeray, R. (2017). Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating Health Promotion Programs: A Primer (7th Ed). Glenview, IL: Pearson Education.

Students are encouraged to access the National Collaborating Center for Methods & Tools at http://www.nccmt.ca/learningcentre/EN/index.php and complete the Introduction to Evidence-Informed Decision Making model, and other applicable modules to their project.

Core modules and other project development tools will be reviewed in the first face-to-face meeting. Students need to come to the meeting with a draft outline of their project topic (max. 1 page).

Course Format
Online, with two face-to-face seminar days.

Week	Dates	Format
1	Jan 10	**Face-to-face in AH119 0830-1230**
3	Jan 23	Online
5	Feb 6	Online
7	Feb 21-25	**Spring Reading Week – No Class**
8	Feb 27	Completion of the ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool **(no discussion forum)**
10	March 13	**Synchronous Discussion (via Skype)**
11	March 20	**Face-to-face Proposal colloquium in M3022, 1300-1600**
12	March 27	Online
13	April 3	Written Project Proposal due

Face-to-face:
Week 1: topic area for project; practice issues and general context for the project; initial ideas of project format; PICO (population, intervention, comparison, outcomes); and ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool. Required resource: National Collaborating Center for Methods and Tools, and the Online Health Program Planner resources
http://www.nccmt.ca/professional-development/modules
http://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/ServicesAndTools/ohpp/Pages/default.aspx

Week 11: proposal colloquium
Discussion forum:
The purpose of the discussion forums for this course is to provide students with the opportunity to engage in thoughtful reflection and discussion regarding their intended project proposal.

So that discussion forums are meaningful to the students and help advance their thinking and work in the development of their proposal, a requirement of this course is that students are required to post their work by ***Wednesday of the previous week***, according to the week's theme, for their colleagues and instructor to review and respond to. *For example*, in week 3, we will be discussing the evidence (what is known about the topic in the scholarly literature, grey literature, and interdisciplinary literature). So that a meaningful discussion can ensue, students need to post their work by Jan 18 (Wednesday prior to the beginning of week's discussion forum).

Note that there are only six discussion forums in the term (i.e. not weekly). Students are encouraged to check the dates carefully to ensure required documents and posts are available according to the class schedule.

Week 3 (on-line): synthesis and critique of evidence including interdisciplinary evidence; evidence demonstrates theoretical knowledge; feasibility and scope

Week 5 (on-line): initial plan for the project including specific strategies for target audience reflect demonstration of methodological knowledge including limitations of the project i.e. its impact

Week 12 (on-line): review and critique of written project proposal

Synchronous Discussion:
Week 10 (synchronous discussion): run-through of colloquium presentation

Evaluation Strategies

	Strategy	Medium	Weighting	Due Date
1	ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool	On-line	10% 10%	March 3 April 3
2	Proposal Colloquium	Face-to-face	25%	March 21
3	Written Project Proposal		55%	April 3

ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool:
In response to a gap in guidelines and resources to assist project leaders in considering the ethical implications associated with quality improvement and evaluation projects, the ARECCI Network has developed the ARECCI Ethics Guidelines for Quality Improvement and Evaluation. Grounded in ethical principles, these guidelines help project leaders ensure the rights of participants in these types of projects are respected.

To help students to differentiate between research and non-research projects, learn how to use the ARECCI decision-support tools, and assess and mitigate ethical risk in their project, it is highly recommended students complete the Project Ethics Course (see ARECCI Training Opportunities at http://www.aihealthsolutions.ca/initiatives-partnerships/arecci-a-project-ethics-community-consensus-initiative/project-ethics-courses/project-ethics-course/)

Note that projects are intended to be in the realm of Quality Improvement, Quality Assurance, and program evaluation and not research i.e. creation of new knowledge. Completing the ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool will help students identify potential deficits and modifications required in order for it to be consistent with an ethical Quality Improvement/Assurance or program evaluation project.

There are *two parts to this assignment*:
Part 1: Due March 3 (10% of assignment grade)

The completed ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool will be submitted, including the report that suggests revisions for mitigating factors will be submitted.

Please note, students who fail to submit the ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool will not be allowed to proceed to the colloquium.

Part 2: Due April 3 (10% of assignment grade)

If there are any required revisions these need to be adequately addressed. A documented that clearly outlines the revisions will be submitted with the Written Project Proposal. This will be appended to the proposal.

Proposal Colloquium:
The project colloquium is intended to provide students with the opportunity to present his or her project proposal to the course instructor and colleagues and receive helpful suggestions and feedback prior to finalizing the written project proposal.

Students will provide a brief oral presentation (20 minutes maximum) of their project proposal to the course instructor and colleagues at the second face-to-face meeting followed by a 10 minute open discussion period.

The presentation will consist of a rationale or purpose statement; a synthesis of relevant literature and conclusions/recommendations; a brief overview of the theoretical framework for the project (methodology); project goals, strategies, activities and outcomes (logic model); and an evaluation design.

Written Project Proposal:
Composition of Project Proposal will include:

Section 1: Introduction	A brief 1–2 page description of the nursing practice problem that the project addresses, and the purpose of the project.
Section 2: Review of Relevant Literature and Nursing Evidence	A 10–15 page description of the scope and nature of the problem, the impact of the problem on clients, nursing students and/or nurses, overview of current strategies used to address the problem, and possible gaps in the literature and/or future directions to address the problem (all using existing nursing evidence and/or evidence in other relevant areas).
Section 3: Project Description	A 5–10 page description, excluding Appendices, of the specific format the project will take (e.g., lesson plan, paper, orientation manual), target population, plan for process of project development and/or implementation as well as a rationale for the proposed format, including relevant nursing evidence (and/or evidence in other relevant areas) and limitations of the project.

The format for the written project proposal will comply with the Thesis and Project Format Regulations (see Part 9 MN Policy and Procedure Manual: Thesis and Project Paper Format Regulations).

Students must receive a minimum grade of B- on their Project Proposal in order to proceed with implementing their project during Nursing 6002: Final Project.

Resources
American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, D.C.: Author. Online support: http://www.apastyle.org/manual/whats-new.aspx

Bonnel, W., & Smith, K. V. (2014). *Proposal writing for nursing capstones and clinical projects.* New York, NY: Springer.

Plagiarism Statement
The University of Lethbridge subscribes to www.turnitin.com, a plagiarism detection service. Please be advised that student work submitted for credit in this course may be submitted to this system to verify its originality. Students must submit both electronic and hard copy versions of their work upon request.

Copyright Statement
All University of Lethbridge students, faculty and staff must comply with Canadian law and institutional license agreements pertaining to copyright. At the same time, keeping abreast of our copyright obligations and options is a complex task as copyright matters locally and globally are in flux and are likely to remain so for at least the near future.

The University's Copyright website (www.uleth.ca/copyright) is a source of current copyright information that includes:
- answers to common copyright questions (see the FAQs),
- guidance on whether you need permission or a license to copy a particular work (see the Copyright Permissions Flow Chart),
- guidance on assessing whether fair dealing may apply to specific instances of copying you wish to undertake (see the Guidelines for Copying under Fair Dealing), and
- a permissions look-up tool to help you determine the kinds of copying and other uses permitted by the Library's license agreements covering specific online journals and other online resources.

You are encouraged to contact the University Copyright Advisor (copyright@uleth.ca) for assistance with any copyright questions or issues.

Overall Grades

The determination of final grades for courses in the School of Graduate Studies is as follows:

Letter Grade	Comments	GPA	Percent
A+	Outstanding	4.0	97 - 100
A	Excellent	4.0	93 - 96
A-	Commendable	3.7	90 - 92
B+	Very good	3.3	87 - 89
B	Good	3.0	83 - 86
B-	Satisfactory	2.7	80 - 82
NB: Any course with a grade of less than B- cannot be considered for credit in the School of Graduate Studies.			
C+		2.3	77 - 79
C		2.0	73 - 76
C-		1.7	70 - 72
D+		1.3	67 - 69
D		1.0	63 - 66
F		0.0	< 63

Accommodations for Students with a Disability

Reasonable accommodations are available for students who have a documented disability. If you have been diagnosed with a disability, there is no need to face the challenge of University without support. Please contact the Counselling Services/Accommodated Learning Centre at 403.329.2766 http://www.uleth.ca/ross/counselling/index.html to set up an appointment. After registering with the Accommodated Learning Centre, your instructor will be notified by a formal letter of any accommodations you require. In addition, students are responsible for requesting accommodations from the instructor at least *two weeks* in advance of the evaluation date. The instructor and student are jointly responsible for arranging the resources needed for the evaluation process.

Nursing 5150
Proposal Colloquium Marking Guideline

	Poor	Satisfactory	Exceptional
Purpose	The purpose of the presentation and project are unclear & rambling.	The purpose of the presentation and project are generally clear & succinct.	The purpose of the presentation and project are clearly & succinctly stated.
Nursing practice problem	The scope and nature of the nursing problem is unclear & irrelevant to current nursing practice climate.	The scope and nature of the nursing problem could be clearer. However, the problem is relevant to the current nursing practice climate.	The scope and nature of the nursing problem is clearly articulated & relevant to the current nursing practice environment.
Evidence	Irrelevant, insignificant & dated evidence is presented. Irrelevant, insignificant & dated evidence from other relevant areas/disciplines & professional contexts is presented. Evidence is either too narrow or broad to bring deeper understanding of the problem. No gaps in the literature and professional context are presented. Understanding of the problem and evidence is poor, scattered, & incomplete.	Relevant, significant & current evidence is presented although some relevant evidence is missing. Relevant, significant & current evidence from other relevant areas/disciplines and professional contexts is presented although some relevant evidence is missing. Gaps in the literature and professional context are not clearly presented. Understanding of the problem and evidence is satisfactory.	Comprehensive, relevant, significant & current evidence is clearly presented. Comprehensive, relevant, significant & current evidence from other relevant areas/disciplines and professional contexts is clearly presented. Gaps in the literature and professional context are clearly presented. Clear, accurate understanding of the problem and evidence is superior.
Interpretations/Conclusions	Nursing problem does not flow from the evidence. Conclusions drawn from the evidence demonstrates a lack of awareness of the complexities of the problem. No limitations are presented.	The flow of the nursing problem from the evidence could be strengthened. Conclusions drawn from the evidence demonstrates satisfactory but somewhat superficial awareness of the problem. Limitations of the project are somewhat superficial.	Nursing problem logically flows from the evidence. Conclusions drawn from the evidence demonstrates exceptional awareness of the complexities of the problem. Limitations of the project are thoughtful and reasonable.

Specific project format	Proposed project format demonstrates a lack of methodological knowledge of target audience; need; and strategies, evaluation methods.	Proposed project format demonstrates satisfactory methodological knowledge of target audience; need; strategies, and evaluation methods.	Proposed project format demonstrates superior methodological knowledge of target audience; need; strategies, and evaluation methods.
Presentation	Presentation is disorganized & unprofessional. The presentation does not adhere to the time limit. Responses to questions & discussion are vague and do not provide clarity.	Some hesitation and disorganization during the presentation. The presentation was within the time limit. Responses to questions & discussion are respectful but demonstrate some uncertainty of the evidence, methodology, and/or problem.	Presentation is polished & professional and within the time limit. Responses to questions & discussion are respectful and thoughtful.

Nursing 5150
Written Project Proposal Marking Guideline

	Poor	Satisfactory	Exceptional
Purpose	The purpose of the paper and project are unclear & rambling.	The purpose of the paper and project are generally clear & succinct.	The purpose of the paper and project are clearly & succinctly stated.
Nursing practice problem	The scope and nature of the nursing problem is unclear & irrelevant to current nursing practice climate.	The scope and nature of the nursing problem could be clearer. However, the problem is relevant to the current nursing practice climate.	The scope and nature of the nursing problem is clearly articulated & relevant to the current nursing practice environment.
Evidence	Irrelevant, insignificant & dated evidence is presented. Irrelevant, insignificant & dated evidence from other relevant areas/disciplines & professional contexts is presented. Evidence is too narrow and/or broad to demonstrate deep understanding of the problem. No gaps in the literature and professional context are presented. Understanding of the problem and evidence is poor, scattered, & incomplete.	Relevant, significant & current evidence is presented although some relevant evidence is missing. Relevant, significant & current evidence from other relevant areas/disciplines and professional contexts is presented although some relevant evidence is missing. Gaps in the literature and professional context are not clearly presented. Understanding of the problem and evidence is satisfactory.	Comprehensive, relevant, significant & current evidence is clearly presented. Comprehensive, relevant, significant & current evidence from other relevant areas/disciplines and professional contexts is clearly presented. The literature presented is sufficiently broad and deep. Gaps in the literature and professional context are clearly presented. Clear, accurate understanding of the nuances of the problem and evidence is superior.
Interpretations/Conclusions	Nursing problem does not flow from the evidence. Conclusions drawn from the evidence demonstrates a lack of awareness of the complexities of the problem. No limitations are presented.	The flow of the nursing problem from the evidence could be strengthened. Conclusions drawn from the evidence demonstrates satisfactory but somewhat superficial awareness of the problem. Limitations of the project are somewhat superficial.	Nursing problem logically flows from the evidence. Conclusions drawn from the evidence demonstrates exceptional awareness of the complexities of the problem. Limitations of the project are thoughtful and reasonable.

Specific project format	Proposed project format demonstrates a lack of methodological knowledge of target audience; need; strategies, and evaluation methods.	Proposed project format demonstrates satisfactory methodological knowledge of target audience; need; strategies, and evaluation methods.	Proposed project format demonstrates superior methodological knowledge of target audience; need; strategies, and evaluation methods.
Presentation	Presentation of the paper is disorganized, & does not follow SGS format regulations. The paper does not adhere to page limit. APA errors throughout the document.	The paper mostly adheres to SGS format regulations. The paper is generally well organized, easy to read and within the page limit. Minor APA errors throughout the document.	The paper is polished, exceptionally well organized, adheres to SGS format regulations & is within the page limit. No APA errors noted.