



**NURSING 5150
Project Development Seminar
Spring 2017**

Instructor	Silvia Koso, MD, MPH
Email	Silvia.koso@uleth.ca
Phone	587.228.3132
Office hours	Please email or call to arrange a phone/Skype appointment
Preferred contact method	Please contact the instructor by email. Every effort will be made to respond within 24 hours excluding weekends and/or holidays.

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 Resources:

McKenzie, J., Neiger, B., & Thackeray, R. (2017). *Planning, implementing, and evaluating health promotion programs: A Primer (7th Ed)*. Glenview, IL: Pearson Education.

Alberta Innovates. (2017). ARECCI ethics guideline tool. Retrieved from:

<http://www.aihealthsolutions.ca/media/ARECCI-Ethics-Guideline-Tool.pdf>

Alberta Innovates. (2010). ARECCI Ethics Screening Tool. Retrieved from:

<http://www.aihealthsolutions.ca/arecci/screening/>

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.

Class Schedule

Week	Dates	Format
1	Jan 8	Face-to-face in M3014 12:30 to 15:30
2	Jan 15 – 21	Online: Finalize the Project Idea
3 – 4	Jan 22 – Feb 4	Online: Evidence collection
5 – 6	Feb 5 – 18	Online: Initial Project plan
7	Feb 19 – 25	Spring Reading Week – No Class
8	Feb 26 – Mar 4	Completion of the ARECCI Ethics Guidelines and Screening Tools (no discussion forum)
9	Mar 5 – 11	Synchronous Discussion (via Skype): Presentation run-through
10	March 13	Face-to-face Proposal colloquium in M3022, 12:30-15:30
11	Mar 19 – 25	Online: Proposal Review and Critique
12	Mar 26 – Apr 2	Proposal finalization (no discussion forum)
13	April 3	Written Project Proposal + Final ARECCI Tools due

Description of Key Course Activities

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 resources:

National Collaborating Center for Methods and Tools: <http://www.nccmt.ca/professional-development/modules>

Online Health Program Planner:

<http://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/ServicesAndTools/ohpp/Pages/default.aspx>

Week 10: proposal colloquium

Online Discussion Forums:

The purpose of the discussion forums for this course is to provide students with the opportunity to engage in thoughtful reflection and discussion regarding the elements of their intended project proposal.

The discussion questions will be posted by the instructor on Sunday night prior to the first week of the discussion forum (e.g. if the discussion forum is from Monday, Jan 22 to Sunday, Feb 4, the questions will be posted on Sunday, Jan 21 night). 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 post their original answer **by Thursday of the first week of the forum, and their answer/comment to the colleagues' original answers by the Sunday of the first week of the forum** (e.g. if the discussion forum is from Monday, Jan 22 to Sunday, Feb 4, the student is required to post their original answer by Thursday, Jan 25, and the answer/comment to their colleagues' original answer by Sunday, 28). When there is a second week of discussion, students are encouraged to continue posting their own questions and answers online. Please see Guidelines for Discussion Forums later in this document.

Note that there are only **four** 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 2 (online): Defining nursing practice problem and proposed solution.

Weeks 3 – 4 (online): Synthesis and critique of evidence including interdisciplinary evidence; evidence demonstrates theoretical knowledge; feasibility and scope.

Suggested databases:

Nursing Reference Center: <https://www.ebscohost.com/nursing/products/nursing-reference-center>

CINAHL: <https://health.ebsco.com/products/the-cinahl-database>

SocINDEX: <https://www.ebsco.com/products/research-databases/socindex>

Weeks 5 – 6 (online): 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 11 (online): Review and critique of written project proposal

Synchronous Discussion (via Skype):

Week 9: run-through of colloquium presentation

ARECCI Ethics Guidelines and Screening Tools:

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, needs assessment, and program evaluation and not research i.e. creation of new knowledge. Completing the ARECCI Ethics Guidelines and Screening Tools will help students identify potential risks and modifications required in order to mitigate these risks and ensure ethics rigor.

There are ***two parts to this assignment***:

Part 1: Due March 5 (10% of assignment grade)

The completed ARECCI Ethics Guidelines and Screening Tools 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 document 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.

Please note: Students should provide the list of stakeholders they would like to invite to colloquium 3 weeks prior to the colloquium date.

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

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.

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.

Submission Deadlines and Evaluation Strategies

	Strategy	Medium	Weighting	Due Date
1	Discussion Forums	Online	10%	Jan 21, Feb 4, Feb 18 Mar 21
2	ARECCI Ethics Guidelines and Screening Tools	Online	10%	March 5 April 3
3	Proposal Colloquium	Face-to-face	25%	March 13
4	Written Project Proposal	Written	45%	April 3

Marks will be deducted for late assignments at a rate of 5% per day, or a portion thereof, including weekends.

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 grading system for this course is consistent with that established in the Faculty of Health Sciences, effective May, 2002.

Letter	GPA	Percent	Letter	GPA	Percent
A+	4.0	95 - 100%	C+	2.3	71 - 74.9%
A	4.0	91 - 94.9%	C	2.0	67 - 70.9%
A-	3.7	87 - 90.9%	C-	1.7	63 - 66.9%
B+	3.3	83 - 86.9%	D+	1.3	59 - 62.9%
B	3.0	79 - 82.9%	D	1.0	55 - 58.9%
B-	2.7	75 - 78.9%	F	0	0 - 54.9%

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.

Guidelines for Discussion Forums

Note of acknowledgement: with grateful thanks to Dr. Em Pijl of the University of Lethbridge for sharing her discussion forum guidelines.

There will be a total of 4 discussion forums over the 13 weeks of the course. Each student will be expected to do the following:

1st half of the week (Monday to Thursday):

1. Without reading the postings of others, **post your original thoughts on the questions posted by instructor** in the appropriate discussion forum. These original posts should be **no more than 500 words** in length. You must enter your original posts within the first half of the week, so as to allow your peers time to respond. **Please post all postings in text, not as attachments.** You may want to initially develop your thoughts in Word and then copy and paste; this is helpful in the event that Moodle gobbles up your response—a rare but time-consuming event for you. Please be aware that if you do choose to post three original posts, only the first two read by the course instructor will be graded.

2nd half of the week (Friday to Sunday):

2. **Respond to peers' original postings** to affirm and extend their thinking. Your response to your peers' original posts should be **no more than 150 words** in length and should professionally *affirm*, *challenge* and *extend* your peers' thinking.

The course instructor will assess discussion participation as per the criteria below.

1. Timeliness and consistency of contributions (as above). Postings are within the time frame specified. No grammatical or spelling errors. Postings have substance yet are concise.
2. Evidence of deep reflection on and engagement with course material. Course materials and academic literature are cited. Clear evidence of critically examining issues raised by the prompting questions. Expression of ideas is clear and succinct. Actively and consistently discusses the strengths and limitations of any materials and resources brought into the discussion. Clear links between the course topic and readings; demonstrates understanding of linked sources where applicable. Logical development of ideas, arguments and conclusions.
3. Relates course content to issues in personal/professional context to make theory-practice links (i.e., clarifies concepts with examples). Consistent use of personal insights, experiences, and/or examples as evidence of personal engagement with the question.
4. Responds to peers' and instructor's questions. Proactively promotes learning of the class as a whole. Considerable and consistent engagement with other students' ideas, opinions, and viewpoints. Responses to peers are professional, affirming, and challenging and aim to extend the thinking of peers. Overall comments highly respectful of others and offers constructive feedback to others. Responses to peers end with a question that seeks to clarify and extend the thinking of others. Proactively promotes learning of the class as a whole.

Nursing 5150 Proposal Colloquium and Final Paper 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	<p>Presentation is disorganized & unprofessional. The presentation does not adhere to the time limit. Responses to questions & discussion are vague and do not provide clarity.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Presentation is polished & professional and within the time limit. Responses to questions & discussion are respectful and thoughtful.</p>
--------------	---	--	---