

Data Collection Plan (100 points) and Discussion Board (50 points)

Purpose: To assess ability to synthesize key course concepts and the ability to design and implement a data collection and analysis plan (Objectives 1 – 5).

Due date: Sunday of Week 5 (draft and initial discussion participation is due by Wednesday)

Submitted: Blackboard

Throughout the course, students should be thinking about their clinical scholarly projects and how key concepts are generally or specifically related to the project. The signature assignment in this course is a draft of the methodology chapter of the clinical scholarly project which will explain the expected data collection and analysis. ***This Week 5 assignment*** is a PowerPoint presentation of your intended data collection and analysis plan. The goal of the assignment is to assess students' readiness to do the final assignment in the course and the oral defense of the clinical scholarly project. The focus of the assignment is on developing a clear vision of (a) what should be done in a clinical scholarly project to collect, analyze and interpret data appropriately.

This assignment must be submitted by Sunday, end of Week 5. Students must use the assignment template provided in and attach a PowerPoint file. An example of the presentation format is provided here and in a larger format in Week 5.

Students are expected to use the feedback they got from their instructor on previous assignments as they prepare for this assignment. Students are encouraged to work with classmates, instructors, and mentors/chairs when preparing the assignment. However, this assignment is not group work. Each student's final presentation file should be unique to the student and reflect his/her background, experience, expertise, integrity, and specific doctoral project.

The assignment consists of two parts:

Part I. PowerPoint Presentation (100 Points)

The student should prepare a PowerPoint presentation (not a narrated or video presentation, presenter notes only as needed). It should be organized in the format shown below, and follow the example carefully to include key components and formatting. Students should choose ***the ONE most important quantitative outcome of the clinical scholarly project*** as the topic of the Analysis Plan. Students should make sure that the audience will understand what change in practice s/he will be evaluating, why it is an important problem, why s/he is predicting the results s/he is predicting, and how the results will impact nursing practice if s/he achieves them. The project will draw heavily on the project proposal developed in DNPU 706.

Slide 1 – Title and Author

Slide 2 – Problem statement (brief explanation of the background and significance of the clinical scholarly project)

Slide 3 – Claim (predicted result of the clinical scholarly project)

Slide 4 – Evidence (statistical evidence from the literature review to support the claim)

Slide 5 – Reasoning (explanation of how the evidence supports the claim; include a clear statement of the analysis planned and the predicted result)

Slide 6 – Implications (what are the implications of your study on EBP?)

Slide 7 – Sample (describe your sample and the population it is drawn from)

Slide 8 – Variables (Identify your primary outcome and predictor variable(s))

Slide 9 – Collection Plan and Timeline (Briefly describe the data collection plan – may use up to two slides)

Slide 10 – References (alphabetical list of citations in APA format)

Part II. Draft Feedback and Discussion

You will post a DRAFT of this plan to the class discussion by Wednesday of Week 5 along with a 1-2 paragraph CER Summary of your plan (typed into the discussion). Your classmates will have an opportunity to provide feedback by **Saturday**, and you will submit a final draft of this plan by Sunday, midnight.

Student work will be graded with a rubric and individual feedback from instructors will be posted. Students are expected to use the feedback in preparing for the final assignment.

The Data Collection Plan (100) will be graded using the rubric below.

	Exemplary 4	Proficient 3	Developing 2	Emerging 1
Problem (2.5)	Clear and concise explanation of the significance of the problem	Adequate explanation of the significance of the problem	Explanation of the significance of the problem lacks focus	Nature of the problem is not clear
Claim (2.5)	Claim stated as empirical statement, clear, concise, includes all required elements, expected results included	Claim stated as empirical statement, includes all elements, expected results included.	Claim not stated as empirical statement, does not include all elements	Not stated as empirical statement, does not follow example.
Evidence (3.75)	Three articles presented. In appropriate format. Empirical statement provided for each, results presented as APA format statistics with all required elements.	Three articles presented. In appropriate format. Empirical statements provided for some, but all results presented as APA format with all required elements.	Fewer or greater than three articles presented. (OR) Empirical Statements not provided for any articles (OR) results not in APA format or missing elements.	Does not follow example (OR) Not in appropriate format.
Reasoning (2.5)	Reasoning clearly connects evidence to claim and justifies evidence support of claim. No new evidence presented. Therefore statement reports appropriate statistical test.	Reasoning attempts to connects evidence to claim and justify evidence support of claim. No new evidence presented. Therefore statement reports appropriate statistical test.	Reasoning does not connect evidence to claim (OR) New evidence presented (OR) Therefore statement not used or does not identify appropriate statistical test.	Does not follow example (OR) Not in appropriate format.
Implications (2.5)	Synthesizes data to provide a clearly appropriate justification to the audience .	Provides a clear justification to the audience.	Provides a poorly explained justification to the audience.	Does not provide a justification to the audience.
Sample (2.5)	Clearly defines sample, recruitment strategy, and the population it is drawn from.	Defines sample, and recruitment strategy, but relationship to population is unclear.	Sample poorly defined and recruitment strategy or relationship to population is unclear.	No definition of sample.
Variables (2.5)	Appropriately identifies outcome and predictor variables and levels or measurement.	Appropriately identifies outcome, but missing predictor variables. Levels of measurement correct.	Does not identify outcome variable OR levels of measurement incorrect or missing.	Does not identify variables.
Plan and Timeline (3.75)	Collection plan is appropriate and CSP benchmarks (CSP Handbook), identifies collection tool, and is realistic	Collection plan is appropriate but may not include benchmarks, (OR) does not clearly identify collection tool (OR) timeline unrealistic.	Data collection plan isn't fully developed or does not align with CSP benchmarks. (AND/OR) Tool not clearly identified. (OR) No timeline.	No discussion of data collection plan, tools, or timeline.
Expression (3.75)	Presentation is engaging, and communicates clearly using appropriate professional tone, grammar, spelling, and punctuation. No errors in APA format.	Presentation communicates clearly with few errors in professional tone, grammar, spelling, or punctuation. Few errors in APA.	Presentation has many distracting errors in professional tone, grammar, spelling, or punctuation. Many errors in APA format.	Presentation does not communicate clearly. (OR) APA not used.

Presentation Feedback Discussion (50) will be graded with the following rubric (deadline is Saturday):

	Exemplary 4	Proficient 3	Developing 2	Emerging 1
Original post (3.75)	Fully responds to all questions in DB Prompt with insightful appraisal of evidence	Responds to all questions, but lacks development (AND) Clear statement of evidence and conclusion	Does not respond to all questions (OR) Response not in appropriate format.	Does not respond to all questions. (AND) Response not in appropriate format.
Timeliness of original posts (1.25)	Initial post by Wednesday of the assigned week.	Initial post by Thursday of the assigned week	Initial post by Friday of the assigned week	Initial post after Friday of the assigned week.
Comments on Others' Posts (3.75)	Provides relevant and helpful feedback with insightful, clear, and thorough use of CER approach in discussions with classmates.	Provides relevant and helpful feedback with use of CER approach in discussions with classmates.	Responses lack substance and attempt to use CER approach in discussions with classmates.	Poor response quality
Engagement (1.25)	Responses to at least three classmates (AND) Responses spread over more than two days	Responds to fewer than three classmates (OR) Responses on two days.	Responds to two classmates on two days (OR) all responses on one day	Responds to one classmate on one day (OR) does not respond to classmates.
Expression and Format (2.5)	Writing is graduate level and engaging. (AND) Written responses communicate clearly using appropriate professional tone, grammar, spelling, and punctuation.	Writing is graduate level and engaging. (AND) Written responses may not communicate clearly, use appropriate professional tone, or there may be a few errors grammar, spelling, and punctuation without detracting from readability.	Writing may not be graduate level. (OR) Written responses do not communicate clearly, use appropriate professional tone, or there are several errors grammar, spelling, and punctuation, detracting from overall readability.	Poor writing quality, poor communication and unprofessional tone. (OR) Extensive errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation that detract from the readability.

Sample Draft Analysis Plan

<p>Reducing stress among parole officers using centered caring</p> <p>Joe King, MS, RN, PHD-BC</p>	<h3>Problem</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parole officers (POs) have the highest rates of depression and suicide of all law enforcement personnel (Sykes, 2010). They report that stress and shame are daily characteristics of the job (McAlly, 2012). Initial training for POs is \$42,000 and turnover wastes \$4 million per year (Sykes, 2013). 	<h3>Claim</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stress-reduction knowledge and skills training based on centered caring for parole officers is associated with a 10 point decrease on the Pearson Stress Test (PST) within 30 days. 	<h3>Evidence</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stress-reduction knowledge and skills training based on centered caring is associated with reduced the PST levels of rookie law enforcement officers (LEOs) in six weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> $M_{before} = 22.3$ ($S_{before} = 5.5$) and $M_{after} = 10.5$ ($S_{after} = 3.6$) $t(45) = 3.14, p < .05$ (Able, 2009) Trauma nurses (TNs) using centered-caring meditation significantly reduced PST levels in two weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> $M_{before} = 17.3$ ($S_{before} = 4.5$) and $M_{after} = 10.4$ ($S_{after} = 4.6$) $t(35) = 2.64, p < .05$ (Baker, 2012) Urban high school teachers (UHSTs) using centered-caring time-outs significantly reduced PST levels in four weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> $M_{before} = 18.6$ ($S_{before} = 4.4$) and $M_{after} = 9.4$ ($S_{after} = 4.0$) $t(215) = 4.73, p < .05$ (DeLaney, 2010)
<h3>Reasoning</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job stress of POs has many of the same characteristics and consequences of job stress experienced by other LEOs, TNs, and UHSTs (McAlly, 2012; Bader, 2009; DeLaney, 2010). LEOs, TNs, and UHSTs reduced their PST levels by 7 to 12 points in 2 to 6 weeks (McAlly, 2012; Bader, 2009; DeLaney, 2010). Therefore, in a paired-samples t-test comparing PST scores before and 4 weeks after centered-caring stress-reduction training, POs should show an average reduction of ~ 10 points. 	<h3>Implications</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If centered-caring, stress-reduction training can reduce the stress levels of POs, we may see a corresponding reduction in the rates of depression, suicide, and job turnover among these personnel (Able, 2009; Cool, 2014). The savings in human and economic capital corresponds with overall improved public health (McAlly, 2012; McCool, 2009). We may also see increased job effectiveness of Pos, which could positively impact their clients, recovering additional human and social capital from the correctional system (O'Coole, 2005). 	<h3>Sample</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 35 parole officers from the Nahtdis County Probation Department Adult Court Services (ACS) Division, a convenience sample from the county probation department. Descriptive statistics will be compared to overall department parameters to establish generalizability. Participation will be mandated to participate as part of the We Care About Us (WCAS) initiative to improve employee mental health. Participants will sign optional waiver form to confirm participation. 	<h3>Variables</h3> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographic variables will be collected for sample <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age, gender, race, ethnicity, years on job, education level, overall health status, full-time/part-time status The Pearson Stress Test (pst_pre) will be administered prior to the three-week knowledge and skills training. The Pearson Stress Test (pst_post) will be administered four weeks after the conclusion of the training.
<h3>Plan and Timeline</h3> <p>The timeline includes the following milestones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summer 1, 2018: IRB Approval of Research Plan and IRB Submission Summer 2, 2018: Final IRB Approval, Recruitment, and Enrollment of Participants Fall 1, 2018: Data Collection, Pre-Test, and Baseline Data Analysis Fall 2, 2018: Data Collection, Post-Test, and Post-Test Data Analysis Spring 1, 2019: Final Report and Presentation 	<h3>References</h3> <p>XXX,X. (XXXX). XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. XXXX: XX</p> <p>XXX,X. (XXXX). XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. XXXX: XX</p> <p>XXX,X. (XXXX). XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. XXXX: XX</p> <p>XXX,X. (XXXX). XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. XXXX: XX</p>		