

NSG 470: EBP Project Grading Rubric

Phase I: Scholarly Paper Title:

Team Members:

Learning Outcomes	Total Points Possible	Initial	Emerging	Developing	Highly Developed	Student Score
Identifies Nursing Problem/Question	4	<p>Problem incorrectly identified</p> <p>No query of staff regarding identified clinical practice</p>	<p>Problem not clearly stated</p> <p>Query of staff regarding identified clinical practice is noted but not summarized</p>	<p>Problem is lacking some elements or is unclearly stated</p> <p>Queries staff regarding identified clinical practice, summarizes query</p>	<p>Clearly identifies primary problem</p> <p>Queries staff regarding identified clinical practice and query is clearly summarized, adds support for need to change practice</p>	
Formulates a focused answerable PICO question	4	<p>PICO question incorrectly identified, or some elements missing, or incorrect format used</p>	<p>PICO question correctly identified however, some elements missing, or incorrect format used</p>	<p>States PICO question clearly in PICO format</p>	<p>States a focused PICO question using PICO format links prior evidence to PICO question</p>	
Discusses search strategies	4	<p>Search strategies missing, incorrect, not research based, keywords or data bases missing</p>	<p>Search strategies listed</p>	<p>Incorporates search strategies, data bases, into text with search terms and keywords</p>	<p>Clearly, succinctly incorporates search strategies, data bases, into text with search terms and keywords</p>	
Discusses level of evidence, validity, reliability and applicability of references in the Summary/	16	<p>Inaccurately identifies/addresses most of the following, level of evidence, validity, reliability, and applicability correctly, or</p>	<p>Accurately identifies/addresses most of the following, level of evidence, validity, reliability, and applicability correctly, in</p>	<p>Accurately identifies/addresses level of evidence using the hierarchy of evidence (lecture slide 29), validity, reliability, and</p>	<p>Accurately identifies/addresses level of evidence using the hierarchy of evidence (lecture slide 29), validity,</p>	

Literature Review		<p>writing style poorly worded</p> <p>Insufficient body of < 8 sources utilized to support best clinical practice</p> <p>Missing appraisal utilizing checklist at (slide 59): http://www.gla.ac.uk/departments/generalpractice/ca_check.htm</p> <p>Absence of the Evidence Evaluation & Evidence Synthesis Tables</p>	<p>concise writing style.</p> <p>Insufficient body of < 8 sources utilized to support best clinical practice</p> <p>Inaccurately utilizes checklist at (lecture slide 59): http://www.gla.ac.uk/departments/generalpractice/ca_check.htm Attaches checklist to paper</p> <p>Inaccurate use of the Evidence Evaluation & Evidence Synthesis Tables, incorrect interpretation of study findings and inadequate summaries of articles detract from purpose of grid</p>	<p>applicability correctly in concise writing style using research terminology</p> <p>Sufficient body of 8-10 sources of evidence utilized to support best clinical practice</p> <p>Appraises the evidence using the checklists at (slide 59): http://www.gla.ac.uk/departments/generalpractice/ca_check.htm Attaches checklist to paper</p> <p>Appropriate use the Evidence Evaluation & Evidence Synthesis Tables, brief summaries of articles</p>	<p>reliability, and applicability correctly in concise writing style using research terminology and rationale for decision</p> <p>Sufficient body of 8-10 reliable and valid sources of evidence utilized to support best clinical practice</p> <p>Accurately appraises the evidence using the checklists at (lecture slide 59): http://www.gla.ac.uk/departments/generalpractice/ca_check.htm Attaches checklist to paper</p> <p>Appropriate and accurate use of the Evidence Evaluation & Evidence Synthesis Tables, concise summaries of articles help to correctly identify best practice</p>
Synthesizes research articles summarizing the	20	Inaccurate contrasts and comparisons of the evidence to existing	Lacking logical contrasts and comparisons of the evidence to existing	Contrasts and compares the evidence to existing clinical practice	Clearly and accurately contrasts and compares the

<p>evidence that supports best practice related to the problem selected</p>		<p>clinical practice</p> <p>Incorrectly identifies and rationalizes implications for nursing practice</p> <p>Poorly summarized conclusion of scholarly paper. Identification of clinical practice, unable to incorporate relevant data that supports whether or not the clinical practice is consistent with the best practice identified in the evidence.</p> <p>Few elements addressed or illogical flow of ideas represented, repeats or quotes author's own words, misinterprets study results</p>	<p>clinical practice</p> <p>Identifies implications for nursing practice</p> <p>Summary of scholarly paper is fair; conclusion lacks identification of clinical practice and incorporation of relevant data that supports whether or not the clinical practice is consistent with the best practice identified in the evidence.</p> <p>Many of elements addressed represented, logical flow not apparent, superficially interprets data or merely restates authors premise</p>	<p>Identifies implications for nursing practice</p> <p>Summarizes scholarly paper with a conclusion identifying clinical practice and incorporates relevant data that supports whether or not the clinical practice is consistent with the best practice identified in the evidence.</p> <p>All elements addressed / represented in a logical flow of ideas, identifies relevant findings, alternate views, explanations in concise writing style using research terminology</p>	<p>evidence to existing clinical practice</p> <p>Accurately identifies and rationalizes implications for nursing practice</p> <p>Summarizes scholarly paper with a clearly worded conclusion identifying clinical practice and incorporates relevant data that supports whether or not the clinical practice is consistent with the best practice identified in the evidence.</p> <p>All elements addressed / represented in a logical flow of ideas, identifies relevant findings, alternate views, explanations in concise writing style using research terminology-evidence of scholarly writing through use of research terminology</p>	
<p>Articulates with logical progression</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>Writing style does not flow well or illogical</p>	<p>Writing style flows well with logical thought</p>	<p>Writing style flows well with logical thought</p>	<p>Writing style flows well with logical</p>	

<p>of thoughts, clarity, APA usage</p>		<p>thought progression, or inappropriate use of research terms, unclear and many APA errors are found; or references are within the past 5 years</p>	<p>progression, Occasional inappropriate use of research terms, or unclear statement and occasional APA errors are found; references are within the past 5 years</p>	<p>progression, appropriate use of research terms, clear and rare APA errors are found; references are within the past 5 years; grammatical errors</p>	<p>thought progression, appropriate use of research terms, clear, rare APA errors are found; references are within the past 5 years, grammar is appropriate within APA context</p>	
---	--	---	---	---	---	--

Comments:

NSG 470: EBP Project Grading Rubric

Phase II: Scholarly Paper Title:

Team Members:

Learning Outcomes	Total Points Possible	Initial	Emerging	Developing	Highly Developed	Student Score
<p>Implements strategy to change clinical practice to evidence based practice</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>Significance of project is weak and not convincing of a need to change practice</p> <p>Baseline practice is inaccurately discussed</p> <p>No mention of organizational stakeholders</p> <p>SWOT analysis (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) is absent or inaccurately utilized</p> <p>Cost benefit assessment is absent or inaccurate</p> <p>Protocol outlining the steps involved in the change in practice are vague or illogical. Change theory not utilized to support</p>	<p>Significant facts to change practice are emerging, slight support from reader to support change in practice</p> <p>Baseline practice is discussed but lacking depth and little mention of staff queries</p> <p>Inaccurate organizational stakeholders listed</p> <p>SWOT analysis (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) is present, missing significance of analysis</p> <p>Cost benefit assessment lacks detail and significance to project initiation</p> <p>Protocol outlining the steps involved in the change in practice are weak, reflects lack of knowledge of Change</p>	<p>Significance of project is present, adequately discusses need for change in clinical practice</p> <p>Baseline practice is accurately discussed with mention of staff queries</p> <p>Organizational stakeholders discussed with minimal mention of impact each stakeholder has on practice change</p> <p>SWOT analysis (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) present, unpersuasive analysis</p> <p>Cost benefit is present, details accurate</p> <p>Protocol outlining the steps involved in the change in practice are stated. Change theory is present and correctly utilized to support change strategy</p>	<p>Discussion of the significance of project is compelling and encourages reader to support new practice</p> <p>Baseline practice is clear and accurately discussed with in depth results of staff queries</p> <p>Clear/thorough discussion of organizational stakeholders and impact each stakeholder has on progression of clinical change</p> <p>SWOT analysis (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) of project is accurately and clearly discussed, focus on strengths encourage “buy-in” of reader and stakeholders</p> <p>Cost benefit assessment is convincing and adds to “buy-in”</p> <p>Protocol outlining the steps involved in the change in practice are</p>	

		change Proposed timeline missing	theory Proposed timeline is unrealistic	Proposed timeline is realistic	creative, detailed and clearly stated. Change theory is present and correctly utilized to support change strategy Proposed timeline is creative and realistic	
Articulates with logical progression of thoughts, clarity, APA usage	6	Writing style does not flow well or illogical thought progression, or inappropriate use of research terms, unclear and many APA errors are found	Writing style flows well with logical thought progression, Occasional inappropriate use of research terms, or unclear statement and occasional APA errors are found	Writing style flows well with logical thought progression, appropriate use of research terms, clear and rare APA errors are found; grammatical errors	Writing style flows well with logical thought progression, appropriate use of research terms, clear, rare APA errors are found; grammar is appropriate within APA context	

COMMENTS: