Nursing Knowledge Development  
NUR 901  
Section 001  
3 credits  
Wednesdays: 9:00 am – 11:50 am C388 Bott Nursing Education and Research Building  
Spring 2015

Catalog Course Description: Development and growth of substantive knowledge within nursing. Middle range theories. Strategies for concept development and theory testing in nursing research for understanding health status and health outcomes for individuals, families and community-based primary care.

Course Objectives: At the end of this course, students will:

1. Analyze knowledge development in nursing.
2. Compare and contrast strategies for theory development.
3. Develop a concept relevant to health status and health outcomes for individuals, families and community-based primary health care.
4. Evaluate, compare and contrast middle range theories for their relevance to nursing science.

Additional Course Objectives: In the course content each week, the student will be provided with specific class objectives.

Prerequisites: NUR 960 –Scientific Foundations of Nursing

Co-requisites: None

Professional Standards & Guidelines: The curriculum is guided by the following documents:


Faculty:  
Mildred A. Horodynski, PhD, RN, FAAN  
Office: C244 Bott building  
517-355-8360 (office)  
Email: millie.horodynski@hc.msu.edu  
Office Hours: Wednesdays 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm & by appointment

Telephone communication: Please conduct telephone communications during regular office hours when possible or by appointment for times other than regular office hours.

Email communication: The Instructor will be using student msu.edu email addresses. My goal will be to respond to your questions within 72 hours between 8 am and 5 pm as a general rule.

Please contact me by phone as soon as possible if you need particular accommodations due to a disability so that we can make suitable arrangements.
Instruction:

a. Methodology:

Presentation of course content is accomplished through three scheduled class hours weekly. The course incorporates seminar, class discussion, and class activities. Active learning by the student is emphasized. Completion of required reading and activities prior to class time is essential in order to facilitate comprehension and synthesis of content.

b. Required Texts:


c. Required Resources, References, Supplies:

Desire 2Learn Help Line
1.800.500.1554 (24 hrs, 7 days/week)
517.355.2345 (24 hrs, 7 days/week)
[http://help.d2l.msu.edu](http://help.d2l.msu.edu)
Always check with the D2L Help Line first!
There are student d2l tutorials available as well.

Evaluation:

a. Learning Assessments and Grading:

Three written papers, formal presentation, participation in classroom discussions, and completion of assignments and in-class activities.

Please see Part B of the syllabus for further details. There is no opportunity for “extra credit” in this course.

b. Course Grade Requirements:

1) As one of the nine required doctoral courses, a 3.0 grade must be attained in this course.

2) A student who fails or does not receive a 3.0 grade in this course must meet with the Faculty of Record for this course. After the meeting with the Faculty of Record for this course, the student is to meet with his/her Major Professor and guidance committee to determine a remediation action to continue progression in the doctoral
program. This course may be repeated only once.

c. Course Grading Scale:

The standard College of Nursing grading scale will be utilized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 – 100%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 – 85%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 – 80%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 79%</td>
<td>Not passing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Minimum passing grade)

d. Writing Requirements:

The College of Nursing requires that students refer to a style manual when writing required papers and bibliographies. The reference format adopted by the College of Nursing is the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (most recent edition).

Evaluation:

Required Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Course Grade</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Student Participation and Completion of Assignments</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #1 – Concept Development paper</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #2 – Model Building paper</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Student Presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #3 – Concept Application within 2 Mid-range Theories: Analysis, Evaluation, and Application</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ!

Class participation is critical to a successful graduate-level course. Each student is expected to prepare in advance to participate in group discussions and activities as assigned. Students are responsible for all materials covered in class, assigned reading, and in-class activities. Due dates and times are firm unless negotiated at least two weeks ahead of time.

Paper #1 Guidelines – Concept Development paper.

The goal of this paper is to apply principles of concept development and analysis to a specific clinical problem.

1. Select a concept of interest that is of relevance to the advancement of nursing science.
2. Clarify the purpose of your concept development and analysis.
3. Identify all uses of the concept.
4. Determine major defining attributes of the concept.
5. Identify the philosophical assumptions on which your concept development is based. Are they explicit?
6. Explore contextual factors and any values associated with your concept of interest.
7. Conduct and evaluate interdisciplinary comparisons and/or parallels.
8. How might you re-conceptualize your concept based on your analysis of assumptions, context and values, arguments, and evidence?
9. Formulate criteria that is included and excluded in the depiction of your concept.
10. How might you translate your concept into 2-3 researchable questions and hypotheses?
11. Include in your summary paragraph how you intend to expand this concept development in your future nursing
research.
12. Provides sound argument with rationale and evidence to support.
13. Provides well thought out discussion and conclusion with literature to support.
14. Appropriate use of APA format
15. Writing is clear with logical presentation of ideas.
17. Depth of knowledge of literature demonstrated in writing.
18. Meets deadline for date and time due.

APA manual guidelines are to be used for this paper. The paper length is **not to exceed 8 pages excluding cover page and references.**

**Paper #2 Guidelines – Model Development paper.**

The goal of this paper is to develop a conceptual model based on your conceptual area/problem of interest.

1. Provide a brief introduction of the problem and identify how your conceptual model will advance nursing science. Include a description of significance and innovation.
2. Summarize literature related to your conceptual area of interest. Describe the major characteristics of your target population and problem of interest. What antecedent knowledge from nursing and adjunctive disciplines was used in the development of the conceptual area of interest?
3. Describe your model. Define all terms in the model.
4. Provide linkage statements for all relationships among major concepts that relate to your problem of interest.
5. Provide descriptions and rationales for all relationships that exist in the model.
6. List three research questions that stem from the model. Be clear in considering the testability of your conceptual framework in relation to the observability and measurability of the concepts.
7. Provides sound arguments and strong evidence of critical thinking including rationales and evidence to support all statements.
8. Provides well thought out discussion and conclusion with literature to support. Includes discussion of future directions.
9. Appropriate use of APA format
10. Writing is clear with logical presentation of ideas.
11. Appropriate use of English grammar.
12. Depth of knowledge of literature demonstrated in writing.
13. Meets deadline for date and time due.

APA manual guidelines are to be used for this paper. The paper length is **not to exceed 8 pages excluding references.**

**Formal Student Presentations—Concept Development with a Theoretical Framework.**

The goal of this presentation is to present logically and coherently your development of a conceptual model based on your conceptual area/problem of interest. The presentation needs to include the following:

1. Identification of a nursing research problem and a theoretical concept appropriate to study within that problem.
2. Significance of concept and appropriateness to nursing research: Student presents concept and rationale for why this is an important concept to advance nursing science.
3. Concept well described: Student is clear in the description of the concept that will be used for the student’s work.
4. Strategies used for concept construction is outlined and adhered to.
5. Breadth of literature: Presents research on topic from at least three disciplines or bodies of literature in a manner that demonstrates understanding of each viewpoint.
6. Synthesis of literature and depth of knowledge on topic: Student presents research literature in a manner that demonstrates a depth of knowledge on the topic (in presentation this includes response to questions). Critiques quality of research, identifying faulty thinking, gaps in literature, and appropriateness to nursing. Comparing and contrasting conceptualizations from different disciplines/bodies of literature throughout presentation or paper.
7. Develops concept within a theoretical framework. Develops a concept within an appropriate theoretical framework and consistent with the framework.
8. Presents well thought-out conclusion and includes discussion of future directions and contribution to advancing the science.
9. Innovation: Presents own thinking related to concept and how conceptualization will be used in research. Provides diagram of concept within the framework.
10. Presentation: Presentation is clear and logical using appropriate power point presentation; DUE 24 hours before for students to download.

**Paper #3 Guidelines— Concept Application within 2 Mid-range theories: Analysis, Evaluation, and Application**

The goal of this paper is to apply your concept within 2 mid-range theories, to compare and contrast the two theories, and to apply the principles of theory analysis and evaluation to the two mid-range theories, using Fawcett’s criteria.

1. Expand the development of your nursing research problem and theoretical concept previously developed in papers 1 and 2.
2. Integrated and active review and synthesis of the relevant literature; further development of your literature review. Includes breadth of literature: Presents research on topic from at least three disciplines or bodies of literature in a manner that demonstrates understanding of each viewpoint and synthesis of literature and depth of knowledge on topic: Critiques quality of research, identifying faulty thinking, gaps in literature, and appropriateness to nursing. Comparing and contrasting conceptualizations from different disciplines/bodies of literature throughout presentation or paper.
3. Identify and describe two mid-range theories that use your concept. Describe the concepts and propositions of the two mid-range theories you selected.
4. Define your concept from each of these theoretical points of view, and compare and contrast the concept. Provide a diagram of where your concept fits within each of the two mid-range theories. Label each component/concept appropriately.
5. Evaluate how these differing definitions for your concept affect the usefulness of the concept in the study of your research problem?
6. Identify if the two-mid-range theories are well described; explain with literature to support.
7. Discuss the internal consistency of the two mid-theories in relation to the clarity of concepts, the consistency of language, and the structural consistency of the theory? Discuss in relation to your concept. Be specific and provide examples to support your position.
8. Discuss your conclusions about your concept, the two mid-range theories it is contained within, its usefulness for the study of the clinical problem, and the usefulness of the mid-range theory in your potential research.
9. Select one of the mid-range theories described as the best fit for your concept and provide a sound rationale for the mid-range theory selected.
10. Provides sound argument and strong evidence of critical thinking including rationale and evidence to support all statements.
11. Provides well thought out discussion and conclusion with literature to support. Includes discussion of future directions and contribution to advancing the science.
12. Appropriate use of APA format
13. Writing is clear with logical presentation of ideas.
15. Depth of knowledge of literature demonstrated in writing.
16. Meets deadline for date and time due.

APA manual guidelines are to be used for this paper. The paper length is **not to exceed 10 pages excluding cover page and references.**

**University & College Policies:**

The College of Nursing expects that students will demonstrate professional behavior in all situations. Specific expectations for clinical and other professional venues can be found in the appropriate handbook. You are responsible for reviewing and acting in accordance with the policies and procedures found in the following sources, including the following topics: Professionalism, Academic Integrity, Accommodations for Students with Disabilities, Disruptive Behavior, Attendance, Compliance, and Progression.
Professionalism:

All graduate students at Michigan State University should be fully familiar with the Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities Articles (published by the Graduate School; available at http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/graduate-student-rights-and-responsibilities); the University guidelines for ethical research (published by the University committee on Research Involving Human Subjects [UCRIHS]; available at http://www.msu.edu/user/ucris/); The MSU Guidelines for Integrity in Research and Creative Activities, http://grad.msu.edu/all/ris04activities.pdf; and specific principles for informal conflict management, in the Graduate Student Resource Guide (published by the Graduate School; available at http://grad.msu.edu/conflict.htm).

The Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR) Articles address professional standards for graduate students as follows: “Each department/school and college shall communicate to graduate students, at the time of their enrollment in a degree program or course in the unit, any specific codes of professional and academic standards covering the conduct expected of them.” (Article 2.4.7). “The graduate student shares with the faculty the responsibility for maintaining the integrity of scholarship, grades, and professional standards” (Article 2.3.8).

In addition to meeting academic standards included in the Academic Progression Guidelines, students and faculty in the Doctoral Program in Nursing have shared responsibility for adherence to the professional standards referred to the Doctoral Student Handbook of the CON.

Professional expectations are rooted in the maintenance of high quality working relationships with faculty, peers, research participants, staff, and all others with whom the graduate student interacts. Aspects of high quality working relationships that are addressed in the GSRR as shared faculty-student responsibilities include: mutual respect, understanding, and dedication to the education process (2.1.2); maintenance of a collegial atmosphere (2.3.7); and mutual trust and civility (2.3.1.2).

Policies

Academic Integrity:

Academic Honesty: Article 2.3.3 of the Academic Freedom Report states: “The student shares with the faculty the responsibility for maintaining the integrity of scholarship, grades, and professional standards.” In addition, the College of Nursing adheres to the policies on academic honesty specified in General Student Regulation 1.0, Protection of Scholarship and Grades; the all-University Policy on Integrity of Scholarship and Grades; and Ordinance 17.00, Examinations. (See http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/regulations/general-student-regulations and/or the MSU Web site www.msu.edu.)

Therefore, unless authorized by your instructor, you are expected to complete all course assignments, including homework, lab work, quizzes, tests and exams, without assistance from any source. You are expected to develop original work for this course; therefore, you may not submit course work you completed for another course to satisfy the requirements for this course. Also, you are not authorized to use the www.allmsu.com Web site to complete any course work NUR 901. Students who violate MSU rules may receive a penalty grade, including but not limited to--a failing grade on the assignment or in the course. Contact your instructor if you are unsure about the appropriateness of your course work. (See also https://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/RegsOrdsPolicies.html).

Students engaged in scholarly activities (e.g. dissertation, scholarly projects) should follow the guidelines of scholarly writings as outlined in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (most recent edition). Ethical principles ensure the accuracy of scientific and scholarly knowledge and protect intellectual rights. Principles include reporting of results, plagiarism, publication credit, sharing data, and copyright.
Please read each part of the following site to fully understand your responsibilities and the position of the University regarding:

- Cheating
- Plagiarism
- MSU regulations, ordinances, and policies regarding academic honesty and integrity

Academic dishonesty in any form will not be tolerated in the College of Nursing. Any student involved in academic dishonesty will be reported to the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Student Services in the College of Nursing and a grade of 0.0 may be issued for the course.

Research Misconduct and Questionable Research Practices within the college are defined consistently with the Interim University Document on Intellectual Integrity approved by the President of Michigan State University on August 5, 1994 and revised June 29, 1995. Refer to the CON Doctoral Student Handbook.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Students with disabilities should contact the Resource Center for Person with Disabilities to establish reasonable accommodations. For an appointment with a disability specialist, call 353-9642 (voice, 355-1293 (TTY), or visit MyProfile.rcpd.msu.edu

Disruptive Behavior: Article 2.3.5 of the Academic Freedom Report (AFR) http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/ for students at Michigan State University states: "The student's behavior in the classroom shall be conducive to the teaching and learning process for all concerned." Article 2.3.10 of the AFR states that "The student has a right to scholarly relationships with faculty based on mutual trust and civility." General Student Regulation 5.02 http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/graduate-student-rights-and-responsibilities states: "No student shall . . . interfere with the functions and services of the University (for example, but not limited to, classes . . . ) such that the function or service is obstructed or disrupted. Students whose conduct adversely affects the learning environment in this classroom may be subject to disciplinary action through the Student Faculty Judiciary process.

Attendance: Students whose names do not appear on the official class list for this course may not attend this class. Students who fail to attend the first four class sessions or class by the fifth day of the semester, whichever occurs first, may be dropped from the course. Attendance policy, if different from the University attendance policy and especially when the attendance policy affects students’ grades. For details, see Attendance Policy, Excused Absences and Make-up Work on the Ombudsman’s Web site. This site includes discussion of student observance of major religious holidays, student-athlete participation in athletic competition, student participation in university-approved field trips, medical excuses and a dean’s drop for students who fail to attend class sessions at the beginning of the semester).

College of Nursing Policies regarding Professional Development Guidelines [found in the CON Student Handbook at the CON website]. Students are responsible for the information found in the CON Doctoral Student Handbook. Effective conflict management/negotiation skills are essential for navigating the graduate school experience and maintaining high quality working relationships. Specific principles for conflict are responsible for making concerted good faith efforts to resolve conflicts with others in a constructive and informal fashion, prior to proceeding to formal conflict resolution options as consistent with the GSRR statement on informal conflict resolution (Article 5.3.2.). Doctoral students who have specific questions or concerns about professional standards or conflict resolution issues should consult with their Major Professor, the Director of the Doctoral Program, and/or the University Ombudsman for guidance, as appropriate.
NUR 901 Spring 2015 Course Calendar
(Subject to Change: Check weekly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong> Concept identification. Research interests. Read required readings; be prepared to present one discussion question to class based on the readings; be prepared to respond to your question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong> Continue discussion of your concepts. Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar. Submit one key point learned from each of the articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In Class:</strong> Be prepared to present your concept. Conceptual content cognitive map exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/28/15</td>
<td>Concept Development &amp; Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Readings:**


**Assignment:**

**Post** all of the words you can think of which relate to or express your concept by 6 pm 1/27/15.

Look up the concept in a large unabridged dictionary and write a list of the definitions you feel most closely describe your feelings or thoughts on the concept.

Search the literature for journal articles and books related to the concept to get a sense of the beliefs and thoughts of others in the discipline regarding the concept.

**Post** a written beginning definition of your concept from dictionary definitions and literature support, having utilized at least 3 references and how the authors defined the concept. Bring your references. (**Post by 6 pm 1/27/15**).

**In Class:**

Be prepared to present your concept and beginning definition and be prepared to provide critique of your classmates’ concepts.

Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar. Submit one key point learned from each of the readings.
Weeks 4 & 5

Date: 2/4/15

Topic: Mid-range theories: Analysis and Application

Readings:


Assignment:

Further expand the nursing research problem previously identified and your theoretical concept. Specify the significance of research problem and concept and appropriateness to nursing research:

Select a mid-range theory (would suggest selecting a mid-range theory that might fit your concept development.

Post/Submit a short written paragraph on D2L/email as to why you selected the mid-range theory by **Tuesday, February 3, 2015 by 6 pm**. What are the primary concepts and propositions of the mid-range theory?

Study Questions:

What does scope of the theory refer to?

What criteria are used to evaluate nursing theory? What do the terms: significance, internal consistency, parsimony, testability, empirical adequacy, and pragmatic adequacy refer to?

In Class:

Be prepared to discuss your nursing research problem, concept, and significance. Be prepared to discuss a mid-range theory to fit your concept with rationale in class.

Be prepared to discuss the mid-range theory with respect to analysis and evaluation per Fawcett’s criteria.
Is the mid-range theory well described? Explain.
What is the scope of the MRT (mid-range theory)? Provide supporting evidence.
What are the concepts and propositions of your MRT selected?

Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar.

Post a copy of your paper #1 in d2l by Wednesday, February 11, 2015 by 8 am.

Paper #1 Due, Wednesday February 11 at 8 am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 + 7</td>
<td>2/18/15</td>
<td>Concepts and Theoretical Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Readings:**


**Assignment:** Analysis of mid-range theories—to be assigned for presentation and discussion in class with power point slides. Chapter 7 will assist you in this assignment
Study Questions:
What criteria would you use to select a mid-range theory for your nursing problem and concept?
Why are the TOUS, HRQOL and HP theories middle range?

In Class: Student power point presentations of analysis of mid-range theories and critique.

Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar. Submit one key point from each of the readings.

Week | Date | Topic
--- | --- | ---
8 | 3/4/15 | Concept Model Building

Readings:


Assignment: Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar. Identify one key point from each of the readings.

In Class: Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar.

Paper #2 Due Wednesday, March 18, 2015, by 8 am.

Week | Date | Topic
--- | --- | ---
9 | 3/11/15 | Spring Break

Week | Date | Topic
--- | --- | ---
10 | 3/18/15 | Concept Model Building


**Assignment:** Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar. Submit one key point from each of the readings.

**In Class:** Conceptual content cognitive map exercise.

**Paper #2 Due Wednesday, March 18, 2015, by 8 am.**

**Weeks** | **Date** | **Topic** | **6**
--- | --- | --- | ---
**11 + 12** | 3/25/15 | **Model Application: Conceptual and Theoretical Comparisons between Mid-range Theories**
 | 4/1/15 |  


**Assignment:** Select two mid-range theories to compare, contrast, and evaluate.*

Read other students’ mid-range theories selected –to be sent by Monday night, October 29 by 6 pm.

The goal of this assignment is to compare, contrast and evaluate mid-range theories for their relevance to nursing science. Select two mid-range theories. You will use Fawcett’s criteria to compare, contrast and evaluate the two mid-range theories.

1. Identify and describe the two mid-range theories.
2. Provides a diagram of each mid-range theory identifying the key concepts within the framework.
3. Identify if the two-mid-range theories are well described; describe the scope of the two mid-range theories.
4. Has the internal consistency of the two mid-theories been discussed in relation to the clarity of concepts, the consistency of language, and the structural consistency of the theory? Be specific and provide examples to support your position.
5. Discuss your conclusions about the two mid-range theories.
6. Compare and contrast the two middle range theories.
7. Provide a short power point presentation to present your two middle range theories in class.
8. Select the two middle range theories and post/send the readings to students and faculty in the class by Tuesday, March 24, 2015 by 6 pm via d2l/email so that we may review the mid-range theories to be presented.

In Class: Be prepared to present your mid-range theories and discuss your written work in class.
Be prepared to critique your classmates’ evaluation of two mid-range theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/8/15</td>
<td>Concept and Theory Derivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readings:


Assignment: Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar. Submit one key point from each of the readings.

In Class: Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/8/15</td>
<td>Concept and Theory Synthesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readings:


**Assignment:** Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar.

**In Class:** Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar.

**Week**  **Date**  **Topic**  **8**
14  4/15/15  Student Presentations

**Readings:** Print off classmates’ power point slides and read before class.*

**Assignment:** Prepare power point presentation per guidelines provided in the syllabus. Provide a copy of your complete power point presentation via d2l/email to all classmates on Tuesday April 14, 2015, by 6 pm.

**In Class:** Present a formal presentation on concept development with a theoretical framework using power point slides. A time frame will be provided the week before. Be prepared to critique your classmates’ presentations develop questions to ask each presenter.

**Week**  **Date**  **Topic**  **9**
15  4/22/15  Theory Validation and Analytical Critique: Next Steps

**Readings:**


**Paper #3 Due Wednesday, April 22, 2015 by 8am**

**Assignment:** Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar.

**In Class:** Be prepared to actively and critically discuss the assigned readings in seminar.

**Week**  **Date**  **Topic**  **16**
16  4/29/15  Bringing it all together: Nursing knowledge development

**In Class:** Conceptual content cognitive map exercise.

- Running Head
- Pagination – Pages Numbered
- Title
- Body
- Reference List
- Leveled Headings (3-4)
- In Body Citations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>No/Limited Proficiency</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An introduction of the concept of interest with justification of nursing science relevance; and purpose of the concept development and analysis.</td>
<td>Nursing concept is clearly, thoroughly and concisely explained, within the problem area and the relevance to nursing science.</td>
<td>Nursing concept is mostly explained within the problem area with the relevance to nursing science. One or two points may be unclear; concept of interest is not clearly identified.</td>
<td>Confusing, vague or contradictory explanation of the nursing conceptual problem and justification to nursing science.</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>13 points 11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of all uses of the concept and major defining attributes.</td>
<td>Clearly presents all uses for identified concept. Clearly and accurately describes the major defining attributes.</td>
<td>The uses for identified concept and the defining attributes are mostly explained. One or two points may be unclear; one or two obvious uses of the concept may be missing,</td>
<td>Confusing or contradictory presentation of the uses of the concept, obvious uses of the concept are missing, and the major defining attributes are poorly explained.</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>13 points 11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical assumptions, exploration of the contextual factors, and values of the concept of interest.</td>
<td>Clearly presents a critical appraisal of the philosophical assumptions, contextual factors, and values of the concept of interest.</td>
<td>A critical appraisal of the philosophical assumptions, contextual factors, and values of the concept of interest are presented but there is a lack of engaged critical inquiry evident. One or two points may be unclear.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear and vague appraisal of the philosophical assumptions, contextual factors, and values of the concept of interest. There is a lack of critical logical analysis and depth of inquiry.</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>8 points 7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of interdisciplinary comparison and/or parallels.</td>
<td>Clearly describes at least two interdisciplinary parallels of the concept of interest with examples to support position.</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary comparisons and/or parallels are mostly described; but the discussion of comparisons and/or parallels may be unclear or lacking in active critique.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear and vague or absent description of at least two interdisciplinary comparisons and/or parallels.</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>8 points 7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of re-conceptualization</td>
<td>Clearly provides active critique and</td>
<td>The discussion of</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on the assumptions, contextual factors, values, and interdisciplinary parallels that are identified.</td>
<td>discussion of how the concept and its attributes have be re-conceptualized based on the assumptions, contextual factors, values, and interdisciplinary parallels identified.</td>
<td>conceptualization based on the assumptions, contextual factors, values, and interdisciplinary parallels that are identified. Is mostly described but one or two points may be unclear.</td>
<td>discussion of re-conceptualization based on the assumptions, contextual factors, values, and interdisciplinary parallels that are identified.</td>
<td>7 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion and exclusion criteria.</td>
<td>Clearly describes the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the concept in language that is clear and objective.</td>
<td>Mostly describes the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the concept in language that is clear and objective. One or two criteria may be unclear; there may be a inclusion/exclusion criteria that is missing.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague presentation of the inclusion and exclusion criteria.</td>
<td>7 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of 2-3 relevant, feasible research questions that are based on the concept development and analysis.</td>
<td>Clearly provides sound research questions that are relevant and feasible and are logically based on the concept development and analysis.</td>
<td>Presents a formulation of research questions that are based on the concept development and analysis but are not relevant and feasible for investigation, or have one or two points that may be unclear.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague formulation of research questions. Research questions may not be based on the logical development and analysis that stems from the conceptual problem.</td>
<td>7 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical appraisal of conclusions from the concept development and critical analysis. Summary paragraph with how expand concept development in your future research.</td>
<td>Clearly presents a critical appraisal of conclusions from the concept development and critical analysis. Conclusions presented critically depict the importance of concept to advancing the science of nursing</td>
<td>An appraisal of conclusions from the concept development and critical analysis are presented, but is lacking a critical appraisal of its contribution towards advancing the science. A summary provided but one or two</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague discussion of conclusions from the concept development and analysis; lacks adequate conclusions and summary synthesis.</td>
<td>7 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the problem area. There is a clear and concise summary synthesis. <strong>15 points</strong></td>
<td>points may be unclear; summary not a synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics: APA Format</td>
<td>Correct APA format</td>
<td>Some errors but does not detract from the content of the paper.</td>
<td>Formatting and structure errors that detract from the paper, difficult to follow the narrative due to errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References and citations</td>
<td>Correct sentence structure, grammar and diction; no run on sentences, paragraphs have a beginning, middle and conclusion, no slang used, terminology for variables is consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacing &amp; Margins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of tables/graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font and font size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An introduction of the research problem with critical justification of how the conceptual model will advance nursing science and is significant and innovative.</td>
<td>Nursing problem is clearly, thoroughly and concisely explained, with critical justification for how the conceptual model is significant, innovative and relevant to the advancement of nursing science.</td>
<td>Nursing problem is mostly explained with justification of how the model advances the science of nursing. One or two points may be unclear; Differences between significance and innovation may be blurred or one area may be missing or confusing.</td>
<td>Confusing, vague or contradictory explanation of the nursing research problem with a lack of critical justification of how the conceptual model will advance nursing science, and does not address significance and innovation.</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration and active review, summarization of the relevant literature, including antecedent knowledge from nursing and adjunctive disciplines used in the development of your conceptual area of interest.</td>
<td>Clearly presents an integrated and active review and summarization of the relevant literature, including antecedent knowledge from nursing and adjunctive disciplines used in the development of your conceptual area of interest. Identifies gaps and makes appropriate contrasts and comparisons.</td>
<td>The literature review and summarization is presented but lacks integration and synthesis and identification of the gaps and antecedent knowledge from nursing and adjunctive disciplines used in the development of your conceptual area of interest.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague synthesis of the literature and lacking antecedent knowledge from nursing and adjunctive disciplines used in the development of your conceptual area of interest. Literature is rotey presented.</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>13 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the target population.</td>
<td>Clearly presents a description of the target population.</td>
<td>The target population is mostly described, one or two points may be unclear.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear and vague description of the target population.</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>8 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>No/Limited Proficiency</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe model. Definition of all model terms.</td>
<td>Clearly describes model and provides a definition of all model terms that are logically developed.</td>
<td>A description of the model and a definition of all model terms that are present but one or two points may be lacking logical coherence.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague model and model definitions.</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of linkage statements and descriptive rationales for all relationships among major concepts that relate to the problem of interest.</td>
<td>Clearly describes linkage statements and there are sound and clear arguments presented for all relationships among the major concepts.</td>
<td>Linkage statements are presented but the arguments presented for all relationships among the major concepts are not always clear and logically developed. One or two criteria may be missing.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague presentation of the linkage statements. There are confusing, unclear, vague and/or absent arguments presented for the relationships among the major concepts.</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of three logical and relevant research questions that stem from the model. A description of the testability of the conceptual framework in relation to the observability and measurability of the concepts.</td>
<td>Clearly provides a description of three logical and relevant research questions that stem from the model. A sound description of the testability of the conceptual framework in relation to the observability and measurability of the concepts is presented.</td>
<td>Relevant research questions that stem from the model and a description of the testability of the conceptual framework are presented but are not clear, or have one or two points that may be unclear.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague description of research questions. Research questions may not stem from the model. A description of the testability of the conceptual framework in relation to the observability and measurability of the concepts is missing or is unclear and illogical.</td>
<td>8 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of sound arguments and strong evidence of critical thinking.</td>
<td>Clearly presents sound arguments. There is strong evidence of critical thinking and rationales and evidence to support all inferential statements.</td>
<td>There is presence of sound arguments and evidence of critical thinking but some rationales may be lacking. Evidence to support all inferential statements may be lacking.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague arguments and a lack of evidence of critical thinking. Rationales and evidence to support inferential statements is absent.</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and conclusion are well thought out with future research directions described.</td>
<td>Clearly presents a discussion and conclusion that is supported by the literature with a coherent discussion of future research directions.</td>
<td>There is presence of a discussion and conclusion but it lacks clarity in places. The discussion of future directions for research is unclear at times.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague discussion and conclusions with poor evidence of supportive literature. There is no discussion of future research directions.</td>
<td>7 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics: APA Format</td>
<td>Correct APA format</td>
<td>Some errors but does not detract from the content of the paper.</td>
<td>Formatting and structure errors that detract from the paper, difficult to follow the narrative due to errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence and paragraph structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Concept Application within 2 Mid-range theories: Analysis, Evaluation, and Application Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>No/Limited Proficiency</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of the development of your nursing research problem and theoretical concept previously developed in papers 1 and 2</td>
<td>Nursing research problem is clearly, thoroughly and concisely explained, including population of interest and clearly identified theoretical concept appropriate to the research problem. <strong>5 points</strong></td>
<td>Nursing research problem and population of interest mostly explained, one or two points may be unclear; theoretical concept not clearly identified. <strong>4 points</strong></td>
<td>Confusing, vague or contradictory explanation of the nursing research problem, theoretical concept, and population of interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated and active review and synthesis of the relevant literature; further development of your literature review. Includes Breadth of Literature: presents research on topic from at least 3 disciplines/bodies of literature in manner that demonstrates understanding of each viewpoint and synthesis of literature and depth of knowledge on topic and appropriateness to nursing. Compares and contrasts conceptualizations from different disciplines/bodies of literature throughout the paper.</td>
<td>Clearly presents appropriate and current research on nursing research problem from at least 3 different disciplines. Demonstrates synthesis of the literature, identifying gaps.. Compares and contracts conceptualizations from different disciplines/bodies of literature throughout the paper. <strong>20 points</strong></td>
<td>Literature presented on nursing research problem but not from 3 different disciplines or lacks current research from the various disciplines. Some comparison and contrasting of conceptualizations; one or two points may be unclear. Lacks synthesis; gaps not clearly identified. <strong>17 points</strong></td>
<td>Confusing or contradictory presentation of the literature from the various disciplines; only one discipline of research presented, no relationship to research problem, concept, or population of interest. Lacks comparison and contrasting of conceptualizations. No synthesis of the literature or identification of gaps. <strong>15 points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of two mid-range theories; describing the concepts and propositions of the two mid-range theories.</td>
<td>Clearly presents two appropriate mid-range theories for identified concept. Clearly and accurately describes the concepts and propositions of the</td>
<td>Two mid-range theories mostly described; one or two concepts and/or propositions may be unclear.</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear and vague description of 2 mid-range theories, their concepts and propositions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mid-range theories. 5 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of concept from 2 theoretical points of view and comparison and contrasting the concept. Evaluation of differing definitions and how affect usefulness of concept. Diagram of concept within two mid range theories; each component/concept labeled appropriately.</strong></td>
<td>Clearly defines concept from 2 theoretical points of view and comparing and contrasting the concept in relation to the usefulness of the concept to problem under study. Clearly presents a diagram of the concept within two mid-range theories, each concept clearly labeled. 15 points</td>
<td>Definition of concept from 2 theoretical points of view mostly presented with some comparison and contrasting related to the usefulness of the concept. Diagram of concept with two mid-range theories mostly described and labeled; one or two points may be unclear. 13 points</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague definition of concept from 2 theoretical points of view; lacks comparison and contrasting of the concept to usefulness. Confusing, unclear, vague diagram of concept within 2 mid-range theories; diagram not clearly labeled. 11 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of two mid-range theories: how described? Rationale to support.</strong></td>
<td>Clearly describes two-mid-range theories. Provides sound rationale to support. 5 points</td>
<td>Description of two mid-range theories mostly presented with some rationale to support. One or two point may be unclear. 4 points</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague description of two mid-range theories. No sound rationale presented to support. 3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of 2 mid-range theories: internal consistency of 2 mid-range theories: clarity of concepts; consistency of language and the structural consistency of the theory. Discussed in relation to own concept with examples to support position.</strong></td>
<td>Clearly describes the internal consistency of the 2 mid-range theories in terms of clarify, consistency of language and structure with examples to support position. 15 points</td>
<td>Internal consistency of 2 mid-range theories in terms of clarity, consistency of language and structure with examples to support position mostly described; one or two points may be unclear; limited examples to support position. 13 points</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague evaluation of 2 mid-range theories in terms of, clarity, consistency of language and structure, no examples to support position. 11 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and usefulness of your concept within two mid-range theories, usefulness of each theory to your clinical problem and usefulness of the mid-range theories.</strong></td>
<td>Clearly provides sound conclusions about concept identified, the 2 mid-range theories, the usefulness of each theory for</td>
<td>Presents a conclusion which mostly describes the concept, the 2 mid-range theories and usefulness of each theory for the clinical problem</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague conclusions about the concept, the mid-range theories, and the usefulness for the clinical problem and your research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>No/Limited Proficiency</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>range theories for your potential research.</td>
<td>the clinical problem and usefulness of the 2 mid-range theories for your research.</td>
<td>and usefulness of the 2 mid-range theories selected for your research; one or two points may be unclear.</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of one mid-range theory as best fit with sound rationale provided</td>
<td>Clearly describes one mid-range theory as the best fit for concept identified with sound rationale presented to support selection; clearly drawn.</td>
<td>Presents a mid-range theory as best fit with adequate rationale to support;</td>
<td>Confusing, unclear, and vague discussion of mid-range theory selected;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well thought-out discussion and conclusion with literature to support with discussion of future directions.</td>
<td>Clearly presented discussion and conclusions regarding the importance of concept with literature to support; discussion of future directions and contribution to advancing the science.</td>
<td>Discussion and conclusions presented with beginning identification of importance of concept; some literature to support; some discussion of future directions and contribution to advancing the science. One or two points may be unclear; 8 points</td>
<td>Lacks adequate discussion and conclusions with minimal or no literature to support; lacks discussion of future directions and contribution of advancing the science.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics: APA Format</td>
<td>Correct APA format</td>
<td>Some errors but does not detract from the content of the paper.</td>
<td>Formatting and structure errors that detract from the paper, difficult to follow the narrative due to errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- References and citations</td>
<td>Correct sentence structure, grammar and diction; no run on sentences, paragraphs have a beginning, middle and conclusion, no slang used, terminology for variables is consistent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spacing &amp; Margins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Headings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quotations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Title page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Running head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of tables/graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Font and font size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence and paragraph structure</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Visually appealing presentation; presentation readily available at time of presentation; handouts information provided to audience; references included in presentation.</td>
<td>Presentation acceptable, presentation available but time spent during class locating or accessing it, handouts available to audience, reference included in presentation.</td>
<td>Presentation not easily accessed; no handout materials for audience, no reference included in presentation.</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Presentation well organized, with all components included (see guidelines for presentation).</td>
<td>Presentation with most of components; minor disorganization of content.</td>
<td>Presentation with multiple missing components, major disorganization of content.</td>
<td>65 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Speaker helps the audience understand the sequence and relationships of ideas, arguments clear, evident that speaker has extensive knowledge of the material</td>
<td>Speaker presents content in sequence but may miss connecting some of the ideas, arguments clear, evident that speaker has an adequate knowledge of the material</td>
<td>Speaker does not connect ideas; arguments are vague or illogical; evident that speaker lacks an adequate knowledge of the material; unable to answer most questions from the audience.</td>
<td>52 points</td>
<td>51 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions</td>
<td>material, able to answer questions from the audience.</td>
<td>material, able to answer most questions from the audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Speaker stay within time limit without rushing; speaks clearly and varies vocal tone; makes eye contact with the audience; neat professional appearance; audience is engaged in the presentation.</td>
<td>Speaker runs over time limit by several minutes or rushes the presentation to conclusion; speaks clearly but may have monotone; makes eye contact but may lose eye contact for some time to read from notes, neat professional appearance, audience engaged in the presentation.</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker runs over time so as to be stopped by faculty or rushes through presentation so as to impact the comprehension of the subject; speech is unclear or volume too low to be heard, does not make noticeable eye contact with the audience, audience not engaged in presentation or embarrassed by speaker's poor delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>High Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>No/Limited Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>• Clear and logical statements</td>
<td>• Substantial information</td>
<td>• Generally competent but superficial information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shows insight and engages in analysis</td>
<td>• Thought, insight and analysis has taken place</td>
<td>• No analysis or insight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reasoning is justified</td>
<td>• Reasoning mostly explained</td>
<td>• Lacks explanation for reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevant to the all questions for the readings</td>
<td>• Relevant to most questions for the readings.</td>
<td>• Irrelevant to most questions for the readings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>• Provides new ideas or examples in discussion</td>
<td>• New ideas or connections</td>
<td>• Few, if any new ideas or connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connections made with readings</td>
<td>• Initial ideas or responses may lack depth and/or detail</td>
<td>• Repeat or restatement of previous ideas; does not add to the dialogue on the questions for the readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to</td>
<td>• Evidence of critical analysis of study questions with clear connections draw to nursing,</td>
<td>• Some evidence of critical analysis of study questions with some connections draw to nursing,</td>
<td>• Little evidence of critical analysis of study questions with unclear connections to nursing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursing</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>7 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points**: 29