NURS20173 *Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 1*

Term 1 - 2022

Profile information current as at 05/04/2024 02:56 pm

All details in this unit profile for NURS20173 have been officially approved by CQUniversity and represent a learning partnership between the University and you (our student). The information will not be changed unless absolutely necessary and any change will be clearly indicated by an approved correction included in the profile.

General Information

Overview

In this unit, you will apply research design and ethical principles to health, safety, or wellbeing research. You will develop and submit a quality improvement research proposal based on an area of interest in your field of practice. You will also develop and submit an accompanying CQUniversity Human Research Ethics application for your quality improvement research project. Successful completion of the unit will result in ethical approval to undertake the proposed project.

Details

Career Level: *Postgraduate*
Unit Level: *Level 9*
Credit Points: *6*
Student Contribution Band: *7*
Fraction of Full-Time Student Load: *0.125*

Pre-requisites or Co-requisites

Corequisites: NURS20167 Literature Review in Health, Safety and Wellbeing; NURS20168 Designing Research in Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences
Important note: Students enrolled in a subsequent unit who failed their pre-requisite unit, should drop the subsequent unit before the census date or within 10 working days of Fail grade notification. Students who do not drop the unit in this timeframe cannot later drop the unit without academic and financial liability. See details in the [Assessment Policy and Procedure (Higher Education Coursework)](#).

Offerings For Term 1 - 2022

- Online

Attendance Requirements

All on-campus students are expected to attend scheduled classes – in some units, these classes are identified as a mandatory (pass/fail) component and attendance is compulsory. International students, on a student visa, must maintain a full time study load and meet both attendance and academic progress requirements in each study period (satisfactory attendance for International students is defined as maintaining at least an 80% attendance record).

Website

[This unit has a website, within the Moodle system, which is available two weeks before the start of term. It is important that you visit your Moodle site throughout the term. Please visit Moodle for more information.](#)

Class and Assessment Overview

Recommended Student Time Commitment

Each 6-credit Postgraduate unit at CQUniversity requires an overall time commitment of an average of 12.5 hours of study per week, making a total of 150 hours for the unit.

Class Timetable

Regional Campuses

Bundaberg, Cairns, Emerald, Gladstone, Mackay, Rockhampton, Townsville

Metropolitan Campuses

Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne, Perth, Sydney

Assessment Overview

1. **Research Proposal**
Weighting: 60%
2. **Report**
Weighting: 40%
3. **Report**
Weighting: Pass/Fail

Assessment Grading

This is a graded unit: your overall grade will be calculated from the marks or grades for each assessment task, based on the relative weightings shown in the table above. You must obtain an overall mark for the unit of at least 50%, or an overall grade of 'pass' in order to pass the unit. If any 'pass/fail' tasks are shown in the table above they must also be completed successfully ('pass' grade). You must also meet any minimum mark requirements specified for a particular assessment task, as detailed in the 'assessment task' section (note that in some instances, the minimum mark for a task may be greater than 50%). Consult the University's Grades and Results Policy for more details of interim results and final grades.

CQUniversity Policies

All University policies are available on the CQUniversity Policy site.
You may wish to view these policies:

- Grades and Results Policy
- Assessment Policy and Procedure (Higher Education Coursework)
- Review of Grade Procedure
- Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure
- Monitoring Academic Progress (MAP) Policy and Procedure – Domestic Students
- Monitoring Academic Progress (MAP) Policy and Procedure – International Students
- Student Refund and Credit Balance Policy and Procedure
- Student Feedback – Compliments and Complaints Policy and Procedure
- Information and Communications Technology Acceptable Use Policy and Procedure

This list is not an exhaustive list of all University policies. The full list of University policies are available on the CQUniversity Policy site.

Unit Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this unit, you will be able to:

1. Justify the use of ethical principles in research
2. Formulate solutions for ethical dilemmas in health, safety and wellbeing research
3. Design a quality improvement research proposal
4. Execute a successful low risk ethics application.

NA

Alignment of Learning Outcomes, Assessment and Graduate Attributes

— N/A Level   ○ Introductory Level   ○ Intermediate Level   ● Graduate Level   ○ Professional Level   ○ Advanced Level

Alignment of Assessment Tasks to Learning Outcomes

Assessment Tasks	Learning Outcomes			
	1	2	3	4
1 - Research Proposal - 60%	●	●	●	
2 - Report - 40%	●	●		●
3 - Report - 0%	●	●		●

Alignment of Graduate Attributes to Learning Outcomes

Graduate Attributes	Learning Outcomes			
	1	2	3	4
1 - Knowledge	○	○	○	○
2 - Communication	○	○	○	○
3 - Cognitive, technical and creative skills	○	○	○	○
4 - Research	○	○	○	○
5 - Self-management	○	○	○	○
6 - Ethical and Professional Responsibility	○	○	○	○
7 - Leadership	○	○	○	○
8 - Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultures				

Alignment of Assessment Tasks to Graduate Attributes

Assessment Tasks	Graduate Attributes							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 - Research Proposal - 60%	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
2 - Report - 40%	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
3 - Report - 0%	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	

Textbooks and Resources

Textbooks

There are no required textbooks.

IT Resources

You will need access to the following IT resources:

- CQUniversity Student Email
- Internet
- Unit Website (Moodle)
- Zoom account (Free)

Referencing Style

All submissions for this unit must use the referencing style: [American Psychological Association 7th Edition (APA 7th edition)](#)
For further information, see the Assessment Tasks.

Teaching Contacts

Sue Hunt Unit Coordinator
s.hunt@cqu.edu.au
Julie Shaw Unit Coordinator
j.m.shaw@cqu.edu.au
Colleen Johnston-Devin Unit Coordinator
c.johnston-devin@cqu.edu.au

Schedule

Week 1 - 07 Mar 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Introduction to unit and discussion of assessment items. Introduction to Quality Improvement in Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	Zoom drop-in session, time to be announced.

Week 2 - 14 Mar 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Components of a Quality Improvement project proposal.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	

Week 3 - 21 Mar 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Defining the Quality Improvement issue, research question, aims and objectives.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	Workplace manager discussion and preliminary approval to be arranged where appropriate.

Week 4 - 28 Mar 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Selecting the research design for your Quality Improvement project.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	Zoom drop-in session, time to be announced.

Week 5 - 04 Apr 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
The literature review as a structured approach for knowledge synthesis and project justification.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	

Vacation Week - 11 Apr 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Enjoy your tuition free week!		

Week 6 - 18 Apr 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Introduction to ethical considerations for Quality Improvement projects.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	Zoom drop-in session, time to be announced.

Week 7 - 25 Apr 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Designing the data collection tool.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	**Assessment 1 – Quality Improvement Project Proposal** Due: Week 7 Wednesday (27 Apr 2022) 5:00 pm AEST

Week 8 - 02 May 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
The CQUniversity ethics application process Part A.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	Zoom drop-in session, time to be announced.

Week 9 - 09 May 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
The CQUniversity ethics application process Part B.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	

Week 10 - 16 May 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Quantitative data collection methods in practice.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	Zoom drop-in session, time to be announced. **Assessment 2 – Ethics application** Due: Week 10 Wednesday (18 May 2022) 5:00 pm AEST

Week 11 - 23 May 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Qualitative data collection methods in practice.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	

Week 12 - 30 May 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Finalising your ethics application for submission to the CQUniversity Ethics Committee.	Selected eReadings. Please refer to Moodle site.	Zoom drop-in session, time to be announced.

Review/Exam Week - 06 Jun 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
		Assessment 3: Ethics Application Submission Due: Review/Exam Week Wednesday (8 June 2022) 5:00 pm AEST

Exam Week - 13 Jun 2022

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic

1 Assessment 1 – Quality Improvement Project Proposal

Assessment Type
Research Proposal

Task Description
Type: Proposal
Length: 4000 words plus or minus 10% (excluding reference list and appendices)

Aim
The aim of this assessment is to design a quality improvement project proposal. This proposal will inform Assessment 2, an ethics application, and leads into the project that you will undertake in your workplace for *NURS20174 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 2*.
To successfully complete this assessment, you will need to engage with the weekly unit material on the NURS20173 Moodle site (Weeks 1 – 6). The resources offered during these weeks will support you to complete this assessment task.

Instructions
You will write a quality improvement project proposal to investigate a quality issue in your workplace or practice, identified in collaboration with your manager where appropriate. If completed in your workplace, written manager approval for this proposed project must be included as an Appendix in your assignment. Reference to professional and policy documents, and contemporary primary research literature and texts must be included throughout your proposal, including your research design.
Use the following headings, guidelines, and suggested word allocations to structure your proposal:

1. ABSTRACT (no more than 250 words)
Write a 250-word abstract which provides the reader with a 'snapshot' that summarises the entire quality project proposal. Include the following headings: Background and Context; Problem; Aim; Methodology and Method; Significance to Professional Practice.

2. INTRODUCTION (~500 words)
The introduction should clearly inform the reader of what you are intending to investigate for your quality improvement project. The following should be included:
• The background to your project.
• The context for your investigation.
• A clear statement of the overarching purpose of the study. This includes stating the problem that requires quality improvement.
• A clear rationale or justification – why is this a quality issue or problem that needs to be investigated?
• The importance or significance of what you are proposing to do – relate this to quality improvement and professional practice.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW (~700 words)
The literature review demonstrates your knowledge of the topic and provides a rationale for why this is an important area to investigate. The literature review needs to include the most current evidence about the topic and any gaps identified in earlier research studies on the topic. At the end of the review, state clearly how the proposed project will contribute to the existing professional body of knowledge in the focus area.

4. RESEARCH QUESTION, AIM and OBJECTIVES (~250 words)
The research question, aim, and objectives need to align with your identified problem, background, context and literature review. Articulate one overarching research question. The question guides your project and allows you to address the identified quality issue. The research question needs to be clear, focused, and clearly written as a question. The project must be feasible to complete in the 12-week time frame of NURS20174.
The overall quality improvement question generates the aim and objectives. The aim should state the purpose or the intent of the project – what the study aims to achieve. The objectives identify the project outcomes necessary to achieve the aim. The objectives are specific, clearly defined, and measurable.
The quality improvement question, aim, and objectives must align and relate to the identified problem.

5. RESEARCH DESIGN / METHODOLOGY / METHODS (~600 words)
Outline and discuss your planned research approach and the overall methodology you selected to answer your quality improvement question. Discuss the methods you will use to collect and analyse the data. Justify the research approach and data collection methods – why are they the most appropriate to address the research question?

6. PROJECT TIMELINES (~50 WORDS)
List the key actions that must occur to conduct your quality project and how long each action will take. The project must be conducted and reported on within 13 weeks (1 term). Please use the provided Gannt chart.

7. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS (~1000 words) Examine and justify the general use of ethical principles in research, and how these relate to the design and implementation of your quality improvement project. Identify and examine potential ethical dilemmas in your project and formulate and justify your management solutions. Your discussion must include

reference to the 'National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research', 2007 (the National Statement'), and include discussion of the following:
- Recognition and minimisation of the risk of harm, discomfort and inconvenience for participants, the organisation and investigators
- Recruitment of participants
- Informed consent
- Privacy and confidentiality
- Data collection, use and management

8. LIMITATIONS (~250 words) Identify and examine actual and potential limitations of your quality improvement project and how you plan to prevent or limit these to reduce the possible impact on the project. Limitations are the influences on the project that cannot be controlled. They are the shortcomings, conditions or influences that may place restrictions on the project.

9. CONCLUSION (~400 words)
Summarise the key points made and include a concluding statement of the main ideas put forward in this proposal.

10. REFERENCES

11. APPENDIX A
Where appropriate, attach the preliminary approval letter from your workplace manager, using the template available on Moodle. This letter must include reference to the intended quality improvement question, research approach and data collection methods. The letter must confirm that you have discussed the quality improvement project idea with the manager, and that they provide provisional approval for you to undertake this project in your workplace for NURS20174. You will gain final written approval for the project on completion of this proposal for your ethics application.

Literature and references
In this assessment use at least 15 contemporary references (<7 years) to support your discussion. You may also use seminal scholarly literature where relevant. Suitable references include peer-reviewed journal articles as well as textbooks and credible websites. When sourcing information, consider the 5 elements of a quality reference: currency, authority, relevance, objectivity, and coverage. Grey literature sourced from the internet must be from reputable websites such as from government, university, or peak national bodies: for example, the Australian College of Nursing, or the World Health Organization.

Requirements
• Use a conventional and legible size 12 font, such as Times New Roman or Arial, with 1.5 line spacing and 2.54cm page margins (standard pre-set margin in Microsoft Word).
• Include page numbers on each page in a footer.
• Write in the third-person perspective.
• Use formal academic language.
• Use the seventh edition American Psychological Association (APA) referencing style. The CQUniversity Academic Learning Centre has an online APA Referencing Style Guide.
• The word count is considered from the first word of the introduction to the last word of the conclusion. The word count excludes the reference list but includes in-text references and direct quotations.

Resources
• You can use unit provided materials and other credible sources (e.g. journal articles, books, grey literature) to reference your argument. The quality and credibility of your sources are important.
• We recommend that you access your discipline specific library guide: the Nursing and Midwifery Guide; Social Work and Community Services Guide.
• We recommend you use EndNote to manage your citations and reference list. More information on how to use EndNote is available at the CQUniversity Library website.
• For information on academic communication please go to the Academic Learning Centre Moodle site. The Academic Communication section has many helpful resources including information for students with English as a second language.
• Submit a draft before the due date to review your Turnitin Similarity Score and report before making a final submission. Instructions are available here.

Submission
Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in Microsoft Word format only.

References
National Health and Medical Research Council, Australian Research Council and Australian Vice Chancellors Committee. (2007, updated 2018). National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). Canberra: Australian Government. Available from:
https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/about-us/publications/national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research-2007-updated-2018

Assessment Due Date
Week 7 Wednesday (27 Apr 2022) 5:00 pm AEST

Return Date to Students
Week 9 Wednesday (11 May 2022)

Weighting
60%

Assessment Criteria

Key Criteria	High Distinction 84.5 – 100%	Distinction 74.50 – 84.49%	Credit 64.50 – 74.49%	Pass 49.50 – 64.49%	Fail <49.5%	Fail (content absent) 0%
Abstract (5%)	Concise and comprehensive summary of proposal which is exceptionally structured and written.	Concise and comprehensive summary of proposal which is very well structured and written. Some very minor points missing, incomplete and/or are minimally misaligned.	Largely concise and comprehensive summary of proposal which is well structured and written. Some minor points missing, incomplete and/or are somewhat misaligned.	A satisfactory summary of proposal. However, is not concise and/or not comprehensive. The structure and writing are satisfactory but somewhat confusing. Some points are missing, incomplete and/or are misaligned.	The abstract does not satisfactorily summarise the proposal. The content is verbose and/or difficult to comprehend. The structure and writing are unsatisfactory. Numerous points are missing, incomplete and/or misaligned.	No abstract present.
Introduction (10%)	The introduction very clearly, convincingly and succinctly provides the background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and the importance of the study.	The introduction clearly, convincingly and succinctly provides the background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and the importance of the study.	The introduction somewhat clearly, convincingly and succinctly provides the background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and the importance of the study.	The introduction provides the background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and the importance of the study. However, it lacks clarity.	The introduction is not complete. It does not include one of the following: background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification; the importance of the study.	No introduction present.
QI Research Question, Aim and Objectives (10%)	Research question is very clearly focused, relevant and specifically indicates the type of data required. Aim and objectives are very clearly stated and align with research question/topic.	Research question is clearly focused and relevant and indicate the type of data required. Aim and objectives are clearly stated and align with research question/topic.	Research question is somewhat focused and relevant and indicate the type of data required. Aims and objectives are stated and in the most part align with research question/topic.	Research question lacks clarity in focus and/or relevance but mostly indicates the type of data required. Aims and objectives are ambiguous and do not completely align with the research question/topic.	Research question is not focused and/or relevance and does not indicate the type of data required. Aim and objectives are unclear, inappropriate and do not align with research question/topic.	No research question, aim or objectives present.
Literature Review (10%)	The literature review cogently and comprehensively supports the project by pointing to a solution to the problem identified and/or a gap in the literature in relation to the problem.	The literature review is largely cogent and comprehensive in supporting the project by pointing to a solution to the problem identified and/or a gap in the literature in relation to the problem.	The literature review is somewhat cogent and comprehensive in supporting the project by pointing to a solution to the problem identified and/or a gap in the literature in relation to the problem.	The literature supports the project by pointing to a solution to the problem identified. There are some gaps in this review.	The literature review does not clearly support the project by pointing to a solution to the problem identified and/or a gap in the literature in relation to the problem.	No literature review present.
Research Design (15%)	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question is very clearly explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is clearly evident. It is highly feasible and realistic.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question is clearly explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is largely evident. It is feasible and realistic.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question is somewhat clearly explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is somewhat evident, however feasibility needs to be considered more thoroughly.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question is explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is somewhat evident, however it does not appear feasible or realistic for the timeframe provided.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question is not explained and justified or is unclear; and/or the link between methodology and methods is not explained or is very unclear. It is neither feasible to conduct nor realistic.	No research design present.
Timelines (5%)	Timelines provided are a comprehensive list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines are proposed are realistic and achievable.	Timelines provided are a complete list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines are proposed are realistic.	Timelines provided are a mostly complete list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines are proposed are realistic.	Timelines provided are an adequate list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines are proposed are realistic.	Timelines provided do not include the actions required to complete the project. The timelines are proposed are not realistic.	No timelines present.
Ethical Considerations (25%)	Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained very clearly. Discussion very clearly outlines and discusses how these ethical considerations will be managed.	Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained clearly. Discussion clearly outlines and discusses how these ethical considerations will be managed.	Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained clearly. Discussion outlines and discusses how these ethical considerations will be managed in most cases	Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained. There is some lack of clarity. Discussion outlines how these ethical considerations will be managed but does not discuss all aspects entirely.	Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are not identified and explained or the explanation is confusing.	Ethical considerations are not present.
Limitations (5%)	Limitations are explained with a very convincing argument as to why they do not negate the proposed project.	Limitations are explained with a largely convincing argument as to why they do not negate the proposed project.	Limitations are explained with a somewhat convincing argument as to why they do not negate the proposed project.	Limitations are explained and it is argued why they do not negate the proposed project. Argument is not always logical.	Limitations are not explained and/or it is not argued why they do not negate the proposed project.	No limitations present.
Conclusion (5%)	Conclusions are insightful, very well supported and flow logically from work presented.	Conclusions are sound, well supported and flow logically from work presented.	Conclusions are logical, mostly supported, and linked to the work presented.	Conclusions are satisfactory. They are somewhat supported with limited links to the work presented.	Conclusions are unsatisfactory. They are not supported or have weak links to the work presented.	No conclusion present.

Criterion						
Ability to write and present effectively and complete required task (5%)	Exemplary effort. Professional approach with no or very minor gaps. Attention to detail is without fault and all requirements of task have been met. Exemplary writing standard. Correct grammar, spelling and punctuation. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	Excellent effort attending to requirements of the tasks. All items demonstrate due attention to detail with some minor gaps. Quality of writing is of a high standard with only minor grammar, spelling, punctuation, and referencing mistakes evident. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	Good effort attending to requirements of the task. All items demonstrate due attention to detail with some gaps that impact on presentation and the readers' understanding. Quality of writing is of a good standard with a few grammar, spelling, punctuation and referencing mistakes evident. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	Satisfactory effort attending to requirements of the task. Most items demonstrate due attention to detail with some gaps that impact on presentation and the readers' understanding. Quality of writing and presentation is of a satisfactory standard with quite a few grammar, punctuation, spelling, and referencing mistakes evident. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	Submission is missing aspects of task or task requirements have been misunderstood. Quality of writing and presentation is at a poor standard grammar, punctuation, spelling and referencing mistakes evident. Workplace approval letter is required but not included.	Submission is missing most aspects of task. Little evidence of task requirements. Little to no meaningful writing. Workplace approval letter is required but not included.
Reference quality and referencing accurately (5%)	A minimum of 20 contemporary*, appropriate and high-quality references articles have been cited. Accurate APA 7th edn referencing. No in-text referencing or reference list errors.	A minimum of 18 mostly contemporary*, appropriate and high-quality references have been cited. Mostly accurate APA 7th edn referencing. 1-2 consistent in-text or reference list errors (may be made multiple times).	17 mostly contemporary*, appropriate and quality references have been cited. Somewhat accurate APA 7th edn referencing. 3 consistent in-text or reference list errors (may be made multiple times).	15 mostly contemporary*, appropriate and quality references have been cited. Occasionally accurate APA 7th edn referencing. 4 consistent in-text or reference list errors (made multiple times).	Less than 15 references have been cited, and many not contemporary* or appropriate in focus and quality. APA referencing not used, or more than 4 consistent in-text or reference list errors.	In-text referencing and reference list is absent.

Referencing Style

- [American Psychological Association 7th Edition (APA 7th edition)](#)

Submission
Online

Submission Instructions
Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in Microsoft Word format only.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Justify the use of ethical principles in research
- Formulate solutions for ethical dilemmas in health, safety and wellbeing research
- Design a quality improvement research proposal

Graduate Attributes

- Knowledge
- Communication
- Cognitive, technical and creative skills
- Research
- Self-management
- Ethical and Professional Responsibility
- Leadership

2 Assessment 2 – Ethics application

Assessment Type
Report

Task Description
Type: Report
Length: Application should be approximately 5000 words in total but will depend on your project (excluding appendices)

Aim
This assessment aims to develop your skills in writing a CQUniversity low risk ethics application for your Quality Improvement project that you will undertake in *NURS20174 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 2*.
Following marking and feedback, the final revised ethics application will be approved by the Unit Coordinator for submission to the CQUniversity Human Research Ethics Committee for Assessment 3.
To successfully undertake this application, you will need to refer to the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007), the CQUniversity Guideline: Coursework Ethics Application Form (2018) and engage with the weekly unit material on the NURS20173 Moodle site (Weeks 7-9). The resources offered during these weeks will support you to complete this assessment task.

Instructions
You are writing a low risk, coursework ethics application for the Quality Improvement project designed for Assessment 1. This ethics application will include appendices as appropriate for the submission - please see details below.

Please follow the steps below to complete your assessment task:

1. Download the CQUniversity 'Ethics Application Form for students enrolled in undergraduate programs or non-research postgraduate programs' from the NURS20173 Moodle site. Please note, some of the generic details have been pre-filled for you.

2. Follow the CQUniversity Guidelines on completing the application form available on the NURS20173 Moodle site and complete Parts 1-7 of the ethics application form. Pay careful attention to the information required for each section of the form. Do not complete Part 8 Declarations.

3. When completing the ethics application form, refer to the feedback you received for Assessment 1 and liaise with your Unit Coordinator.

4. Attach the following Appendices to your Application form, ensuring that each has a heading which includes the Appendix indicator, and title. Proformas for Appendix B, C and G are available on the NURS20173 Moodle site.

Appendix A. Reference List

Appendix B. Workplace manager approval letter (NURS20173 proforma – do not send this to your manager at this stage)

Appendix C. Participant invitation email

Appendix D. Participant Information sheet (CQUniversity proforma)

Appendix E. Survey or interview questions

Include the following additional appendices if appropriate to your recruitment and data collection method:

Appendix F. Recruitment flyer / social media participation invitation (NURS20173 template)

Appendix G. Participant consent form (CQUniversity proforma)

Literature and references

In this assessment use at least 10 contemporary references (<7 years) to support your discussion. You may also use seminal scholarly literature where relevant. Suitable references include peer-reviewed journal articles as well as textbooks and credible websites. When sourcing information, consider the 5 elements of a quality reference: currency, authority, relevance, objectivity, and coverage. Grey literature sourced from the internet must be from reputable websites such as from government, university, or peak national bodies: for example, the Australian College of Nursing, or the World Health Organization.

Requirements

• Use the CQUniversity 'Ethics Application Form for students enrolled in undergraduate programs or non-research postgraduate programs' pre-set formatting.

• For Appendices B, D, F and G use the CQUniversity proformas/templates from the NURS20173 Moodle site.

• For all other appendices use a conventional and legible size 12 font, such as Times New Roman or Arial, with 1.5 line spacing and 2.5cm page margins (standard pre-set margin in Microsoft Word).

• Include page numbers on each page in a footer.

• Write in the third-person perspective.

• Use formal academic language.

• Use the seventh edition American Psychological Association (APA) referencing style. The CQUniversity Academic Learning Centre has an online APA Referencing Style Guide.

• The approximate word count provided includes the pre-filled text in the application.

Resources

• You can use unit provided materials and other credible sources (e.g., journal articles, books, grey literature) to reference your argument. The quality and credibility of your sources are important.

• We recommend that you access your discipline specific library guide: the Nursing and Midwifery Guide; Social Work and Community Services Guide.

• We recommend you use EndNote to manage your citations and reference list. More information on how to use EndNote is available at the CQUniversity Library website.

• For information on academic communication please go to the Academic Learning Centre Moodle site. The Academic Communication section has many helpful resources including information for students with English as a second language.

• Submit a draft before the due date to review your Turnitin Similarity Score and report before making a final submission. Instructions are available here.

Submission

Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in Microsoft Word format only. Submit the Ethics application form as one Word document, and each Appendix as a separate word document. Ensure that the files are appropriately named (i.e., NURS20173_S Smith_A1_Appendix A).

References

National Health and Medical Research Council, Australian Research Council and Australian Vice Chancellors Committee. (2007, updated 2018). National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). Canberra: Australian Government. Available from:
https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/about-us/publications/national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research-2007-updated-2018

CQUniversity Human Ethics Research Committee. (2018). Guideline: Coursework Ethics Application Form. CQUniversity.

Assessment Due Date
Week 10 Wednesday (18 May 2022) 5:00 pm AEST

Return Date to Students
Week 12 Wednesday (1 June 2022)

Weighting
40%

Assessment Criteria

Key Criteria	High Distinction 84.5 – 100%	Distinction 74.50 – 84.49%	Credit 64.50 – 74.49%	Pass 49.50 – 64.49%	Fail <49.5%	Fail (content absent) 0%
Ability to write and effectively and complete required task (5%)	Exemplary effort. Professional approach with no gaps in the ethics application document and appendices. All sections of the form are expertly completed. Attention to detail is without fault and all requirements of task have been met. References to appendices are accurate throughout the document. Exemplary writing standard. Correct grammar, spelling and punctuation and referencing throughout document.	Excellent effort attending to requirements of the tasks. All items demonstrate due attention to detail with some very minor gaps in the ethics application document and appendices. References to appendices are accurate throughout the document. Quality of writing is of a high standard with only minor grammar, spelling, punctuation and referencing mistakes evident.	Good effort attending to requirements of the task. All items demonstrate due attention to detail with some minor gaps in the ethics application document and appendices which impact on presentation and the readers' understanding. All sections of the form are completed quite well. References to appendices are mostly accurate throughout the document. Quality of writing is above standard with a few grammar, spelling, punctuation, and referencing mistakes evident.	Satisfactory effort attending to requirements of the task. Most items demonstrate due attention to detail with several gaps in the ethics application document and appendices that impact on presentation readers' understanding. Inconsistencies in reference to appendices throughout the document. Quality of writing is of a satisfactory standard with quite a few grammar, spelling, punctuation, and referencing mistakes evident.	Submission is missing numerous aspects of task or task requirements have been misunderstood. Multiple gaps in the ethics application document and appendices. References to appendices are missing or very inaccurate throughout the document. Quality of writing is at a poor standard grammar, punctuation, with numerous spelling and referencing mistakes evident.	Submission is missing most aspects of task. Little evidence of task requirements. No reference to appendices throughout the document. Little to no meaningful writing.
Ethics Application Part 2.1-2.5: Project Details (15%)	Extremely concise and comprehensive layperson description of project. Background and context are clear, succinct, and expertly explained. The QI project question, aim and objectives are appropriate aligned and expertly articulated. The significance of the project and potential contribution is expertly discussed, the project is extremely well justified using appropriate contemporary research evidence.	Concise and comprehensive layperson description of project. Some very minor points are missing. Background and context are clear and succinctly explained. The QI project question, aim and objectives are appropriate, aligned and very well-articulated. The significance of the project and potential contribution is very well discussed. The project is very well justified using mostly appropriate contemporary research evidence.	Mostly concise and comprehensive summary of layperson description of project. Some minor points are missing or incomplete. Background and context are clear and succinctly explained. The QI project question, aim and objectives are mostly appropriate, aligned, and well-articulated. The significance of the project and potential contribution is well discussed. The project is quite well justified using mostly appropriate contemporary research evidence.	Summary of layperson description of project is not concise and/or not comprehensive. Several points are missing or incomplete. Background and context are satisfactorily explained. The QI project question, aim and objectives are mostly appropriate; however, are not well aligned nor well-articulated. The significance of the project and potential contribution is discussed, but further clarity required. The project justification is satisfactory but weak, using some contemporary research evidence.	Unsatisfactory or incomplete layperson description of project. Missing significant points. Background and context are not satisfactorily explained. The QI project question, aim and objectives are inappropriate, misaligned and are very poorly articulated. The significance of the project and potential contribution is incomplete or inappropriate to the project focus. The project justification is unsatisfactory, and not appropriately supported by contemporary research evidence.	No project details for Part 2.1-2.5 present.
Ethics Application Part 2.6-2.7: Project Details (15%)	The appropriateness of the methodology and methods to the research question is expertly explained and justified. It is feasible and realistic. The link between methodology and methods is very evident. The sample size and data analysis are appropriate for the project and very well justified using appropriate evidence. Ethical considerations are appropriate and detailed expertly.	The appropriateness of the methodology and methods to the research question is very clearly explained and justified. It is feasible and realistic. The sample size and data analysis are appropriate for the project and well justified using appropriate evidence. Ethical considerations are appropriate and detailed clearly.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question is somewhat clearly explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is somewhat evident, however feasibility needs to be considered more. The sample size and data analysis are mostly appropriate for the project and justified with some evidence. Ethical considerations are appropriate.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question/s is explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is somewhat evident, however it does not appear feasible or realistic for the timeframe provided. The sample size and data analysis are somewhat appropriate but require some further thought and/or justification. Ethical considerations are mostly appropriate. There is a lack of clarity at times.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question/s is not explained and justified or unclear and/or the link between methodology and methods questions is not explained or very unclear and/or ethical considerations are not explained and or very unclear. It is neither feasible to conduct nor realistic. The sample size and data analysis are not included, are inappropriate and/or are not justified.	No project details for Part 2.5-2.9 present.

Criteria					
Ethics Application Part 2.8-2.9: Risk (15%)	The risks to participants/others and the project team are appropriately identified and expertly discussed. The mechanisms to minimise the risks are appropriate and very well explained. The potential benefits and the location of the project are expertly articulated and explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is expertly incorporated.	The risks to participants/others and the project team are appropriately identified and very well discussed. The mechanisms to minimise the risks are appropriate and very well explained. The potential benefits and the location of the project are very well articulated and explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is clearly incorporated.	The risks to participants/others and the project team are mostly appropriately identified and well discussed. The mechanisms to minimise the risks are appropriate and well explained. The potential benefits and the location of the project are quite well articulated and explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is incorporated.	The risks to participants/others and the project team are mostly identified and discussed, however there is a lack of clarity at times. The mechanisms to minimise the risks are mostly appropriate however require further clarity. The potential benefits and the location of the project are explained but require some additional clarity. Appropriate scholarly evidence is mostly incorporated.	The risks to participants/others and the project team are not identified or are inappropriate or not discussed in any detail. The mechanisms to minimise the risks are not identified, are inappropriate and/or poorly explained. The potential benefits and the location of the project are not explained, are inappropriate or poorly explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is unsatisfactorily/not incorporated.	No project details for Part 2.8-2.9 present.
Ethics Application Part 4 & 5: Recruitment of Participants / Consent (15%)	The proposed participants, identification strategy and recruitment methods are highly appropriate, and expertly explained and justified. Relationships with participants and steps to minimise participant pressure to participate are highly appropriate and expertly explained. All recruitment strategies are ethically appropriate. The plans to ensure and record informed consent are appropriate and expertly explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is expertly incorporated.	The proposed participants, identification strategy and recruitment methods are appropriate, and very well explained and justified. Relationships with participants and steps to minimise participant pressure to participate are appropriate and very well explained. All recruitment strategies are ethically appropriate. The plans to ensure and record informed consent are appropriate and very well explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is clearly incorporated.	The proposed participants, identification strategy and recruitment methods are mostly appropriate, and well explained and justified. Relationships with participants and steps to minimise participant pressure to participate are mostly appropriate and well explained. All recruitment strategies are ethically appropriate. The plans to ensure and record informed consent are appropriate and well explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is incorporated.	The proposed participants, identification strategy and recruitment methods are somewhat appropriate, and satisfactorily explained and justified. Relationships with participants and steps to minimise participant pressure to participate are somewhat appropriate and reasonably explained. Recruitment strategies are ethically appropriate however further clarification and justification required. The plans to ensure and record informed consent are mostly appropriate and reasonably explained. Additional clarification required. Appropriate scholarly evidence is mostly incorporated.	The proposed participants, identification strategy and recruitment methods are incomplete and/or unethical and/or without explanation or justification. Relationships with participants and steps to minimise participant pressure to participate are missing, unethical and/or without appropriate explanation. The plans to ensure and record informed consent are missing, inappropriate or not explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is unsatisfactorily/not incorporated.	No project details for Part 4-5 present.
Ethics Application Part 6 & 7: Information protection / Dissemination of Results (15%)	The proposed strategy to ensure participant confidentiality and/or anonymity, data storage and security are appropriate, and expertly explained and justified. The plan for dissemination of results is appropriate and expertly explained and justified.	The proposed strategy to ensure participant confidentiality and/or anonymity, data storage and security are appropriate, and very well explained and justified. The plan for dissemination of results is appropriate and very well explained and justified.	The proposed strategy to ensure participant confidentiality and/or anonymity, data storage and security are mostly appropriate, and well explained and justified. The plan for dissemination of results is mostly appropriate and well explained and justified.	The proposed strategy to ensure participant confidentiality and/or anonymity, data storage and security are somewhat appropriate, and reasonably explained and justified. The plan for dissemination of results is somewhat appropriate and reasonably explained and justified. Additional clarification required.	The proposed strategy to ensure participant confidentiality and/or anonymity, data storage and security are missing, incomplete or inappropriate. The plan for dissemination of results is missing, inappropriate and/or poorly explained or justified.	No project details for Part 6 -7 present.
Appendices (20%)	All appendices are appropriate and included as required by the assessment instructions. Accurate APA 7th edition referencing. No reference list errors. Expertly written and professionally presented appendices, with appropriate headings, which are accurate and in complete alignment with the ethics application and each other.	All appendices are appropriate and included as required by the assessment instructions. Mostly accurate APA 7th edition referencing. 1-2 consistent in-text or reference list errors (may be made multiple times). Very well written and presented appendices, with appropriate headings, which are accurate and in complete alignment with the ethics application and each other. Few minor errors or inconsistencies.	All appendices are appropriate and included as required by the assessment instructions. Somewhat accurate APA 7th edition referencing. 3 consistent in-text or reference list errors (may be made multiple times). Well written and presented appendices, with appropriate headings, which are mostly accurate and in alignment with ethics application and each other. Some minor errors or inconsistencies.	All appendices are appropriate and included as required by the assessment instructions. Occasionally accurate APA 7th edition referencing. 4 consistent in-text or reference list errors (made multiple times). Appendices are satisfactorily written and presented, with mostly appropriate headings. A number of errors with accuracy and alignment with the ethics application and each other.	Some or all appendices and inappropriate and/or missing or incomplete. They do not meet the assessment instructions. APA referencing not used, or more than 5 consistent in-text or reference list errors. Appendices are poorly written and presented with missing or inappropriate headings. Significant errors with accuracy and alignment with the ethics application and each other.	Appendices not present.

Referencing Style

- [American Psychological Association 7th Edition (APA 7th edition)](#)

Submission

Online

Submission Instructions

Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in Microsoft Word format only. Submit the Ethics application form as one Word document, and each Appendix as a separate Word document. Ensure that the files are appropriately named

(i.e. NURS20173_S Smith_A1_Appendix A).

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Justify the use of ethical principles in research
- Formulate solutions for ethical dilemmas in health, safety and wellbeing research
- Execute a successful low risk ethics application.

Graduate Attributes

- Knowledge
- Communication
- Cognitive, technical and creative skills
- Research
- Self-management
- Ethical and Professional Responsibility
- Leadership

3 Assessment 3: Ethics Application Submission

Assessment Type
Report

Task Description
Type: Report
Length: 500–1000-word equivalent (amendments from Assessment 2)

Aim
The aim of this assessment is to finalise and submit a low-risk ethics application to the CQUniversity Human Research Ethics Committee for approval prior to undertaking the Quality Improvement project for NURS20174 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 2.
To successfully complete this application, you will need to review and revise your application from the marking feedback received for Assessment 2 and liaise with your Unit Coordinator. Ensure that you also refer to the resources provided on your Moodle site.

Instructions
You are finalising a low risk, coursework ethics application for the quality improvement project proposal submitted for Assessment 1.
Please follow the steps below to complete your assessment task:
1. Review the marking feedback received for Assessment 2 and undertake a draft revision of your ethics application and appendices as required.
2. Liaise with your Unit Coordinator for a final review and approval of your ethics application and appendices. Upload all final review documents onto your CQUniversity NURS20173/74 TEAMS site, including:
CQUniversity Ethics Application Form for students enrolled in undergraduate programs or non-research postgraduate programs
Appendix A. Reference list
Appendix B. Workplace manager approval letter (NURS0173 proforma)
Appendix C. Participant invitation email
Appendix D. Participant information sheet (CQUniversity proforma)
Appendix E. Survey or interview questions
Include the following additional appendices if appropriate to your recruitment and data collection method:
Appendix F. Recruitment flyer
Appendix G. Participant consent form (CQUniversity proforma)
3. Arrange your application documents into one PDF document, which combines the ethics application form and all appendices in the correct order. Ensure all Appendices have an appropriate heading as outlined above.
4. Once the application form declaration has been electronically signed by you and the Unit Coordinator email your full application to: ethics@cqu.edu.au. CC in your Unit Coordinator's email address: s.hunt@cqu.edu.au.
5. Upload the combined PDF submission document to the Assessment 3 submission portal as evidence for completing the assessment requirements.

Literature and references
In this assessment use at least ten contemporary references (<5 years) to support your discussion. You may also use seminal scholarly literature where relevant. Suitable references include peer-reviewed journal articles as well as textbooks and credible websites. When sourcing information, consider the 5 elements of a quality reference: currency, authority, relevance, objectivity, and coverage. Grey literature sourced from the internet must be from reputable websites such as government, university, or peak national bodies: for example, the Australian College of Nursing, or the World Health Organization.

Requirements
• Use the CQUniversity 'Ethics Application Form for students enrolled in undergraduate programs or non-research postgraduate programs' pre-set formatting.
• For Appendices B, D, F and G use the CQUniversity templates from the NURS20173 Moodle site.
• For all other appendices use a conventional and legible size 12 font, such as Times New Roman or Arial, with 1.5 line spacing and 2.54cm page margins (standard pre-set margin in Microsoft Word).
• Include page numbers on each page in a footer.
• Write in the third-person perspective.
• Use formal academic language.
• Use the seventh edition American Psychological Association (APA) referencing style. The CQUniversity Academic Learning Centre has an online [APA Referencing Style Guide](#).

Resources
• You can use unit provided materials and other credible sources (e.g. journal articles, books, grey literature) to reference your argument. The quality and credibility of your sources are important.
• We recommend that you access your discipline specific [library guide](#): the Nursing and Midwifery Guide; Social Work and Community Services Guide.
• We recommend you use EndNote to manage your citations and reference list. More information on how to use EndNote is available at the [CQUniversity Library website](#).
• For information on academic communication please go to the [Academic Learning Centre Moodle site](#). The Academic Communication section has many helpful resources including information for students with English as a second language.
• Submit a draft before the due date to review your Turnitin Similarity Score and report before making a final submission. [Instructions are available here](#).

Submission
Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in PDF format only.

References
National Health and Medical Research Council, Australian Research Council and Australian Vice Chancellors Committee. (2007, updated 2018). National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). Canberra: Australian Government. Available from:
https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/about-us/publications/national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research-2007-updated-2018
CQUniversity Human Ethics Research Committee. (2021). Guideline: Coursework Ethics Application Form. CQUniversity.

Assessment Due Date
Review/Exam Week Wednesday (8 June 2022) 5:00 pm AEST
Following Unit Coordinator approval, the Ethics application will be submitted to the CQUniversity Ethics Committee via email, and the application submitted on Moodle by the due date.

Return Date to Students

Feedback will be received from the CQUniversity Ethics Committee via email, which may require a response prior to approval.

Weighting
Pass/Fail

Assessment Criteria
A Non-Graded Pass will be awarded for full completion of this assessment and will be achieved once all feedback is successfully addressed as determined by the Unit Coordinator and the form submitted. There is no marking rubric provided for this assessment.
To achieve a passing grade for this unit you are required to pass this assessment item.

Referencing Style

- [American Psychological Association 7th Edition (APA 7th edition)](#)

Submission
Online

Submission Instructions
Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in PDF format only.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Justify the use of ethical principles in research
- Formulate solutions for ethical dilemmas in health, safety and wellbeing research
- Execute a successful low risk ethics application.

Graduate Attributes

- Knowledge
- Communication
- Cognitive, technical and creative skills
- Research
- Self-management
- Ethical and Professional Responsibility
- Leadership

Academic Integrity Statement

As a CQUniversity student you are expected to act honestly in all aspects of your academic work.

Any assessable work undertaken or submitted for review or assessment must be your own work. Assessable work is any type of work you do to meet the assessment requirements in the unit, including draft work submitted for review and feedback and final work to be assessed.

When you use the ideas, words or data of others in your assessment, you must thoroughly and clearly acknowledge the source of this information by using the correct referencing style for your unit. Using others' work without proper acknowledgement may be considered a form of intellectual dishonesty.

Participating honestly, respectfully, responsibly, and fairly in your university study ensures the CQUniversity qualification you earn will be valued as a true indication of your individual academic achievement and will continue to receive the respect and recognition it deserves.

As a student, you are responsible for reading and following CQUniversity's policies, including the **Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure**. This policy sets out CQUniversity's expectations of you to act with integrity, examples of academic integrity breaches to avoid, the processes used to address alleged breaches of academic integrity, and potential penalties.

What is a breach of academic integrity?
A breach of academic integrity includes but is not limited to plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collusion, cheating, contract cheating, and academic misconduct. The Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure defines what these terms mean and gives examples.

Why is academic integrity important?
A breach of academic integrity may result in one or more penalties, including suspension or even expulsion from the University. It can also have negative implications for student visas and future enrolment at CQUniversity or elsewhere. Students who engage in contract cheating also risk being blackmailed by contract cheating services.

Where can I get assistance?
For academic advice and guidance, the Academic Learning Centre (ALC) can support you in becoming confident in completing assessments with integrity and of high standard.

What can you do to act with integrity?

Be Honest
If your assessment task is done by someone else, it would be dishonest of you to claim it as your own

Seek Help
If you are not sure about how to cite or reference in essays, reports etc, then seek help from your lecturer, the library or the Academic Learning Centre (ALC)

Produce Original Work
Originality comes from your ability to read widely, think critically, and apply your gained knowledge to address a question or problem