



NURS20173 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 1

Term 1 - 2024

Profile information current as at 08/05/2024 01:35 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 paradigms, 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 specialty practice and your chosen research question and methodology developed in units NURS20167 and NURS20168. 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

Students must be enrolled in CL22 Master of Clinical Nursing to undertake this unit. Co-requisites: NURS20168. Pre-requisites: NURS20167.

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 - 2024

- 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%

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. Design a low-risk quality improvement research-based proposal and justify an appropriate research paradigm and method to answer your research question.
2. Develop and submit a low-risk ethics application that incorporates methodological rigour to promote credible research outcomes in answering your research question.

There are no learning outcomes linked to external accreditation for this unit.

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
1 - Research Proposal - 60%	•	•
2 - Report - 40%	•	•

Alignment of Graduate Attributes to Learning Outcomes

Graduate Attributes	Learning Outcomes	
	1	2
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		

Textbooks and Resources

Textbooks

NURS20173

Supplementary

A Guide to Responsible Research

Edition: 1st (2023)

Authors: Marusic, A.

Springer Nature

Cham , Switzerland

ISBN: 978-3-031-22412-6

Binding: eBook

NURS20173

Supplementary

Brown's evidence-based nursing: the research-practice connection

Edition: 5th (2024)

Authors: Nowak, E. W., & Colsch, R.

Jones & Bartlett Learning, LLC

Burlington , United States of America

Binding: eBook

NURS20173

Supplementary

Introduction to health research methods: a practical guide

Edition: 3rd (2021)

Authors: Jacobsen, K. H.

Jones & Bartlett Learning

Burlington , United States of America

Binding: eBook

Additional Textbook Information

These textbooks are available through the CQU library.

IT Resources

You will need access to the following IT resources:

- CQUniversity Student Email
- Internet
- Unit Website (Moodle)
- Academic Learning Centre services
- CQ U library search engines for research articles
- CQUniversity library literature search tools
- Microsoft Word
- Wordprocessing, spreadsheeting and powerpoint software
- Zoom account (Free)
- Zoom app on your smart phone or access to Zoom on your laptop
- Endnote bibliographic software. This is optional for formatting references.
- CQUniversity Library Nursing Resources
- CQUniversity Library Resources
- Zoom (both microphone and webcam capability)

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

Colleen Johnston-Devin Unit Coordinator

c.johnston-devin@cqu.edu.au

Leanne Jack Unit Coordinator

l.jack@cqu.edu.au

Schedule

Week 1 - 04 Mar 2024

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Introduction to unit and discussion of assessment items. Principles of ethics, quality improvement and research proposals.	Review the Moodle site and click on all the links. Find out what is in Student Support? Find out how to find the Library? Click on the link and learn what is the Academic Learning Centre? Readings and activities as outlined in module.	Recorded presentations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and Unit Introduction O Week. Assessments 1 and 2. Activity – Access the General Discussion page and introduce yourself to your colleagues by providing your: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Name Where you work Why you are studying MCN. Assessments 1 and 2 - Review the assessment tasks and make a study plan. Foundations of Academic Integrity Program - complete your annual program. Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details. Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates.

Week 2 - 11 Mar 2024

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Ethical principles, considerations, and research risk.	Readings and activities as outlined in module.	Zoom - Tutorial and Unit content and assessment question and answer. Assessment 1 - Start assessment 1 preparation. Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates. Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Week 3 - 18 Mar 2024

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Ethics documents and approval processes.	Readings and activities as outlined in module.	Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details. Assessment 1 - Continue progressing your assessment. Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates. Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Week 4 - 25 Mar 2024

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
--------------	---------	------------------------------

Research proposals, questions, aims, and objectives.

Readings and activities as outlined in module.

Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.

Assessment 1 - Continue progressing your assessment. You might wish to seek assessment preparation help from the Academic Learning Centre and/or Studiosity.

Announcement and Discussion

Boards - Check for posts and updates.

Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Week 5 - 01 Apr 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Background to the problem.

Readings and activities as outlined in module.

Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.

Assessment 1 - Continue preparing your assessment. You should have your initial draft completed by week 5. You might wish to seek assessment preparation help from the Academic Learning Centre and/or Studiosity.

Announcement and Discussion

Boards - Check for posts and updates.

Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Vacation Week - 08 Apr 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Vacation week.

Please use this mid-term break as an opportunity to rest and recover. Enjoy your break!

No timetabled learning activities. Please use this week to progress your assessments.

Week 6 - 15 Apr 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Research design.

Readings and activities as outlined in module.

Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.

Assessment 1 - Continue preparing your assessment. You should have your initial draft completed by week 5. You might wish to seek assessment preparation help from the Academic Learning Centre and/or Studiosity.

Assessment 2 - Review assessment task again and make a study plan to address this assessment.

Announcement and Discussion

Boards - Check for posts and updates.

Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Week 7 - 22 Apr 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Timelines and GANTT charts.	Readings and activities as outlined in module.	<p>Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle for details.</p> <p>Assessment 2 - Review assessment task again and make a study plan to address this assessment.</p> <p>Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates.</p> <p>Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.</p> <p>Research Proposal Due: Week 7 Wednesday (24 Apr 2024) 5:00 pm AEST</p>
-----------------------------	--	--

Week 8 - 29 Apr 2024

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Abstract, introduction, and limitations.	Readings and activities as outlined in module.	<p>Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.</p> <p>Assessment 2 - Start drafting your second assessment. You might wish to seek assessment preparation help from the Academic Learning Centre and/or Studiosity.</p> <p>Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates.</p> <p>Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.</p>

Week 9 - 06 May 2024

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Recruitment, consent, privacy, and information protection.	Readings and activities as outlined in module.	<p>Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.</p> <p>Assessment 2 - Continue progressing your second assessment. Continue preparing your assessment and check originality through Turnitin, make relevant changes to your assessment after reviewing your originality report. Access Studiosity for help with structure/flow/spelling/referencing for your assessment.</p> <p>Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates.</p> <p>Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.</p>

Week 10 - 13 May 2024

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic

Ethics submission to HREC.

Readings and activities as outlined in module.

Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.

Assessment 2 Part A - Finalise your assessment, check originality of assessment through Turnitin, make relevant changes to your assessment after reviewing your originality report, and submit your final Part A assessment.

Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates.
Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Ethics Application Due: Week 10
Wednesday (15 May 2024) 5:00 pm AEST

Week 11 - 20 May 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Project problem-solving.

Readings and activities as outlined in module.

Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.

Assessment 2 - Continue preparing your assessment and check originality through Turnitin, make relevant changes to your assessment after reviewing your originality report. Access Studiosity for help with structure/flow/spelling/referencing for your assessment.

Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates.
Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Week 12 - 27 May 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Finalising your research proposal.

Readings and activities as outlined in module.

Zoom - Drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.

Assessment 2 Part B - Check originality of assessment through Turnitin, make relevant changes to your assessment after reviewing your originality report, and submit your final assessment in Week 13.

Announcement and Discussion Boards - Check for posts and updates.
Student email - Check your student email at least twice per week for communication.

Review/Exam Week - 03 Jun 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Nil.

Nil.

Nil.

Exam Week - 10 Jun 2024

Module/Topic

Chapter

Events and Submissions/Topic

Nil.

Nil.

Nil.

Assessment Tasks

1 Research Proposal

Assessment Type

Research Proposal

Task Description

Aim

The aim of this assessment is for you 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 1-7). The resources offered during these weeks will support you to complete this assessment task.

Instructions

You are asked to 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.

Please use the following headings, guidelines, and suggested word allocations to structure and complete your proposal:

1. ABSTRACT (no more than 250 words)

Write a 250-word abstract which provides the reader with an outline that summarises the entire quality improvement project proposal. Include the following headings: Background and Context; Problem; Aim; Methodology and Method; Significance to Professional Practice.

2. INTRODUCTION (approximately 500 words)

The introduction should clearly inform the reader of what you are intending to investigate for your quality improvement project. The introduction should include:

- Background to your project.
- Context for your investigation.
- A clear statement of the overarching purpose of the quality improvement project including stating the problem to be investigated.
- A clear rationale or justification for why this is a quality issue or problem that needs to be investigated in your workplace?
- The importance or significance of what you are proposing to do, that is, relate this to quality improvement and professional practice.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW (approximately 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 should include the most current evidence about the topic and any gaps identified in earlier research 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. You may draw on the literature review you undertook in NURS20167; however, this will need to be reduced and focus on the key points for this assessment.

4. RESEARCH QUESTION, AIM and OBJECTIVES (approximately 250 words)

The quality improvement question, aim, and objectives need to align with your identified problem, background, context, and literature review. Articulate one overarching research question. The quality improvement question guides your project and allows you to address the identified quality issue. The question should be clear, focused, and clearly written as a question. The project must be feasible to complete in the 12-week time frame of NURS20174. You are encouraged to use the research question you developed in NURS20167 for this assessment. The overall quality improvement question generates the aim and objectives. The aim should state the purpose or the intent of the project, that is, 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 (approximately 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, that is, why are they the most appropriate to address the quality improvement question? The research design you use can be drawn from your assessments in NURS20168.

6. PROJECT TIMELINES (approximately 50 words)

List the key actions that must occur to conduct your quality improvement project and how long each action will take. The project must be conducted and reported on within 12 weeks (1 term). Please use the provided Gantt chart.

7. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS (approximately 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 (2023), 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 (approximately 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 outcomes. 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 (approximately 400 words)

Summarise the key points made and include a concluding statement of the main ideas identified 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 with your 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.

Marking Criteria

Refer to the marking rubric on the Moodle site for more detail on how marks will be assigned. Assessment re-attempt is not available for Assessment One.

Assessment Due Date

Week 7 Wednesday (24 Apr 2024) 5:00 pm AEST

Submit your assessment in Microsoft Word format only.

Return Date to Students

Week 10 Wednesday (15 May 2024)

Students will be advised of release of assessment marking via an announcement posted to the Announcement's Board on the Unit Moodle site. Please note, the 'Return to Students Information' is an approximate date.

Weighting

60%

Assessment Criteria

ASSESSMENT 1 - Quality Improvement Research Proposal

Student Name:

Key Criteria	High Distinction 100-85%	Distinction 84.9-75%	Credit 74.9-65%	Pass 64.9-50%	Fail <49.9%	TOTAL
Abstract (5%)	(5-4.25) Concise and comprehensive summary of proposal which is exceptionally structured and written using the student's own words.	(4.2-3.8) Concise summary of proposal which is very well structured and written using the student's own words. Some very minor points missing or incomplete.	(3.75-3.55) Mostly concise summary of proposal which is well structured and written using the student's own words. Some minor points missing or incomplete.	(3.50-2.5) A satisfactory summary of proposal; however, is not concise and/or not comprehensive. The structure and writing are satisfactory but somewhat confusing and is written in the student's own words. Some points are missing or incomplete.	(2.45-0) The abstract does not satisfactorily summarise the proposal. The content is verbose and/or difficult to comprehend. The structure and writing are unsatisfactory and/or are not written in the student's own words. Numerous points are missing or incomplete.	

Introduction (10%)	(10-8.5) 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 in the student's own words.	(8.4-7.5) The introduction clearly, convincingly, and succinctly provides the background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and the importance of the study in the student's own words.	(7.4-6.5) The introduction is mostly clear, convincing, and succinct and provides the background, context, and overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and the importance of the study and is written in the student's own words.	(6.4-5) The introduction provides the background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and the importance of the study; however, it lacks clarity. It is written in the student's own words.	(4.9-0) The introduction is not complete and/or is not written in the student's own words. It does not include one of the following: background, context, an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification; the importance of the study.	
Project Question, Aim and Objectives (10%)	(10-8.5) Project 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.	(8.4-7.5) Project question is clearly focused and relevant and indicates the type of data required. Aim and objectives are clearly stated and align with research question/topic.	(7.4-6.5) Project question is mostly focused and relevant and indicates the type of data required. Aim and objectives are stated and in the most part align with research question/topic.	(6.4-5) Project question lacks some 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.	(4.9-0) Project question is not focused and/or relevant and does not indicate the type of data required. Aim and objectives are unclear, inappropriate and do not align with research question/topic.	
Literature Review (10%)	(10-8.5) The literature review 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.	(8.4-7.5) The literature review concisely supports the project by pointing to a solution to the problem identified and/or a gap in the literature in relation to the problem.	(7.4-6.5) The literature review is mostly concise 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.	(6.4-5) The literature supports the project by pointing to a solution to the problem identified. There are some gaps in this review.	(4.9-0) The literature review does not clearly support the project as it does not point to a solution to the problem identified and/or a gap in the literature in relation to the problem.	
Research Design (15%)	(15-12.75) 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.	(12.74-11.25) 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.	(11.24-9.75) 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.	(9.74-7.5) 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.	(7.4-0) 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.	
Timelines (5%)	(5-4.25) Timelines provided include a comprehensive list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines proposed are realistic and achievable.	(4.2-3.8) Timelines provided include a complete list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines proposed are realistic.	(3.75-3.55) Timelines provided include a mostly complete list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines proposed are realistic.	(3.50-2.5) Timelines provided include an adequate list of the actions required to complete the project. The timelines proposed are realistic.	(2.45-0) Timelines provided do not include the actions required to complete the project. The timelines proposed are not realistic.	
Ethical Considerations (25%)	(25-21.25) Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained very clearly in the student's own words. Discussion very clearly outlines and discusses how these ethical considerations will be managed.	(21.24-18.75) Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained clearly in the student's own words. Discussion clearly outlines and discusses how these ethical considerations will be managed.	(18.74-16.25) Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained somewhat clearly in the student's own words. Discussion outlines and discusses how these ethical considerations will be managed in most cases.	(16.2-12.5) Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are identified and explained in the student's own words. There is some lack of clarity. Discussion outlines how these ethical considerations will be managed but does not discuss all aspects entirely.	(12.4-0) Ethical considerations specific to chosen method are not identified and explained or the explanation is confusing and/or is not written using the student's own words.	

Limitations (5%)	(5-4.3) Limitations are explained with a very convincing argument as to why they do not negate the proposed project.	(4.2-3.8) Limitations are explained with a largely convincing argument as to why they do not negate the proposed project.	(3.75-3.55) Limitations are explained with a somewhat convincing argument as to why they do not negate the proposed project.	(3.50-2.5) Limitations are explained and it is argued why they do not negate the proposed project. Argument is not always logical.	(2.45-0) Limitations are not explained and/or it is not argued why they do not negate the proposed project.	
Conclusion (5%)	(5-4.25) Conclusions are insightful, very well supported and flow logically from work presented.	(4.2-3.8) Conclusions are sound, well supported and flow logically from work presented.	(3.75-3.55) Conclusions are logical, mostly supported, and linked to the work presented.	(3.50-2.5) Conclusions are satisfactory. They are somewhat supported with limited links to the work presented.	(2.45-0) Conclusions are unsatisfactory. They are not supported or have weak links to the work presented.	
Ability to write and present effectively and complete required task (5%)	(5-4.25) 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. Content is students own work. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	(4.2-3.8) 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. Content is students own work. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	(3.75-3.55) 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. Content is students own work. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	(3.50-2.5) 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. Content is students own work. Workplace approval letter is included as an appendix if appropriate.	(2.45-0) 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. Content is not students own work. Workplace approval letter is required but not included.	
Reference quality and referencing accurately (5%)	(5-4.25) 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.	(4.2-3.8) 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).	(3.75-3.55) 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).	(3.5-2.5) 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).	(2.45-0) Less than 15 references have been cited, and many not be contemporary or appropriate in focus and quality. APA 7 th edn referencing not used, or more than 4 consistent in-text or reference list errors.	
TOTAL						
Markers Comments:						

Referencing Style

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

Submission

Online

Submission Instructions

Submit your assessment via the Assessment 1 submission portal on the unit Moodle site.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Design a low-risk quality improvement research-based proposal and justify an appropriate research paradigm and method to answer your research question.
- Develop and submit a low-risk ethics application that incorporates methodological rigour to promote credible research outcomes in answering your research question.

2 Ethics Application

Assessment Type

Report

Task Description

Aim

Part A – Ethics application report: The aim of Part A of this assessment is to develop a CQUniversity lower risk ethics application for your Quality Improvement project that you will undertake in NURS20174 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 2.

Part B – Ethics application submission: The aim of Part B 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.

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.

To successfully undertake this application, you will need to refer to the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2023), and the documents on Moodle including the 2024 Coursework Ethics Application Form and Coursework Application Guidelines and engage with the weekly unit material on the NURS20173 Moodle site. The resources offered will support you to complete this assessment task.

Instructions

Part A – Ethics application report

Complete the 2024 Coursework Ethics Application for the Quality Improvement research project designed in Assessment 1. This ethics application will include appendices as appropriate for the submission – please see details below.

Please follow the steps below to complete Part A of your assessment task:

1. Download the 2024 Coursework Ethics Application from the NURS20173 Moodle site. Please note that some generic details have been pre-filled for you.
2. Follow the Coursework Application 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 as necessary.
4. Using the Proformas available on the NURS20173 Moodle site, attach the following Appendices to your Application form, ensuring that each has a heading which includes the Appendix indicator, and title:
 - Appendix A. Reference List.
 - Appendix B. Workplace manager approval letter (Do not send this to your manager at this stage).
 - Appendix C. Participant invitation email.
 - Appendix D. Participant Information sheet.
 - 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.
- Appendix G. Participant consent form.

Part B – Ethics application submission

Finalise your low risk, coursework ethics application for the quality improvement project proposal submitted for Assessment 2 Part A – Ethics application report.

Please follow the steps below to complete Part B of your assessment task:

1. Review the marking feedback received for Assessment 2 Part A and undertake a draft revision of your ethics application and Appendices as required.

Liaise with your Unit Coordinator for a final review and approval to submit your documents.

- a. Coursework Ethics Application Form.
 - b. Appendix A. Reference list.
 - c. Appendix B. Workplace manager approval letter.
 - d. Appendix C. Participant invitation email.
 - e. Appendix D. Participant information sheet.
 - f. Appendix E. Survey or interview questions.
 - g. Appendix F. Recruitment flyer (if appropriate).
 - h. Appendix G. Participant consent form (if appropriate).
2. Arrange your application documents into one PDF document, which combines the ethics application form and all appendices in the correct order.
 3. 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 at: NURS20173@cqu.edu.au.

Upload the combined PDF submission document to the Assessment 2 Part B submission portal in Moodle as evidence of completing Part B assessment requirements.

Marking Criteria

Refer to the marking rubric on the Moodle site for more detail on how marks will be assigned. Assessment re-attempt is

not available for Assessment Two.

Assessment Due Date

Week 10 Wednesday (15 May 2024) 5:00 pm AEST

Submit Part A of your assessment in Microsoft Word format only. Submit Part B as per the assessment task sheet.

Return Date to Students

Exam Week Wednesday (12 June 2024)

Students will be advised of release of assessment marking via an announcement posted to the Announcement's Board on the Unit Moodle site. Please note, the 'Return to Students Information' is an approximate date.

Weighting

40%

Assessment Criteria

ASSESSMENT 2 - Ethics Application

Student Name:

Key Criteria	High Distinction 100-85%	Distinction 84.9-75%	Credit 74.9-65%	Pass 64.9-50%	Fail <49.9%	TOTAL
Ability to write and effectively and complete required task (5%)	(3-4.25) Exemplary effort. Professional approach with no gaps in the ethics application and appendices. All sections of the form are expertly completed. Attention to detail is without fault and all requirements of the task have been met. Content is students own work. References to appendices are accurate throughout the document. Exemplary writing standard. No errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, and referencing throughout document.	(4.2-3.8) Excellent effort attending to the requirements of the tasks. All items demonstrate due attention to detail with some very minor gaps in the ethics application and appendices. Content is students own work. References to appendices are accurate throughout the document. Quality of writing is of a high standard with only 1 error in grammar, spelling, punctuation and referencing mistakes.	(3.75-3.55) Good effort attending to the requirements of the task. All items demonstrate due attention to detail with some minor gaps in the ethics application and appendices which impact on presentation and the readers' understanding. All sections of the form are completed quite well. Content is students own work. References to appendices are mostly accurate throughout the document. Quality of writing is above standard with two grammatical, spelling, punctuation, and referencing errors.	(3.50-2.5) Satisfactory effort attending to requirements of the task. Most items demonstrate due attention to detail with several gaps in the ethics application and appendices that impact on presentation readers' understanding. Inconsistencies in reference to appendices throughout the document. Content is students own work. Quality of writing is of a satisfactory standard with three grammatical, spelling, punctuation, and referencing errors.	(2.45-0) Submission is missing numerous aspects of the task or task requirements have been misunderstood. Multiple gaps in the ethics application and appendices. References to appendices are missing or very inaccurate throughout the document. Content is not students own work. Quality of writing has ≥ 4 grammatical, and punctuation, with numerous spelling and referencing errors.	
Ethics Application Part 2.1-2.5: Project Details (15%)	(15-12.75) Concise and comprehensive layperson description of project. Background and context are clear, succinct, and expertly explained. The quality improvement project question, aim and objectives are appropriately 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.	(12.74-11.25) Comprehensive layperson description of project. Some very minor points are missing. Background and context are clear and succinctly explained. The quality improvement 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.	(11.24-9.75) Mostly comprehensive summary of layperson description of project. Some minor points are missing or incomplete. Background and context are clear and succinctly explained. The quality improvement 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.	(9.74-7.5) 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 quality improvement 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.	(7.4-0) Unsatisfactory or incomplete layperson description of project. Missing significant points. Background and context are not satisfactorily explained. The quality improvement 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.	
Ethics Application Part 2.6-2.7: Project Details (15%)	(15-12.75) The appropriateness of the methodology and methods to the project question are expertly explained and justified. It is feasible and realistic. The link between methodology and methods is clearly and succinctly 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.	(12.74-11.25) The appropriateness of the methodology and methods to the project question is 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.	(11.24-9.75) The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the project 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.	(9.74-7.5) The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the project question is explained and justification is attempted. 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 further explanation and/or justification. Ethical considerations are mostly appropriate. There is a lack of clarity at times.	(7.4-0) The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the project question is not explained and/or justified and/or is unclear. The link between methodology and methods questions is not explained or is unclear and/or ethical considerations are not explained and/or are 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.	

Ethics Application Part 2.8-2.9: Risk (15%)	(15-12.75) The risks to participants/others and the project team are appropriately identified and expertly discussed. Mechanisms to minimise the risks are appropriate and comprehensively explained. The potential benefits and the location of the project are expertly articulated and explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is expertly incorporated.	(12.74-11.25) The risks to participants/others and the project team are appropriately identified and very well discussed. Mechanisms to minimise the risks are appropriate and well explained. The potential benefits and the location of the project are very well articulated and explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is clearly incorporated.	(11.24-9.75) The risks to participants/others and the project team are mostly appropriately identified and discussed. Mechanisms to minimise the risks are appropriate and explained. The potential benefits and the location of the project are articulated and explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is incorporated.	(9.74-7.5) The risks to participants/others and the project team are mostly identified and discussed, however there is lack of clarity at times. 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.	(7.4-0) 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.	
Ethics Application Part 4 & 5: Recruitment of Participants / Consent (15%)	(15-12.75) The proposed participants, identification strategy and recruitment methods are highly appropriate, and comprehensively and concisely explained and justified. Relationships with participants and steps to minimise participant pressure to participate are highly appropriate and comprehensively and concisely explained. All recruitment strategies are ethically appropriate. The plans to ensure and record informed consent are appropriate and comprehensively and concisely explained. Appropriate scholarly evidence is expertly incorporated.	(12.74-11.25) 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.	(11.24-9.75) 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.	(9.74-7.5) 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.	(7.4-0) 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.	
Ethics Application Part 6 & 7: Information protection / Dissemination of Results (15%)	(15-12.75) 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.	(12.74-11.25) 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.	(11.24-9.75) 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.	(9.74-7.5) 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.	7.4-0) 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.	
Appendices (20%)	(20-17) 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.	(16.9-15) 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.	(14.9-13) 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.	(12.9-10) 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.	(9.9-0) Some or all appendices are inappropriate and/or missing or incomplete. They do not meet the assessment instructions. APA 7 th edition 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.	
TOTAL:				Marker:		
Marker's feedback:						

Referencing Style

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

Submission

Online

Submission Instructions

Submit your assessment via the Assessment 2 submission portal on the unit Moodle site and as per the instructions on the assessment task sheet.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Design a low-risk quality improvement research-based proposal and justify an appropriate research paradigm and method to answer your research question.
- Develop and submit a low-risk ethics application that incorporates methodological rigour to promote credible research outcomes in answering your research question.

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