



NURS20174 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 2

Term 2 - 2021

Profile information current as at 26/05/2022 09:25 pm

All details in this unit profile for NURS20174 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.

Corrections

Unit Profile Correction added on 27-09-21

Incorrect total percentages in the marking rubric for Assessment 1 has been identified. The correct rubric for this Assessment can be found on the Moodle page under the Assessments tile. Please get in touch with your unit coordinator if you require more information.

General Information

Overview

This unit will provide you with the opportunity to undertake a quality improvement research project in your professional practice related to health, safety or wellbeing. As you undertake your quality improvement research project, you will be mentored in the processes of data collection and analysis, reporting your findings and formulating recommendations to enhance practice. You will be encouraged and supported to disseminate your research findings to your peers and others via presentations and by publication.

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

Prerequisite: NURS20173 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 1 Corequisites: NURS20167 Literature Review in Health, Safety and Wellbeing and NURS20168 Designing Research in Nursing, Midwifery and Social Science

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 2 - 2021

- 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. **Project (research)**

Weighting: 70%

2. **Presentation**

Weighting: 30%

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](#).

Previous Student Feedback

Feedback, Recommendations and Responses

Every unit is reviewed for enhancement each year. At the most recent review, the following staff and student feedback items were identified and recommendations were made.

Feedback from Student email

Feedback

I have been encouraged to learn so much about research here. Your lectures were thorough and easy to understand. Your passion for education is what motivated me throughout the course. I have learnt so much from you and my nursing skills and research have improved immensely thanks to you [the Lecturer].

Recommendation

Continue to provide lectures but on a more regular schedule to support students.

Feedback from Student email

Feedback

Thank you so much for all your guidance and support in our research unit. I have found it quite challenging at times but you were easy to contact [Lecturer] and get support from especially with the data analysis.

Recommendation

Continue to provide lectures but on a more regular schedule to support students.

Unit Learning Outcomes

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

1. Conduct an ethically approved research project
2. Collect and analyse research project data
3. Disseminate research findings and recommendations to a broader audience.

NA

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)
- Statistical software relevant to the students' study area such as R, SPSS, or NVIVO, or equivalent online statistical application.
- 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

Adele Baldwin Unit Coordinator

a.baldwin@cqu.edu.au

Julie Shaw Unit Coordinator

j.m.shaw@cqu.edu.au

Schedule

Week 1 - 12 Jul 2021

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Introduction and orientation to the unit Planning your quality improvement project: a step-by-step approach using a timeline. Data collection methods Refining (and recapping) data collection tools and techniques: quantitative and qualitative methods.		Consult with mentor to refine the approach and processes.

Week 2 - 19 Jul 2021

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Data collection Data collection and management.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop in session, see Moodle site for details. Consult with mentor for any data collection troubleshooting.

Week 3 - 26 Jul 2021

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Data analysis methods Quantitative data analysis workshop 1. Qualitative data analysis workshop 1.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop-in session: Mentor Consult with mentor for any data collection troubleshooting.

Week 4 - 02 Aug 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Data analysis methods Quantitative data analysis workshop 2. Qualitative data analysis workshop 2.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Consult with mentor for any data analysis troubleshooting.
Week 5 - 09 Aug 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Data analysis methods Quantitative data analysis workshop 3. Qualitative data analysis workshop 3.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.
Vacation Week - 16 Aug 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Vacation week		
Week 6 - 23 Aug 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Report writing Framing and writing your quality improvement project report.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop-in session: Mentor.
Week 7 - 30 Aug 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Report writing Presenting your findings.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop-in session, see Moodle site for details. Consult with your mentor to refine results.
Week 8 - 06 Sep 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Report writing Discussing your findings and consulting the literature. Writing recommendations for quality improvement.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Consult with mentor to refine results.
Week 9 - 13 Sep 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Dissemination Disseminating your findings and recommendations - a plan for action.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop-in session: Mentor. Assessment 1: Project (Research) - Quality Improvement Project Report Due: Week 9 Wednesday (15 Sept 2021) 5:00 pm AEST
Week 10 - 20 Sep 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Dissemination Effectively presenting your quality improvement project findings. Poster design.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop-in session: Mentor.
Week 11 - 27 Sep 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Dissemination Publishing your quality improvement project findings.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Zoom drop-in session, see Moodle site for details.
Week 12 - 04 Oct 2021		

Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Reporting Quality Improvement reporting and data storage processes.	Selected eReadings on Moodle.	Assessment 2: Poster Presentation Due: Week 12 Wednesday (6 Oct 2021) 5:00 pm AEST
Review/Exam Week - 11 Oct 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic
Exam Week - 18 Oct 2021		
Module/Topic	Chapter	Events and Submissions/Topic

Assessment Tasks

1 Assessment 1: Project (Research) - Quality Improvement Project Report

Assessment Type

Project (research)

Task Description

Length: 4000 - 4500 words plus or minus 10% (excluding reference list, tables, figures & appendices)

Unit Coordinator: Dr Susan Hunt

Aim

This assessment aims to develop your skills in conducting a quality improvement project, analysing the data collected and reporting your findings and recommendations for dissemination.

Following CQUniversity ethics approval, you will conduct the project developed and approved for NURS20173 Nursing, Midwifery and Social Sciences Project 1.

To successfully undertake this assessment, you will need to engage with the weekly unit material on the NURS20174 Moodle site (Weeks 1 - 8). The resources offered during these weeks will support you to complete this assessment task.

Instructions

You are writing a report of your quality improvement project investigating a quality issue in your workplace or practice. Develop this report from the relevant sections of your proposal undertaken in NURS20173 and your project work completed in this unit.

Please follow the steps and word allocation guide below to complete your assessment task and use the following headings to structure your report.

1. ABSTRACT (~250 words)

Summarise your project in no more than 250 words using the following subheadings: Problem, Background and Context, Research Design, Findings, and Implications for quality improvement. Also include five keywords that can be used to index your report so other researchers would be able to search for it using these terms. The abstract is the last section you write.

2. INTRODUCTION (~400 words)

The introduction should outline the purpose of your report. Include your quality improvement research problem and aim of the study. Include an overview of the study's background and context, and literature already available on the topic to contextualise your research in the field to justify why it is important and/or significant to the profession and quality improvement. Provide some brief details of your methodology and methods. Include a brief outline of the structure of the report.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW (~400 words)

Discuss the relevant existing literature in the area you are researching. 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 your project will contribute to the existing professional body of knowledge in the focus area.

4. RESEARCH QUESTION, AIM and OBJECTIVES (~200-250 words)

Articulate one overarching quality improvement research project question. Phrase this as a question (i.e., What, how, why?). Outline your project aim and objectives. The objectives must be specific, clearly defined and measurable. Ensure that the research question, aim and objectives align with each other, and relate to quality improvement.

5. RESEARCH DESIGN and DATA COLLECTION (~600 words)

Describe the research methodology and methods used for data collection and analysis used in your quality improvement project using contemporary scholarly evidence. Describe your recruitment, data collection and data analysis processes. This section must be written comprehensively so another researcher could duplicate your project. Reference any material you have used from other sources.

Ensure a statement of ethical approval is included.

6. RESULTS / FINDINGS (~750-1000 words)

Report on your project, but do not discuss the results compared to the literature at this stage. Provide a participant summary, including the number of participants and any demographic data collected. Present the findings from your data analysis in a clear, logical and succinct manner. Label and number any diagrams, charts, and graphs. Attribute participant quotes from the data appropriately. Use participant numbers (e.g., Participant 1) or pseudonyms. Tables and figures (if used) should present relevant data which adds substance but does not duplicate what you have written.

7. DISCUSSION (~750 words)

Discuss the relevance and implications of your results. Describe how your findings fit with other contemporary research in the area. Relate the discussion to your literature review, research question and aims and objectives.

8. LIMITATIONS (~200 words)

Describe the limitations of your study and any strategies you used to try to manage these. Limitations are the influences that the researcher cannot control. They are the shortcomings, conditions or influences that may place restrictions on the methodology and results.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS (250 words)

List in bullet point form recommendations for practice change. Recommendations must directly result from your interpretation and discussion of the findings. List the recommendations in order of priority. Write these recommendations for an audience of peers from your discipline.

10. CONCLUSION (~300 words)

Write a summary of your findings and their implications and a brief outline of your plan for dissemination of the findings and recommendations.

Literature and references

In this assessment use at least 15 contemporary references (<7 years) in writing your literature review and discussion related to your findings. 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 using past tense.
- 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, tables and appendices 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.

Submission

Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in Microsoft Word format only. Please note, the Similarity Report is expected to be high due to the use of similar information from NURS20173.

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 9 Wednesday (15 Sept 2021) 5:00 pm AEST

Return Date to Students

Week 11 Wednesday (29 Sept 2021)

Weighting

70%

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%
<i>Abstract (5%)</i>	Concise and comprehensive summary of proposal which is exceptionally structured and written. MeSH headings are used to create keywords.	Concise and comprehensive summary of proposal which is very well structured and written. Some very minor points missing, incomplete and/or are minimally misaligned. MeSH headings are used to create keywords.	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.
<i>Introduction (10%)</i>	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 does not provide the background and/or context, and/or an overarching research statement, rationale and/or justification and/or the importance of the study.	No introduction present.
<i>Literature Review (10%)</i>	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.
<i>Research Question, Aim and Objectives (5%)</i>	Quality improvement research 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.	Quality improvement research project 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.	Quality improvement research project question is somewhat clearly focused and relevant and indicate the type of data required. Aim and objectives are stated and in the most part align with research question/topic.	Quality improvement research project question is not entirely clear in relation to its focus and/or relevance and does not clearly indicate the type of data required. Aims and objectives are ambiguous and do not clearly align with research question/topic.	Quality improvement research project question is unclear in relation to its focus 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 and objectives present.
<i>Project design and data collection (10%)</i>	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question/s is very clearly explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is explicit. Recruitment, data collection and analysis processes were appropriate and expertly explained. The detail provided would easily enable project replication.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question/s is clearly explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is largely evident. Recruitment, data collection and analysis processes were appropriate and very well explained. The detail provided would enable close project replication.	The appropriateness of the research methodology and research methods to the research question/s is somewhat clearly explained and justified. The link between methodology and methods is somewhat evident, however feasibility needs to be considered more carefully. Recruitment, data collection and analysis processes were appropriate and well explained. Replication would require some further information.	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. Recruitment, data collection and analysis processes were mostly appropriate and satisfactorily explained. Replication would require some considerable further information.	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 and management are not explained and or very unclear. Recruitment, data collection and analysis processes are inappropriate and/or poorly explained. Replication would not be possible form the details provided.	No research design present.
<i>Results (20%)</i>	Data and findings are expertly presented. Evidence of thorough, accurate and rigorous analysis of data. Data is coherently, logically, clearly and succinctly presented.	Data, information or Accurate and rigorous analysis of data. Findings are clear. Data is coherently, logically, clearly and succinctly presented.	Data, information or findings are good. Data is coherently, logically, clearly and succinctly presented. Adequate, accurate and rigorous analysis of data.	Data, information or findings are adequate. Data is clearly presented. Adequate, accurate analysis of data.	Data, information or findings are missing. Data is incoherent, illogical, uncleary presented. No evidence of analysis of data.	Results are not present.

<i>Discussion (20%)</i>	Excellent interpretation of the significance of the results. Excellent discussion of the findings and results in relation to the identified problem and of past research literature. Discussion comprehensively and succinctly compares past research with findings. Excellent discussion of how the results may be applied to professional practice, quality improvement and policy.	Very good interpretation of the significance of the results. Very good discussion of the findings and results in relation to the identified problem and of past research literature. Discussion comprehensively compares past research with findings. Very good discussion of how the results may be applied to professional practice, quality improvement and policy.	Good interpretation of the significance of the results. Good discussion of the findings and results in relation to the identified problem and of past research literature. Discussion effectively compares past research with findings. Good discussion of how the results may be applied to professional practice, quality improvement and policy.	Satisfactory interpretation of the significance of the results. Satisfactory discussion of the findings and results in relation to the identified problem and of past research literature. Discussion satisfactorily compares past research with findings. Satisfactory discussion of how the results may be applied to professional practice, quality improvement and policy.	Unsatisfactory interpretation of the significance of the results. Poor or limited discussion of the findings and results in relation to the identified problem and of past research literature. Discussion does not satisfactorily compare past research with findings. Unsatisfactory discussion of how the results may be applied to professional practice, quality improvement and policy. Discussion is illogical and/or inappropriate.	No discussion present.
<i>Limitations (5%)</i>	Limitations are expertly explained - how they were managed and why they do not negate the project.	Limitations are comprehensively explained - how they were managed and why they do not negate the project.	Limitations are convincingly explained - how they were managed and why they do not negate the project.	Limitations are explained - how they were managed and why they do not negate the project.	Limitations are not explained	No limitations present.
<i>Recommendations (5%)</i>	All recommendations are significant, strongly justified, workable and related to project findings, aim and objectives.	Most recommendations are significant, well justified, workable and related to project findings, aim and objectives	Recommendations are relevant, well justified, workable and related to project findings, aim and objectives	Recommendations are relevant but not always well justified. Some are unworkable or do not relate to project findings, aim and objectives.	Recommendations are vague, unjustified, unworkable, or do not relate to project findings, aims or objectives.	No recommendations present.
<i>Conclusion (5%)</i>	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 weak, not supported or not linked to the work presented.	No conclusion present.
<i>Ability to write and present effectively and complete required task (5%)</i>	Exemplary writing standard and report presentation. Attention to detail is without fault and all requirements of task have been met. Correct grammar, spelling and punctuation.	Very high standard of writing and report presentation. Attention to detail very good and all requirements of task have been met. Minor grammar, spelling, punctuation and referencing mistakes evident.	High standard of writing and report presentation. Attention to detail good and majority of requirements of task have been met. Some grammar, spelling, punctuation and referencing mistakes evident.	Satisfactory standard of writing and report presentation. Most requirements of task have been met. More than 5 grammar, spelling, punctuation and referencing mistakes evident.	Submission is missing aspects of task or task requirements have been misunderstood. Quality of writing and presentation is at a poor standard - many grammatical, punctuation, spelling and referencing mistakes evident.	Submission is missing most aspects of task. Little evidence of task requirements. Little to no meaningful writing.
<i>Reference quality and accuracy (5%)</i>	A minimum of 20 contemporary* and high-quality references articles have been cited. Accurate APA 7 th edition referencing. No in-text referencing or reference list errors.	A minimum of 18 mostly contemporary and high-quality references articles have been cited. Mostly accurate APA 7 th edition referencing. 1-2 consistent in-text or reference list errors (may be made multiple times).	A minimum of 17 mostly contemporary and high-quality references articles have been cited. Somewhat accurate APA 7 th edition referencing. 3 consistent in-text or reference list errors (may be made multiple times).	A minimum of 15 mostly contemporary and high-quality references articles have been cited. Occasional accurate APA 7 th edition 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 or quality. APA referencing not used, or more than 5 consistent in-text or reference list errors.	In-text referencing and reference list is absent.

NOTE: * Contemporary = 7 years since publication, unless a seminal reference.

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. Please note, the Similarity Report is expected to be high due to the use of similar information from NURS20173.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Conduct an ethically approved research project
- Collect and analyse research project data
- Disseminate research findings and recommendations to a broader audience.

Graduate Attributes

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

2 Assessment 2: Poster Presentation

Assessment Type

Presentation

Task Description

Due date: Submission of digital poster on Moodle: 5.00pm AEST Wednesday 6 October 2021 (Week 12)

Presentation: 9.00-11.00am AEST Thursday 7 October 2021 (Week 12) OR as negotiated with Unit Coordinator

Length: Poster and 5 minute presentation - equivalent to 800 words

Unit Coordinator: Dr Susan Hunt

Aim

The assessment aim is to develop your skills in designing and presenting a poster to disseminate your quality improvement project findings and recommendations.

To successfully undertake this assessment, you will need to engage with the weekly unit material on the NURS20174 Moodle site (Weeks 9-12). The resources offered during these weeks will support you to complete this assessment task.

Instructions

You will prepare a poster that provides a summary of your quality improvement project. You will present the information from this poster to your student peers in a 5-minute online presentation, followed by a further 5-minutes for questions. The poster and presentation will be compiled from the relevant sections of Assessment 1 and the marking feedback you received.

Please follow the steps below to complete your assessment task.

1. POSTER

Using a Microsoft PowerPoint or Publisher template, design a poster that summarises the key elements of your quality improvement project. The poster should include the following information and related concise summary information: Title, Background (context), Aim and Objectives, Research Design, Results and Recommendations. You can include tables to present quantitative data analysis and graphics to present themes from qualitative data analysis. A PDF digital copy of your poster must be submitted on Moodle by the due date above and must be the version used in your presentation.

2. PRESENTATION

Referring to the information provided on your poster, you will present a verbal summary of your quality improvement research project to your student peers. The presentation will be no longer than 5 minutes in length, with an additional 5 minute question time from your lecturer and peers. You must refer to each section of the poster, however you will need to summarise the content further and focus your time on presenting your findings, discussions and implications for professional practice and quality improvement. Do not just read straight from the poster, instead use it to guide your presentation. You may refer to the information on your poster or provide additional information in response to questions posed by your lecturer or peers.

Literature and references

In this assessment use at least three contemporary references (<7 years) in writing your background. 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 one of the Microsoft PowerPoint slide templates available on the NURS20174 Moodle site for designing your poster. Use a conventional and legible size font for headings, subheadings and text. If you include tables or graphics to present data, you must label them appropriately. If you use a background or embedded photo or picture in your poster, this must be published with a Creative Commons (CC) licence and the source attributed as per the requirements of their CC licence. Do NOT use animations or clipart.
- Write in the third-person perspective, however you may use the first-person perspective for the verbal components of your presentation.
- Use formal academic language.
- You must include in-text citations, and a reference list, however both can be included in small font to reduce visual impact.
- 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.

Submission

Submit your assessment via the unit Moodle site in PDF format only. The poster submitted and presented must be identical.

Assessment Due Date

Week 12 Wednesday (6 Oct 2021) 5:00 pm AEST

Submission of digital poster on Moodle: 5.00pm AEST Wednesday (Week 12). Presentation: 0900-1100 Thursday (Week 12) OR as negotiated with Unit Coordinator.

Return Date to Students

Exam Week Wednesday (20 Oct 2021)

Weighting

30%

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%
POSTER 50%						
<i>Presentation- (15%)</i>	The poster aesthetics thoroughly engaged the audience. The poster structure professionally and expertly presented the QI project with excellent grammar, punctuation, and spelling.	The poster aesthetics very effectively engaged the audience. The poster structure very effectively presented the QI project with a very high standard of grammar, punctuation, and spelling.	The poster aesthetics effectively engaged the audience. The poster structure effectively presented the QI project with a high standard of grammar, punctuation, and spelling.	The poster aesthetics mostly engaged the audience. The poster structure satisfactorily presented the QI project with mostly correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling.	The poster aesthetics did not engage the audience. The poster structure was unsatisfactory and there were more than five grammatical, punctuation, and spelling errors.	A poster is not presented.
<i>Content (30%)</i>	The project steps were expertly and seamlessly presented: Title and Author, Background, Aims and Objectives, Research Design, Results and Recommendations. They provided a comprehensive overview of the QI project.	The project steps were very effectively presented: Title and Author, Background, Aims and Objectives, Research Design, Results and Recommendations. They provided a very effective overview of the QI project.	The project steps effectively presented: Title and Author, Background, Aims and Objectives, Research Design, Results and Recommendations. They effectively provided an overview of the QI project.	The project steps were mostly satisfactorily presented: Title and Author, Background, Aims and Objectives, Research Design, Results and Recommendations. They mostly provided a satisfactory overview of the QI project.	The project steps were not included, and the QI project was poorly explained.	There was no content.
<i>Substantiation and Referencing (5%)</i>	The poster information was expertly substantiated using logic and evidence with a minimum of 4 references. References were correctly cited using APA 7 edition style.	The poster information was very effectively substantiated using logic and evidence with a minimum of 4 references. References were correctly cited using APA 7 edition style.	The poster information was effectively substantiated using logic and evidence with a minimum of 3 references. References were mostly correctly cited, with 1 consistent error, using APA 7 edition style.	The poster information was satisfactorily substantiated using logic and evidence with a minimum of 3 references. References were mostly correctly cited, with 2 consistent errors, using APA 7 edition style.	APA referencing not used, or more than 5 consistent in-text or reference list errors.	The poster information was not substantiated.
ORAL PRESENTATION 50%						
<i>Presentation 20%</i>	The presenter professionally and comprehensively presented the QI project.	The presenter comprehensively presented the QI project.	The presenter thoroughly presented the QI project.	The presenter satisfactorily presented the QI project.	The presenter attempts unsuccessfully to professionally and comprehensively present the QI project.	The presenter did not present the QI project.
<i>Questions 10%</i>	The presenter comprehensively addressed audience questions.	The presenter clearly addressed audience questions.	The presenter effectively addressed audience questions.	The presenter mostly addressed the audience questions.	The presenter did not adequately address the audience questions	The presenter did not address the audience questions.
<i>Professional communication 20%</i>	The presenter engaged the audience expertly using a variety of communication techniques - including infrequent use of notes, plus effective use of voice and body language to maintain audience engagement.	The presenter engaged the audience effectively using a number of known communication techniques - including effective use of voice and body language to maintain audience engagement.	The presenter engaged the audience satisfactorily using communication techniques - including effective use of voice and body language to maintain audience engagement.	The presenter engaged the audience using some communication techniques - such as effective use of voice and body language to maintain audience engagement.	The presenter did not engage the audience. Minimal use of communication techniques.	The presenter did 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 PDF format only. The poster submitted and presented must be identical.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

- Conduct an ethically approved research project
- Collect and analyse research project data
- Disseminate research findings and recommendations to a broader audience.

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