Practicum WEEK 4: Evidence-Based Practice and Evaluation of the Project Through Measurable Goals

Overview: Dr. Marcia Stanhope (2020) explained that evidence-based public health practice refers to those decisions made by using the best available evidence, data and information systems and program frameworks; engaging community stakeholders in the decision-making process; evaluating the results; and then disseminating that information to those who can use the information.

Practicum Discussion: This week, your assignment will be to incorporate all of the information you have gathered from the community—including the population itself, health data, interviews/conversations with interested community members, and your community assessment, including your Windshield Survey—as well as what you have gathered from scholarly literature to propose measurable interventions. Measurable interventions mean that the results can be measured through some data that could be collected (Stanhope, 2020). This requires thinking in terms of actions and then measuring results. An evaluation of interventions is important to see whether or not they are effective in solving a health care problem. Remember, you will need to use the data you gathered to determine whether or not a problem exists in your community and to then determine whether your interventions might be effective.

**Post** your response to the following:

* Identify one evidence-based behavior change that would promote health in your selected population.
* Suggest one specific culturally sensitive, evidence-based, measurable intervention to address the health problem for your selected population.
* Think in terms of measuring outcomes. What outcomes would you expect to see once the intervention(s) are in place? Be specific.
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|  | | **Excellent** | **Proficient** | **Basic** | **Needs Improvement** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Required Content Provided evidence-based behavior change to promote health in the population.** | | 9 (18%) - 10 (20%)  Initial post is exceptional containing well developed and insightful analysis that brings connections to nursing practice into the discussion. | 8 (16%) - 8 (16%)  Initial post contains reasonable analysis that brings insight into the discussion. | 7 (14%) - 7 (14%)  Initial post contains minimal analysis that brings limited insight into the discussion. | 0 (0%) - 6 (12%)  Initial post lacks analysis and/or that brings little or no insight into the discussion. |
| **Required Content Recommended one specific culturally sensitive, evidence-based, measurable intervention to address the health problem in the population.** | | 9 (18%) - 10 (20%)  Initial post is exceptional containing well developed and insightful analysis that brings connections to nursing practice into the discussion. | 8 (16%) - 8 (16%)  Initial post contains reasonable analysis that brings insight into the discussion. | 7 (14%) - 7 (14%)  Initial post contains minimal analysis that brings limited insight into the discussion. | 0 (0%) - 6 (12%)  Initial post lacks analysis and/or that brings little or no insight into the discussion. |
| **Required Content Described the outcomes you would expect to see when the interventions are in place.** | | 4.5 (9%) - 5 (10%)  Initial post is exceptional containing well developed and insightful analysis that brings connections to nursing practice into the discussion. | 4 (8%) - 4 (8%)  Initial post contains reasonable analysis that brings insight into the discussion. | 3.5 (7%) - 3.5 (7%)  Initial post contains minimal analysis that brings limited insight into the discussion. | 0 (0%) - 3 (6%)  Initial post lacks analysis and/or that brings little or no insight into the discussion. |
| **Response Posts Entered the discussion thread on 3 separate days. Wrote at least two posts to two separate peers.  Responses are appropriate to the topic, substantive, and promoted discussion by one or more of the following: • contributing insight to move the discussion forward. • offering substantial and/or different points of view and asks questions to add to discussion • including extra references or websites for peers to consider • relating discussion to different areas of practice and applying concepts to practice** | | 9 (18%) - 10 (20%)  Response posts add substantial ideas and perspectives that invite further analysis and discussion. Participated 3 or more days in the classroom and responded to more than 2 classmates. | 8 (16%) - 8 (16%)  Response posts are proficient and provide adequate analysis and discussion. Participated 3 days in the classroom and responds to at least two classmates. | 7 (14%) - 7 (14%)  Response posts are limited and provide minimal analysis and discussion. Participated less than 3 days in the classroom and/or responds to less than two classmates. | 0 (0%) - 6 (12%)  Response posts are inadequate and provide no analysis of discussion and/ or there is no participation in the classroom. |
| **Professional Writing: Clarity, Flow, and Organization** | | 4.5 (9%) - 5 (10%)  Content is free from spelling, punctuation, and grammar/syntax errors. Writing demonstrates very well-formed sentence and paragraph structure. Content presented is completely clear, logical, and well-organized. | 4 (8%) - 4 (8%)  Content contains minor spelling, punctuation, and/or grammar/syntax errors. Writing demonstrates appropriate sentence and paragraph structure. Content presented is mostly clear, logical, and well-organized. | 3.5 (7%) - 3.5 (7%)  Content contains moderate spelling, punctuation, and/or grammar/syntax errors. Writing demonstrates adequate sentence and paragraph structure and may require some editing. Content presented is adequately clear, logical, and/or organized, but could benefit from additional editing/revision. | 0 (0%) - 3 (6%)  Content contains significant spelling, punctuation, and/or grammar/syntax errors. Writing does not demonstrate adequate sentence and paragraph structure and requires additional editing/proofreading. Key sections of presented content lack clarity, logical flow, and/or organization. |
| **Professional Writing: Context, Audience, Purpose, and Tone** | | 4.5 (9%) - 5 (10%)  Content clearly demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose. Tone is highly professional, scholarly, and free from bias, and style is appropriate for the professional setting/workplace context. | 4 (8%) - 4 (8%)  Content demonstrates satisfactory awareness of context, audience, and purpose. Tone is adequately professional, scholarly, and/or free from bias, and style is consistent with the professional setting/workplace context. | 3.5 (7%) - 3.5 (7%)  Content demonstrates basic awareness of context, audience, and purpose. Tone is somewhat professional, scholarly, and/or free from bias, and style is mostly consistent with the professional setting/workplace context. | 0 (0%) - 3 (6%)  Content minimally or does not demonstrate awareness of context, audience, and/or purpose. Writing is not reflective of professional/scholarly tone and/or is not free of bias. Style is inconsistent with the professional setting/workplace context and reflects the need for additional editing. |
| **Professional Writing: Originality, Source Credibility, and Attribution of Ideas** | | 4.5 (9%) - 5 (10%)  Content reflects original thought and writing and proper paraphrasing. Writing demonstrates full adherence to reference requirements, including the use of credible evidence to support a claim, with appropriate source attribution (when applicable) and references. | 4 (8%) - 4 (8%)  Content adequately reflects original writing and paraphrasing. Writing demonstrates adequate adherence to reference requirements, including the use of credible evidence to support a claim, with appropriate source attribution (when applicable) and references. | 3.5 (7%) - 3.5 (7%)  Content somewhat reflects original writing and paraphrasing. Writing somewhat demonstrates adherence to reference requirements, including the use of credible evidence to support a claim, with appropriate source attribution (when applicable) and references. | 0 (0%) - 3 (6%)  Content does not adequately reflect original writing and/or paraphrasing. Writing demonstrates inconsistent adherence to reference requirements, including the use of credible evidence to support a claim, with appropriate source attribution (when applicable) and reference. |
| Total Points: 50 | | | | | |
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