

HCM 440 Final Project Guidelines and Rubric

Overview

Healthcare administrators, managers, and executives are responsible for planning, directing, and coordinating health services at various levels for the populations they serve. Interpreting research is integral to the role of a healthcare professional, especially when conducting a needs assessment for program planning.

In this course, you will choose a clinical area of interest related to healthcare administration and create an annotated bibliography. For your final assessment, you will compose an integrated review. In this review, you will discuss the criteria necessary for inclusion or exclusion in the research study, critique the quality of each study, and present a synthesis of the results.

This **integrated review** will address the following course outcomes:

1. Critique ethical issues in healthcare research for their influence on compliance with rules and regulations
2. Evaluate basic research strategies applicable to healthcare settings for informing research proposals
3. Assess the appropriateness of utilizing secondary databases in healthcare research as an alternative to conducting original research
4. Justify the selection of specific data analysis methodology in published healthcare research for informing healthcare research methodology
5. Select healthcare administration issues to research in validating the need for program evaluation

Prompt

Using the six peer-reviewed literature articles from your annotated bibliography, compose an integrated review that focuses on a clinical issue of interest. Ensure that the topic of this integrated review is viewed from the perspective of a healthcare professional who is looking to validate the need for program evaluation at your hospital, even if your annotated bibliography was not this focused.

Specifically, your integrated review should focus on the following **critical elements**:

I. Abstract

Craft a well-drafted abstract. Be sure to adhere to the guidelines from the latest edition of the American Psychological Association's style guide. Consider the appropriate length for your audience.

II. Introduction

- a) State the **purpose**, aims, or objectives of the integrated review. What do you wish to achieve through the drafting of this review? Be explicit in your answer.
- b) Introduce the **topic** of interest. Why is this topic the focus of the review?
- c) What is the **research question** you are going to focus on? If you were to prepare a research proposal, what would your hypothesis be? Why?
- d) What **variables** are of interest to you? How will these variables help you throughout this integrated review? Be sure to label the types of variables each of these are.
- e) Discuss the **background** and significance of the problem to healthcare administration.

III. Literature Search

- a) What **keywords and combinations** were used in the initial search? Which were the most effective? Explain why these keywords and combinations provided the most useful results.
- b) Which **databases** were searched? Why were these the chosen databases? Assess the characteristics that make these databases the most reliable.
- c) Evaluate the **inclusion and exclusion** criteria for the sample. How did you decide to narrow the search and focus the review? How was the final sample determined? Be sure to include your process.

IV. Methodology Analysis

- a) What **methodology** was used in this research? Was it effective for the research question and hypothesis? Why or why not? Consider including improvements for the methodology.
- b) What **statistical data analyses** were employed in these articles? Were they appropriate for the research question and methodology? Why or why not?
- c) Evaluate the literature for any **gaps** that exist. Why do you think these gaps exist? Consider factors such as the location of the research, time the research was conducted, and so on.
- d) Evaluate the literature for **inconsistencies** that exist across the studies. Why do you think these inconsistencies exist? Consider factors such as the location of the research, time the research was conducted, and so on.

V. Synthesis and Interpretation

- a) Create an **evidence table** of your results. Be sure to include the following criteria for each study:
 1. Report citation
 2. Design
 3. Method
 4. Sample
 5. Data collection
 6. Data analysis
 7. Validity and reliability
- b) **Compare and contrast** the study findings. Be sure to include pertinent conclusions and statistical findings only.
- c) Evaluate the **research strategies** used in the articles, as applicable to healthcare programs. Was the research design appropriate for the study conducted? Was the statistical analysis employed the best choice for the research questions posed?
- d) What **ethical issues** are pertinent specifically to healthcare research? How can these issues influence the research strategies chosen to investigate clinical topics? Evaluate these research articles and consider how ethical concerns may have limited these clinical investigations.
- e) What **patterns and trends** exist in the research? What generalizations can you draw from the research?
- f) If **secondary data** was utilized, was the source biased or objective? Why? If original research was conducted, do you think the researchers were biased or objective? Why? Be sure to support your answer.

- g) **Synthesize** the main findings of the research articles. What were the hypotheses of the research studies? Did the research add any new scholarly information to the existing body of knowledge?
- h) Assess whether **utilizing** secondary data as an alternative to the researchers' original research would have been a feasible option. If it had been an option, what resource(s) would be the most appropriate to use? What would be some of the strengths and limitations of using secondary data?
- i) Assess the literature for any **ethical concerns** that may be present. Consider things such as conflicts of interest between the researcher and the study sponsors, or the lack of an IRB approval for the study.

VI. Conclusion

- a) What are the studies' **strengths**? Are there patterns in the articles that you chose regarding their strengths?
- b) What are the studies' **limitations**? Are there patterns in the articles that you chose regarding their limitations?
- c) Were the **findings** and conclusions reliable and valid? Why or why not? Logically support your answers.
- d) What are the **implications** of this research? How will it influence your topic in the overall large picture of healthcare research?

Milestones

Annotated Bibliography

This milestone is **due in Module Four**. Submit a summary and analysis of six research articles relevant to the research problem that you have chosen. This milestone is **graded with the Annotated Bibliography Rubric**.

Integrated Review

The final project is **due in Module Eight**. Using the six peer-reviewed literature articles from your annotated bibliography, compose an integrated review that focuses on a clinical issue of interest. Ensure that the topic of this integrated review is viewed from the perspective of a healthcare professional who is looking to validate the need for program evaluation at your hospital. Remember to use APA format. This final project is **graded with the Final Project Rubric**.

Final Project Rubric

Guidelines for Submission: Submit the integrated review as one complete document, including the title page, abstract, written components, references, and any necessary appendices. The written components of the review (excluding the title page, abstract, references, and appendices) should not exceed 12 pages, double-spaced, with one-inch margins. Be sure to adhere to formatting guidelines from the latest edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) reference manual.

Critical Elements	Exemplary (100%)	Proficient (85%)	Needs Improvement (55%)	Not Evident (0%)	Value
Abstract	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and abstract is appropriate in length for reader’s audience	Crafts well-drafted abstract, adhering to guidelines from the latest edition of the APA style guide	Crafts abstract, but abstract is not well drafted or does not adhere to guidelines from the latest edition of the APA style guide	Does not craft abstract	2.5
Introduction: Purpose	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and purpose, aims, or objectives demonstrate a keen understanding of the integrated review process	Explicitly states the purpose, aims, or objectives of the integrated review	States the purpose, aims, or objectives of the integrated review, but is not explicit in doing so	Does not state the purpose, aims, or objectives of the integrated review	3.8
Introduction: Topic	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and explanation is explicitly clear	Explains why the topic is the focus of the review	Explains why the topic is the focus of the review, but explanation is cursory or weak	Does not explain why the topic is the focus of the review	3.8
Introduction: Research Question	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and research question demonstrates depth of understanding of chosen topic	Introduces the research question and hypothesis, including explanation behind hypothesis	Introduces the research question and hypothesis, including explanation behind hypothesis, but explanation is illogical, cursory, or weak	Does not introduce the research question and hypothesis	3.8
Introduction: Variables	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and chosen variables of interest reflect true understanding of chosen topic of interest	Explains labeled variables of interest, including how these variables will be of help throughout the integrated review	Explains variables of interest, but variables are not labeled and explanation of how variables will help throughout integrated review is illogical or weak	Does not explain variables of interest	3.8
Introduction: Background	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and discussion logically links research question to healthcare administration	Discusses the background of the problem and significance of the problem to healthcare administration	Discusses the background of the problem and discusses significance of the problem, but discussion is not thorough or does not relate significance to healthcare administration	Does not discuss the background of the problem and significance of the problem to healthcare administration	3.8

Literature Search: Keywords and Combinations	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and explanation for most useful keywords and combinations demonstrates a nuanced understanding of research databases	Evaluates which keywords and combinations used in the initial search provided the most useful results, including an explanation for why this is true	Evaluates which keywords and combinations provided the most useful results, including an explanation for why this is true, but evaluation is not limited to initial search, or explanation for why this is true is illogical, weak, or cursory	Does not evaluate which keywords and combinations used in the initial search provided the most useful results	3.8
Literature Search: Databases	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and assessment of characteristics shows keen insight into reliability of research databases	Assesses which databases were chosen and what characteristics make them the most reliable	Assesses which databases were chosen and what characteristics make them the most reliable, but assessment is illogical, weak, or not comprehensive	Does not assess which databases were chosen and what characteristics make them the most reliable	3.8
Literature Search: Inclusion and Exclusion	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and process of determining inclusion or exclusion demonstrates ability to logically evaluate research	Comprehensively evaluates the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the sample	Evaluates the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the sample, but evaluation is not comprehensive	Does not evaluate the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the sample	3.8
Methodology Analysis: Methodology	Meets “Proficient” criteria and includes improvements for methodology	Logically evaluates the efficacy of methodology used in the research articles	Evaluates the efficacy of methodology used in the research, but evaluation is illogical	Does not evaluate the efficacy of methodology used in the research	3.8
Methodology: Statistical Data Analyses	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and explanations for appropriateness of data analyses demonstrate a nuanced understanding of statistical techniques	Logically evaluates the appropriateness of the statistical data analyses used in the research articles	Evaluates the appropriateness of the statistical data analyses used in the research articles but the evaluation is not logically sound	Does not evaluate the appropriateness of the statistical data analyses used in the research articles	3.8
Methodology: Gaps	Meets “Proficient” criteria and possible explanations for gaps in literature take into consideration factors such as location and time	Comprehensively evaluates the literature for any gaps that exist, including possible explanations for those gaps	Evaluates the literature for any gaps that exist, including possible explanations for those gaps, but evaluation is not comprehensive or explanations are illogical or weak	Does not evaluate the literature for any gaps that exist	3.8
Methodology: Inconsistencies	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and possible explanations for inconsistencies that exist across the studies take into consideration factors such as location and time	Comprehensively evaluates the literature for any inconsistencies that exist across the studies, including possible explanations for those inconsistencies	Evaluates the literature for any inconsistencies that exist across the studies, including possible explanations for those inconsistencies, but evaluation is not comprehensive or explanations are illogical or weak	Does not evaluate the literature for any inconsistencies that exist across the studies	3.8

Synthesis and Interpretation: Evidence Table	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and evidence table of results is organized and visually appealing	Creates a comprehensive evidence table of results	Creates an evidence table of results, but does not include all required components	Does not create an evidence table of results	3.8
Synthesis and Interpretation: Compare and Contrast	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and comparisons and contrasts of study findings include only significant conclusions and statistically significant findings	Compares and contrasts the study findings, including pertinent conclusions and statistical findings only	Compares and contrasts the study findings, but includes superfluous information	Does not compare and contrast the study findings	3.8
Synthesis and Interpretation: Research Strategies	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and evaluation is focused on the appropriateness of the research strategies within healthcare programs	Comprehensively evaluates research strategies used in the articles as applicable to a healthcare program	Evaluates research strategies used in the articles, but research strategies do not apply to healthcare programs or evaluation is not comprehensive	Does not evaluate research strategies used in the articles	3.8
Synthesis and Interpretation: Ethical Issues	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and evaluation considers how ethical concerns may have limited clinical investigations specifically in the chosen clinical topic	Evaluates research articles for how possible ethical concerns may have limited clinical investigations	Evaluates research articles for how possible ethical concerns may have limited clinical investigations, but evaluation is limited, illogical, or weak	Does not evaluate research articles for how possible ethical concerns may have limited clinical investigations	3.8
Synthesis and Interpretation: Patterns and Trends	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and analysis demonstrates nuanced ability to interpret research findings	Analyzes patterns and trends in the research, drawing generalizations from these patterns and trends	Analyzes patterns and trends in the research and draws generalizations from these patterns and trends, but analysis is cursory or generalizations are illogical	Does not analyze patterns and trends in the research	3.8
Synthesis and Interpretation: Secondary Data	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and support for evaluation includes specific examples	Evaluates if sources or researchers were biased or objective, with support for answer	Evaluates if sources or researchers were biased or objective and supports answer, but evaluation is not complete or support is illogical or weak	Does not evaluate if sources or researchers were biased or objective	3.8
Synthesis and Interpretation: Synthesize	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and synthesis of articles demonstrates nuanced ability to blend multiple articles to support research question	Comprehensively synthesizes the main findings of the research articles	Synthesizes the main findings of the research articles, but synthesis is not comprehensive	Does not synthesize the main findings of the research articles	3.8

Synthesis and Interpretation: Utilizing	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and identification of strengths and limitations to using secondary data considers clinical topics in healthcare administration	Assesses whether utilizing secondary data is a feasible alternative to the researchers’ original research, including what resources would be most appropriate to use and the strengths and limitations to using secondary data	Assesses whether utilizing secondary data is a feasible alternative to the researchers’ original research, but assessment is not comprehensive	Does not assess whether utilizing secondary data is a feasible alternative to the researchers’ original research	3.8
Synthesis and Interpretation: Ethical Concerns	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and assessment includes scenarios such as conflicts of interest between the researcher and study sponsor or the lack of an IRB approval for the study	Comprehensively assesses the literature for ethical concerns	Assesses the literature for ethical concerns, but assessment is not comprehensive	Does not assess the literature for ethical concerns	3.8
Conclusion: Strengths	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and evaluation of studies’ strengths demonstrates keen ability to read beyond superficial results of research articles	Thoroughly evaluates the studies for patterns in strengths	Evaluates the studies for patterns in strengths, but evaluation is not thorough	Does not evaluate the studies for patterns in strengths	3.8
Conclusion: Limitations	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and evaluation of studies’ limitations demonstrates keen ability to read beyond superficial results of research articles	Thoroughly evaluates the studies for patterns in limitations	Evaluates the studies for patterns in limitations, but evaluation is not thorough	Does not evaluate the studies for patterns in limitations	3.8
Conclusion: Findings	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and assessment demonstrates nuanced understanding of statistical principles	Assesses the findings and conclusions for reliability and validity, logically supporting answers	Assesses the findings and conclusions for reliability and validity and supports answers, but assessment is illogical or support is weak or illogical	Does not assess the findings and conclusions for reliability and validity	3.8
Conclusion: Implications	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and analysis of implications demonstrates a keen understanding of research topic overall	Thoroughly analyzes the implications of the research, including how the research will influence the clinical topic in the overall picture of healthcare research	Analyzes the implications of the research topic, including how the research topic will influence the clinic topic, but analysis is cursory or weak or does not consider how research fits into the overall picture of healthcare research	Does not analyze the implications of the research topic	3.8

Articulation of Response	Submission is free of errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, and organization and is presented in a professional and easy-to-read format	Submission has no major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization	Submission has major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that negatively impact readability and articulation of main ideas	Submission has critical errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that prevent understanding of ideas	2.5
Earned Total					100%