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Objectives for Presentation

1. Describe the modified “Actualized DNP Model” to guide scholarly projects.
2. Discuss how group scholarly projects can be facilitated using the “Model”.
3. Discuss improved efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation by using the “Model”.
Background


All DNP Projects should:

- Focus on a change that impacts healthcare outcomes either through direct or indirect care,
- Have a systems or population focus,
- Demonstrate implementation in the appropriate area of practice,
- Include a plan for sustainability,
- Include an evaluation of processes and/or outcomes,
- Provide a foundation for future practice scholarship.
Background


Group/team projects acceptable when project aims are consistent with program focus:

- Each member of the group must meet all expectations of planning, implementation and evaluation of the project, and be evaluated accordingly.
- Each student must have a leadership role in at least one component of the project and be held accountable for a deliverable.
- The DNP project team should consist of a student or a group of students with a minimum of a doctoral prepared faculty member and a practice mentor.
Background


**Academic Considerations:**

- Should be designed with attention to program efficiency.
- Consider new models and processes for implementing DNP project teams that provide efficient use of resources and support student learning.
- Academic and practice partners are encouraged to collect outcome data to demonstrate the added value that DNP graduates bring to healthcare.
Features of Practice Scholarship

- More than translational
- Inclusive, broad, varied
- Incorporates Engagement/Optimization, Integration/Application
- Academic rigor

Scholarship in Practice

• Integrates/demonstrates the Essentials and the effectiveness of the discipline.
• An effort to build the bridge between research and practice.
• Must be done within the context of outcomes.

Expectations of Scholarship

- Within organizations to affect populations, systems
- Within academia to affect all areas of scholarship
- Local to national health policy/outcomes

Nature of the Problem

• DNP scholarly projects lack agreement
• 87% of faculty dissatisfied with DNP project
  – Lack of knowledge:
    • Evidence-based practice
    • Quality improvement
  – Lack of consensus on what project is
  – Lack of faculty resources for projects
  – Challenges with clinical sties for projects
  – Poor student scholarly writing skills
• Most important:
  – Application/translation of evidence into practice
  – Improved population health/clinical outcomes

Dols et. Al, 2017
The Project

Purpose: Examine a model to enact DNP scholarly project guided by the *Actualized DNP Model* (Burson, Moran, & Conrad; 2016) to improve process (efficiency and effectiveness) and outcomes (time to completion/graduation, satisfaction).
The Project

Objectives:

1. Build a “Practice-Partnership” with site.
   a) How partnership evolved?
   b) Relationship building: Why do it?
   c) Value added of DNP: What is it?
   d) Who are our partners?

2. Advisement Team: PhD, DNP, & Site Expert.

3. Elevate project rigor.

4. Streamline IRB and data sharing/use process.
Methods

• Convenience sample prospective cohort study
• Mixed Method
  – Field Notes on project activities
  – Satisfaction Survey (Student, Faculty, Site Mentor)
• GVSU IRB Approved: Exempt Status
Setting & Sample

• Setting:
  – Kirkhof College of Nursing
    • 120 DNP students
      – Adult/Older Adult NP
      – Child/Adelescent
      – Health Systems Leadership
    • 4/3 Year program
  – Large Health System in Midwest
    • 14 locations; 184 PCP offices; 92 Ancillary Services
    • Magnet Designation
Setting & Sample

• Sample:
  – Faculty: N=3 (DNP=2; PhD=1)
  – Students: N=7
  – Site Mentors: N=9
**Actualized DNP Model**

- Project and clinical coursework
- DNP-PhD mentors for group

---

**Advanced Nursing Knowledge**
- DNPSkillset
- Core Content

---

**Evidence Based Knowledge**
- Innovative Advance Practice Roles
- Generation of Practice Based Knowledge

---

**Outcomes**
- Patient
- Policy
- Academic

---

**Developing practice partnerships**
- Projects are contextual and sustainable
- Leading interprofessional team and addressing organizational needs
DNP scholarship application: Knowledge and skillset expansion

Continual advancement of education in addition to the DNP Essentials and Competencies, achieved through:

• Curriculum: EBP coursework, project coursework, immersion experiences
• Faculty Mentorship: PhD-DNP collaboration
Innovative Practice Roles

**Innovative practice roles** may be based in area of specialized advanced practice roles such as a nurse practitioner or health systems leader, characterized by:

• Developing Practice Partnerships
• Emphasizing Value-Added skillset to advance organizational goals with DNP student projects
Innovative Practice Roles

- Facilitating IRB policy on Student led quality improvement projects
- Students are active leader within an inter-professional team, addressing organizational needs
- Projects are contextual and sustainable

Evidence Based Knowledge
Innovative Advance Practice Roles
Generation of Practice Based Knowledge
Outcomes and impact

The achievement of outcomes impacting:

- Patients, populations, systems
- Policy: organizational, IRB
Outcomes and impact

• Academia:
  • Enhancing academic-practice partnerships
  • Clinical placements
  • Project efficiency—reduced faculty workload, reduced time to graduation
Refinement & Testing: Actualized DNP Model

Student Clinical knowledge/DNP Essentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of the Scholarly Project</td>
<td>Advisement Team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Organizational Assessment</td>
<td>-PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Literature Review</td>
<td>-DNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Plan</td>
<td>-Site Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Implement</td>
<td>Faculty: Develop Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Disseminate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOMES (proximal)

“Project”:
-Reduced time to defend/complete/graduate
-Increased satisfaction student, faculty, site mentor
-Reduced burden faculty, site mentor

OUTCOME (distal)

Graduation
Measures

• Survey: Satisfaction (student, faculty, site mentor) at the completion of the semester for 3-semesters (summer, fall, winter)

• Time to COMPARED to prior students:
  – Proposal defense
  – Project defense (project completion)
  – Graduation

• Faculty/Site burden
  – Field notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Model</th>
<th>New Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student found site/mentor</td>
<td>Faculty Team (PhD + DNP) found site: Informal/formal agreement Site Leaders “idea generation” with faculty/students Site Leaders identified mentors with student input on topic to match Site mentors accepted students to do projects with Faculty Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student met with mentor/completed Prospectus -Feedback from Advisor</td>
<td>Faculty Team/student met with site mentor -Explained mentor role/responsibilities and DNP Essentials -Mutually agreed on project “wicked problem” and timeline -Student completed Prospectus after iterative feedback from Faculty Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Model</td>
<td>New Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student conducted organizational assessment (generic)</td>
<td>Faculty Team/student met with mentor/data source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feedback from Advisor</td>
<td>- University/site IRB approvals obtained; site data sharing paperwork completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deep data dive informed assessment with assistance of biostatistician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student completed organizational assessment (tailored/specific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Iterative feedback from Faculty Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student conducted lit review</td>
<td>Faculty/student agreed on key words/lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feedback from Advisor</td>
<td>- Student conducted lit review w/faculty input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student wrote lit review in manuscript format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Iterative feedback from Faculty Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Submit to journal for publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Model</td>
<td>New Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student wrote/defended proposal  
- Advisor reviewed/provided input  
- Presented to other faculty/site verbally/written  
- Obtained university/site IRBs | Student wrote/defended proposal  
- Faculty Team iterative review/provided input  
- Presented to all verbally/written |
| Student implemented project:  
- Faculty Advisor visited site 1x in semester  
- Site mentor provided guidance | Student implemented project:  
- Faculty Team visited site monthly  
- Student met with site mentor regularly |
| Student wrote/defended project  
- Feedback from Advisor/Faculty member/site mentor  
- Provided/presented final version to site mentor/Faculty | Student wrote/defended project  
- Iterative feedback from Faculty Team reviewed/provided input  
- Provided/presented final version to site mentor/Faculty Team |
Lessons Learned (preliminary)

• Team Approach effective:
  – PhD contribution: methodology (design, measures, analysis), data item selection, IRB approvals, data sharing
  – DNP contribution: enactment of Essentials, experience conducting scholarly project
Lessons Learned (preliminary)

• Initial student/site mentor/faculty Collaborative selection of project focus created high satisfaction among all partners AND launched student project enactment
Lessons Learned (preliminary)

- Earlier IRB approval: to access data for organizational assessment
- Data Sharing/Use needed to be formalized
- Site mentors were “experts” and supported students
  - Every mentor asked agreed to mentor!
  - Site appreciative of assistance with WICKED problem
Satisfaction Survey Preliminary Results

Students agree/strongly agree:
• Assignments are clear, achievable and completed on time
• It was beneficial to have faculty attend site meetings
• They had access to the information needed from the site
• They are progressing in meeting the DNP Essentials
Satisfaction Survey Preliminary Results

Faculty agree/strongly agree:
• Clarity of communication has increased within the project team.
• There is reduced burden of coordination issues with the site mentors and students.
Satisfaction Survey Preliminary Results

Site Mentors agree/strongly agree:
• Communication with the faculty was clear
• Communication with the student was clear
• Their role as site mentor was clear
• The project is beneficial to the organization
Testimonial: Site Partner

Dr. Jennifer Kaiser, System Research Nurse

• No DNP students at site conducting projects
• Great need for improvement
• Desire to work with students
• Engaged system leaders
Student Case Study #1: KE

• Focus: Implementation of an Evidence-Based Opioid Reduction Pain Management Protocol for an Observation Unit Prospectus

• Organizational Assessment/Literature Review:
  – Start-Hi dose/administer fast
    • Start-Low dose/administer increases slowly

• Mega-data historical data available by patient/diagnosis/drug (ordered/given), prescriber, RN administering
Student Case Study #2: AG

• Focus: Fall and fall injury rate reduction

• Organizational Assessment/Literature Review:
  – EB interventions not reducing injury rate
    • May not be used?
    • May not be effective?
    • Risk may not be identified?
  – Fall risk assessment: not evidence-based
    • New tool (Hester-Davis plus ABC)
  – POC: standardized
    • New approach: tailored based on risk assessment
Student Case Study #3: IC

• Focus: Child and Adolescent Standardized Behavioral Healthcare Management

• Organizational Assessment/Literature Review:
  – Spike in incidents of patient violence after security intervention due to behavioral issues
  – Lack of education in de-escalation technique
  – No single location to treat
  – Community-wide problem solving
  – Limited evidence on de-escalation training
Student Case Study #4: KK/TR/RC

• Focus: Palliative Care
• Multi-year, single site project implementation
Strengths & Weaknesses

- Value-added benefit of project for site experienced
- Developed strong relationship
- Value-added benefit of DNP experienced
- Wicked problem most needed by site/that was doable
- Multi-student/multi-year
- Variation in projects
Educational Implications

Student outcomes are met using the Actualized DNP Model:

• DNP Essentials are demonstrated
• Assignments are completed on time, meeting all requirements
• All stakeholders report satisfaction with the process
Conclusion

The Actualized DNP Model:

• Guides timely completion of scholarly projects
• Promotes Practice-Partnerships with clinical sites
• Supports translation of evidence into practice for “wicked” problems
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