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Background

- Journal clubs (JC) are a common form of education in health care with the goal of promoting the translation of research evidence into practice. VJC can facilitate a critical review of research to change nursing practice based on empirical findings through quality responses.
- The better the quality of the responses, the more nurses are critically reviewing the possibility of a change in practice based on evidence.
- However, an assessment tool to evaluate the quality of VJC responses does not exist.

Purpose

To determine the reliability and validity of a rubric developed to assess the quality of responses in a virtual journal club.

Methods

This is a psychometric assessment of a rubric study.
1. Content validity will be established on a 4-point Likert scale where 5-10 clinical educators will assess the relevance and clarity of each rubric item.
2. Once agreement is met, inter-observer reliability will be established by the assessment of VJC responses from 10-20 Advanced and/or Expert Medical-Surgical nurses. Each VJC response will have 2-3 assessments for comparison.

Assessment items were taken from questions developed to derive a contact hour for responses.

Figure 1. Researcher-developed Rubric: Virtual Journal Club Posting Quality Assessment Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of main idea</td>
<td>Reader identifies main idea (issue, topic, practice) of the article.</td>
<td>0-No, 1=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader discusses why main idea of article is important.</td>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td>0-Not at all, 1=To a limited extent, 2=To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to clinical setting</td>
<td>Reader compares article’s main idea to current clinical setting.</td>
<td>0-No, 1=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to clinical setting</td>
<td>Reader states if the main idea could or could not be implemented in clinical setting.</td>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to clinical setting</td>
<td>Reader explains why main idea could or could not be implemented in clinical setting.</td>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 1 & 2. Content validity results of rubric items related to clarity and relevance of each item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1 clear</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2 clear</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3 clear</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4 clear</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5 clear</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Content Validity Results
- The 5 rubric items (Figure 1) were considered to be sufficient to determine the quality of a response because none of the 7 reviewers suggested more or different items.
- The content validity coefficients for all items were all excellent. 100% of the 7 reviewers found the 5 items relevant and 100% of the 7 reviewers found the 5 items clear (Tables 1 & 2).

Inter-observer Reliability
- Work in progress.

Implications for Practice
- This study engages clinical educators and staff nurses in the research and tool development process.
- Study byproduct is a tool to assist staff and informal leaders in evidence-based practice engagement, driving an engaged workforce.
- An engaged workforce is a happy workforce which then leads to staff retention.
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