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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. Virtual journal clubs (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.

Methods
This is a psychometric assessment of a rubric developed to assess the quality of responses in a virtual journal club.

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

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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader discusses why main idea of article is important.</td>
<td>1=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0=Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=To a limited extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0=Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=To a limited extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=To a great extent</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>0-No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0=Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=To a limited extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(all 7 agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Item 1
- Clear: 0 of 7
- Somewhat agree or agree: 7 of 7
- (6 agree and 1 somewhat agree)

### Item 2
- Clear: 0 of 7
- Somewhat agree or agree: 7 of 7
- (6 agree and 1 somewhat agree)
- (all 7 agree)

### Item 3
- Clear: 0 of 7
- Somewhat agree or agree: 7 of 7
- (6 agree and 1 somewhat agree)
- (all 7 agree)

### Item 4
- Clear: 0 of 7
- Somewhat agree or agree: 7 of 7
- (6 agree and 1 somewhat agree)
- (all 7 agree)

### Item 5
- Clear: 0 of 7
- Somewhat agree or agree: 7 of 7
- (6 agree and 1 somewhat agree)
- (all 7 agree)

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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