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OBJECTIVES

Upon completion of this presentation, participants will be able to:

1. Discuss the elements of a strong research report
2. Use the Simulation Research Rubric to rate selected elements of a recently published manuscript
INACSL Research Committee identified the need to rate the quality of manuscripts

No existing tool included many of the elements needed to evaluate simulation research reports:

- Use of theoretical or conceptual framework
- Discussion of simulation scenario development & testing
- Discussion of simulation implementation
- Description of debriefing: facilitator and process
PROCESS

1. Following literature search, the elements of the rubric and the scale were created and refined by the three authors.
2. Review and input from a panel of simulation experts and content reviewers.
3. Four manuscripts were reviewed to assess usability of the rubric; revisions made to clarify wording.
4. Content validity index .96 (seven content experts).
5. Inter-rater reliability .92 (agreement within 1 point).
6. All research manuscripts (n=73) from 2013-2014 rated and placed in categories.
FINAL CLASSIFICATION OF MANUSCRIPTS

15 (21.8%) received a rating of excellent (76 – 100 %)

47 (68.1%) received a rating of good (51 – 75%)

7 (10.1%) received a rating of fair (26 – 50%)

no articles below the rating of fair (0 – 25%)
APPLICATION OF SRR

Learning Through Debriefing: Students' Perspectives

Rate categories:
• guiding conceptual or theoretical framework
• simulation development
• description of simulation feedback or debriefing
SUMMARY

• An instrument to rate simulation research reports with evidence of validity and reliability

• Future recommendations
  • Revisions to categories based on feedback from users
  • Continue to rate the quality of research reports in Clinical Simulation in Nursing
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