Unit 6 Assignment: Analysis of a Technology/System Application Presentation

[Submit Assignment](https://herzing.instructure.com/courses/10230/assignments/260487?module_item_id=580653)

* **Due**

* **Points** 330

* **Submitting** a text entry box or a file upload

Instructions

In this course, you learned rapidly changing technologies have a drastic impact on nursing and healthcare. During this course both current and emerging technologies support safety practice environments have been addressed. These technologies can optimize patient safety, cost-effectiveness, and health outcomes.

For the assignment, you are to propose either a change to an existing technological tool/advance/innovation used in a healthcare system or propose a new one related to nursing. Some ideas include, but are not limited to:

* artificial intelligence
* Telemedicine
* vein finders
* blood analyzers
* cloud
* automated medication administration systems
* block chains

Remember, it is through technology in healthcare, care is reshaped. Care is transformed not only in the hospital setting, but in the rural settings as well.

As you are building the presentation, imagine presenting the change to the board of organizational healthcare stakeholders for approval. With a formal presentation, the usage of speaker notes is necessary. The speaker notes include the information not included on the slide. The same writing requirements are applied to the speaker notes. Please include any relevant citations in APA format. Each slide should contain speaker notes with adequate information for presentation purposes.

The PowerPoint presentation should include the following:

* Be 15-20 slides in length, not including the title slide and reference slides.
  + The title slide should list the name of the protocol, the date, and the name of the assignment.
  + The reference slides should provide all references in APA format.
* Each slide should include speaker notes with appropriate APA format.
* Slides ideas might include: introduction, history, literature review, need, proposal idea, implementation strategies, evaluation ideas, financial implications, conclusion.
* A minimum of five recent (within the last 5 years), scholarly, peer-reviewed articles are required.

Select professional backgrounds, coloring, and fonts. No more than two slides should be visuals. Pictures, charts, and visual may be used but should be used to accentuate the content not replace it. Clip art and animation is encouraged to enhance the presentation.

Pictures, charts, and visual may be used but should be used to accentuate the content not replace it.

Estimated time to complete: 6 hours

Rubric

**NU525 Unit 6 Assignment: Analysis of a Technology/System Application Paper**

| NU525 Unit 6 Assignment: Analysis of a Technology/System Application Paper | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | **Pts** |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeTopic  NU525-CO1; NU525-CO4 | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **35.0 pts**  **Level 5**  Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses potentially significant aspects of the topic. An existing technological tool/advance/innovation used in a healthcare system or a proposed new tool/advance/innovation is included with substantial support. | **31.0 pts**  **Level 4**  Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses important and notable aspects of the topic. An existing technological tool/advance/innovation used in a healthcare system or a proposed new tool/advance/innovation is included with adequate support | **28.0 pts**  **Level 3**  Identifies a focused and manageable/doable topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the topic. An existing technological tool/advance/innovation used in a healthcare system or a proposed new tool/advance/innovation is included with minimal support | **24.0 pts**  **Level 2**  Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, is too narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the topic. An existing technological tool/advance/innovation used in a healthcare system or a proposed new tool/advance/innovation is included without substantial support. | **21.0 pts**  **Level 1**  Identifies a topic that is far too general and wide-ranging as to be manageable and doable. An existing technological tool/advance/innovation used in a healthcare system or a proposed new tool/advance/innovation is not provided. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  Does not clearly identify a topic that is relative to the assignment. | | 35.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeExisting Knowledge, Research, and/or Views  NU525-CO1; NU525-CO4 | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **70.0 pts**  **Level 5**  Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches. | **63.0 pts**  **Level 4**  Examines in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches. | **56.0 pts**  **Level 3**  Explains in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches. | **49.0 pts**  **Level 2**  Relates information from relevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches. | **42.0 pts**  **Level 1**  Relates information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/ approaches. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  Information is irrelevant to the topic. No clear point of view/approaches. | | 70.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeDesign Process | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **65.0 pts**  **Level 5**  All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant sub-disciplines. | **58.5 pts**  **Level 4**  Most critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be analyzed from across disciplines or from relevant sub-disciplines. | **52.0 pts**  **Level 3**  Some critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for. | **45.5 pts**  **Level 2**  Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused. | **39.0 pts**  **Level 1**  Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  The design of the paper is not based upon a clear methodology or framework. | | 65.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeAnalysis  NU525-CO1; NU525-CO4 | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **75.0 pts**  **Level 5**  Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. | **67.5 pts**  **Level 4**  Organizes and analyzes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. | **60.0 pts**  **Level 3**  Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. | **52.5 pts**  **Level 2**  Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities. | **45.0 pts**  **Level 1**  Describes evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus. | | 75.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeConclusion | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **20.0 pts**  **Level 5**  States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings. | **18.0 pts**  **Level 4**  States a conclusion that is a logical interpretation of the inquiry findings. | **16.0 pts**  **Level 3**  States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings. | **14.0 pts**  **Level 2**  States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings. | **12.0 pts**  **Level 1**  States an ambiguous or unsupportable conclusion from inquiry findings. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  States an illogical conclusion from inquiry findings. | | 20.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeLimitations and Implications | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **30.0 pts**  **Level 5**  Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications. | **27.0 pts**  **Level 4**  Examines relevant and supported limitations and implications. | **24.0 pts**  **Level 3**  Discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications. | **21.0 pts**  **Level 2**  Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications. | **18.0 pts**  **Level 1**  Presents limitations and implications, but they are unsupported. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  Presents limitations and implications, but they are irrelevant. | | 30.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeWriting | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **20.0 pts**  **Level 5**  The presentation exhibits a superior command of written English language conventions. The presentation has no errors in mechanics, grammar, or spelling. Presentation is 15-20 slides minimum not including the title slide and reference slides. | **18.0 pts**  **Level 4**  The presentation exhibits a strong command of written English language conventions. The presentation has no errors in mechanics, grammar, or spelling that impair the flow of communication. Presentation is 13-14 slides not including the title slide and reference slides. | **16.0 pts**  **Level 3**  The presentation exhibits a command of written English language conventions. The presentation has minor errors in mechanics, grammar, or spelling that impact the flow of communication. | **14.0 pts**  **Level 2**  The presentation exhibits a limited command of written English language conventions. The presentation has frequent errors in mechanics, grammar, or spelling that impede the flow of communication. | **12.0 pts**  **Level 1**  The presentation exhibits little command of written English language conventions. The presentation has errors in mechanics, grammar, or spelling that cause the reader to stop and reread parts of the writing to discern meaning. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  The presentation does not demonstrate command of written English language conventions. The presentation has multiple errors in mechanics, grammar, or spelling that cause the reader difficulty discerning the meaning. | | 20.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeAPA  PRICE-I | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **15.0 pts**  **Level 5**  The required APA elements are all included with correct formatting, including in-text citations and references. | **13.5 pts**  **Level 4**  The required APA elements are all included with minor formatting errors, including in-text citations and references. | **12.0 pts**  **Level 3**  The required APA elements are all included with multiple formatting errors, including in-text citations and references. | **10.5 pts**  **Level 2**  The required APA elements are not all included and/or there are major formatting errors, including in-text citations and references. | **9.0 pts**  **Level 1**  Several APA elements are missing. The errors in formatting demonstrate limited understanding of APA guidelines, in-text-citations, and references. | **0.0 pts**  **Level 0**  There is little to no evidence of APA formatting and/or there are no in-text citations and/or references. | | 15.0 pts |
| Total Points: 330.0 | | |
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