Type: Dissertation Literature Review

Subject: Healthcare InformationTechnology

Subject area: Nursing

Education Level: Undergraduate/College

Length: 2 pages

Referencing style: APA

Preferred English: US English

Title: The Use of Clinical Systems to Improve Outcomes and Efficiencies

Instructions: new technology—and the application of existing technology—only appears in healthcare settings after careful and significant research. the stakes are high, and new clinical systems need to offer evidence of positive impact on outcomes or efficiencies. nurse informaticists and healthcare leaders formulate clinical system strategies. as these strategies are often based on technology trends, informaticists and others have then benefited from consulting existing research to inform their thinking. in this assignment, you will review existing research focused on the application of clinical systems. after reviewing, you will summarize your findings. to prepare: review the resources and reflect on the impact of clinical systems on outcomes and efficiencies within the context of nursing practice and healthcare delivery. conduct a search for recent (within the last 5 years) research focused on the application of clinical systems. the research should provide evidence to support the use of one type of clinical system to improve outcomes and/or efficiencies, such as "the use of personal health records or portals to support patients newly diagnosed with diabetes." identify and select 5 peer-reviewed articles from your research. the assignment: (4-5 pages) in a 4- to 5-page paper, synthesize the peer-reviewed research you reviewed. be sure to address the following: identify the 5 peer-reviewed articles you reviewed, citing each in apa format. summarize each study, explaining the improvement to outcomes, efficiencies, and lessons learned from the application of the clinical system each peer-reviewed article described. be specific and provide examples Focus: rubric detail select grid view or list view to change the rubric's layout. content name: nurs_5051_module04_week06_discussion_rubric grid view list view excellent good fair poor main posting points range: 45 (45%) - 50 (50%) answers all parts of the discussion question(s) expectations with reflective critical analysis and synthesis of knowledge gained from the course readings for the module and current credible sources. supported by at least three current, credible sources. written clearly and concisely with no grammatical or spelling errors and fully adheres to current apa manual writing rules and style. points range: 40 (40%) - 44 (44%) responds to the discussion question(s) and is reflective with critical analysis and synthesis of knowledge gained from the course readings for the module. at least 75% of post has exceptional depth and breadth. supported by at least three credible sources. written clearly and concisely with one or no grammatical or spelling errors and fully adheres to current apa manual writing rules and style. points range: 35 (35%) - 39 (39%) responds to some of the discussion question(s). one or two criteria are not addressed or are superficially addressed. is somewhat lacking reflection and critical analysis and synthesis. somewhat represents knowledge gained from the course readings for the module. post is cited with two credible sources. written somewhat concisely; may contain more than two spelling or grammatical errors. contains some apa formatting errors. points range: 0 (0%) - 34 (34%) does not respond to the discussion question(s) adequately. lacks depth or superficially addresses criteria. lacks reflection and critical analysis and synthesis. does not represent knowledge gained from the course readings for the module. contains only one or no credible sources. not written clearly or concisely. contains more than two spelling or grammatical errors. does not adhere to current apa manual writing rules and style. main post: timeliness points range: 10 (10%) - 10 (10%) posts main post by day 3. points range: 0 (0%) - 0 (0%) points range: 0 (0%) - 0 (0%) points range: 0 (0%) - 0 (0%) does not post by day 3. first response points range: 17 (17%) - 18 (18%) response exhibits synthesis, critical thinking, and application to practice settings. responds fully to questions posed by faculty. provides clear, concise opinions and ideas that are supported by at least two

scholarly sources. demonstrates synthesis and understanding of learning objectives. communication is professional and respectful to colleagues. responses to faculty questions are fully answered, if posed. response is effectively written in standard, edited english. points range: 15 (15%) - 16 (16%) response exhibits critical thinking and application to practice settings. communication is professional and respectful to colleagues. responses to faculty questions are answered, if posed. provides clear, concise opinions and ideas that are supported by two or more credible sources. response is effectively written in standard, edited english. points range: 13 (13%) - 14 (14%) response is on topic and may have some depth. responses posted in the discussion may lack effective professional communication. responses to faculty questions are somewhat answered, if posed. response may lack clear, concise opinions and ideas, and a few or no credible sources are cited. points range: 0 (0%) - 12 (12%) response may not be on topic and lacks depth. responses posted in the discussion lack effective professional communication. responses to faculty questions are missing. no credible sources are cited. second response points range: 16 (16%) - 17 (17%) response exhibits synthesis, critical thinking, and application to practice settings. responds fully to questions posed by faculty. provides clear, concise opinions and ideas that are supported by at least two scholarly sources. demonstrates synthesis and understanding of learning objectives. communication is professional and respectful to colleagues. responses to faculty questions are fully answered, if posed. response is effectively written in standard, edited english. points range: 14 (14%) - 15 (15%) response exhibits critical thinking and application to practice settings. communication is professional and respectful to colleagues. responses to faculty questions are answered, if posed. provides clear, concise opinions and ideas that are supported by two or more credible sources. response is effectively written in standard, edited english. points range: 12 (12%) - 13 (13%) response is on topic and may have some depth. responses posted in the discussion may lack effective professional communication. responses to faculty questions are somewhat answered, if posed. response may lack clear, concise opinions and ideas, and a few or no credible sources are cited. points range: 0 (0%) - 11 (11%) response may not be on topic and lacks depth. responses posted in the discussion lack effective professional communication. responses to faculty questions are missing. no credible sources are cited. participation points range: 5 (5%) - 5 (5%) meets requirements for participation by posting on three different days. points range: 0 (0%) - 0 (0%) points range: 0 (0%) - 0 (0%) points range: 0 (0%) - 0 (0%) does not meet requirements for participation by posting on 3 different days.

Required: required readings mcgonigle, d., & mastrian, k. g. (2017). nursing informatics and the foundation of knowledge (4th ed.). burlington, ma: jones & bartlett learning. chapter 14, "the electronic health record and clinical informatics" (pp. 267–287) chapter 15, "informatics tools to promote patient safety and quality outcomes" (pp. 293–317) chapter 16, "patient engagement and connected health" (pp. 323–338) chapter 17, "using informatics to promote community/population health" (pp. 341–355) chapter 18, "telenursing and remote access telehealth" (pp. 359–388) dykes, p. c., rozenblum, r., dalal, a., massaro, a., chang, f., clements, m., collins, s. …bates, d. w. (2017). prospective evaluation of a multifaceted intervention to improve outcomes in intensive care: the promoting respect and ongoing safety through patient engagement communication and technology study. critical care medicine, 45(8), e806–e813. doi:10.1097/ccm.[removed]9 healthit.gov. (2018c). what is an electronic health record (ehr)?

retrieved from https://www.healthit.gov/faq/what-electronic-health-record-ehr rao-gupta, s., kruger, d. leak, l. d., tieman, l. a., & manworren, r. c. b. (2018). leveraging interactive patient care technology to improve pain management engagement. pain management nursing, 19(3), 212–221. doi:10.1016/j.pmn.2017.11.002 note: you will access this article from the walden library databases. skiba, d. (2017). evaluation tools to appraise social media and mobile applications. informatics, 4(3), 32–40. doi:10.3390/informatics[removed] note: you will access this article from the walden library databases.