Click to verify

Johns hopkins model for evidence based practice

MSN Project Model Guidelines and Rubric Evidence-Based Models Provide a Framework for Improving Clinical Practice Evidence-based practice (EBP) has its roots in the 1800s, when nurse Florence Nightingale utilized patient outcomes to inform care decisions. The concept gained official recognition in medicine in 1992 with Scottish physician Archibald Cochrane's introduction. EBP combines high-quality research, clinical knowledge, and patient choice to enhance clinical practice and patient outcomes (Dugan & Gabuya, 2019). A framework for decision-making is provided by evidence-based practice models. The Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice Model serves as a guide for improving clinical quality and enhancing patient outcomes. This model consists of three phases – practice, evidence, and translation – identified by the PET acronym. The process involves 19 steps, divided into three phases. The first phase entails developing the practice question, which involves assembling a team to address a care concern (Dang & Dearholt, 2018). The second phase is the search for evidence, while the third phase involves translation. The PET model has three main phases: 1. Practice and modification of the practice question 2. Search and evaluation of evidence 3. Translation In this process, a team develops an EBP clinical question by identifying stakeholders, choosing a leader, and planning meetings (Dang & Dearholt, 2018). The search for evidence is evaluated using appendix H of the JHNEBP. Based on the level of evidence, the team decides whether to recommend translation. If change is approved, an action plan will be developed, implemented, and appraised. The results are reported to stakeholders, and further action is determined based on findings (Dang & Dearholt, 2018). Given text: paraphrase this text clinical question in PICOT format. PICOT is an acronym representing the 5 elements of a clinical question. Patient or population, intervention, comparison, outcome, and the optional element of time are represented by P-I-C-O-T. I have adjusted my PICOT question to reflect my practicum location. My PICOT question is: Are students (P) who have not received the annual influenza vaccine (I) compared to those students who have received the annual flu vaccination (C) at increased risk for absenteeism (O) during the school year (T)? Practice Example The Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence Based Practice Model can be used as a guide for change. Following the PET process, the JHNEBP model will guide in the development of a PICOT question, the research process, and translation of the results. Appendix A, the project management guide, will assist me through the process, assuring all 19 steps are completed and recorded. Find Out How NursingAnswers.net Can Help You! Our academic experts are ready and waiting to assist with any writing project you may have. From simple essay plans, through to full dissertations, you can guarantee we have a service perfectly matched to your needs. View our academic writing services The JHNEBP has multiple tools to assist in the completion of the evidence-based practice improvement. Appendix D is a guide to assist in determining the level of the evidence, and the quality of the evidence. Appendix E, the research evidence appraisal tool, will assist in the appraisal of the research, determining the type and quality, Using Appendix F, the same appraisal can be completed for nonresearch evidence. The use of appendix D, E, and F will assist me in determining if the research is of high quality and will provide the best evidence to support the proposed evidence based change. Appendix I of the JHNEBP model is the action planning tool. This tool serves as a guide in the final steps of evaluating the information gathered and developing an action plan. Lastly is Appendix J, the dissemination tool. This tool is used to review the findings and plan the presentation of the results. Conclusion Evidence-based practice (EBP) combines high quality research, clinical knowledge, and patient values to provide quality patient outcomes. The Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice model provides a framework and guidance through the research process to developing an evidence-based plan for change. When an evidence-based model is used to assist in the process of change, a framework is provided to assure the gathered research information is of the highest quality, and the necessary steps have been completed to plan an evidence based change. The EBP model will provide the framework to providing the highest quality of evidence-based patient care. References Dang, D. & Dearholt, S. (2018). Johns Hopkins nursing evidence-based practice: Model and guidelines (3rd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Sigma Theta Tau International. Dugan, K. & Gabuya, A. (2019). A “snippet” of evidence leads to practice change. Nursing Management 50(6), 16-18. doi: 10.1097/01.NUMA.0000558491.89888.f8 Johns Hopkins Medicine. (2017). Evidence-Based Practice Model Expands to Enhance Patient Care A new model for evidence-based practice has been developed at Johns Hopkins, aiming to improve patient outcomes through strategic leadership, skill-building, and resource allocation. The Institute for Johns Hopkins Nursing, in collaboration with Sigma Theta Tau, the Honor Society of Nursing, has published a comprehensive guide to implementing this model. Evidence-based practice is crucial for nurses to make informed patient-care decisions, according to Karen Haller, PhD, RN, FAAN. The book provides guidance on using the principles of evidence-based practice to evaluate research and make critical care decisions. The 224-page book targets nurses in clinical practice, nursing faculty, and students, covering topics such as the definition, history, and relevance of evidence-based practice, as well as its application in various healthcare settings. It also offers recommendations for creating an environment that supports evidence-based practice. A set of eight critical appraisal tools is designed to help nurses evaluate research, including tools for systematic reviews, randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, case control studies, economic evaluations, diagnostic studies, qualitative studies, and clinical prediction rules. Additionally, the book mentions the importance of grading quality (or certainty) of evidence and strength of recommendations, citing various frameworks such as the GRADE working group and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. These tools aim to provide a common approach to assessing quality and strength of evidence in healthcare settings. Nurses' Perception of Evidence-Based Practice Models in Hospitals Evidence-Based Practice Models and Frameworks: A Scoping Review of Best Practices. The five main steps of evidence-based practice (EBP), including acquiring the best evidence, appraising it, applying findings to clinical practice, evaluating outcomes with patient values and preferences, and demonstrating clinical skills, form a comprehensive framework. A scoping review identified 19 models and frameworks that met inclusion criteria from electronic databases published between January 1990 and April 2022. The reviewed EBP models and frameworks demonstrate varying levels of instruction on assessing evidence, with only seven integrating patient values and preferences into their processes. Many models provide diverse tools and contextual instructions, while others offer general process guidance. Expertise in EBP is crucial for assessing evidence, and the level of instruction to assess evidence varies significantly among models. A comprehensive review of existing EBP models and frameworks reveals gaps in integrating patient values and preferences into clinical decision-making. The lack of standardization in EBP expertise and knowledge assessment requires consideration when selecting a model or framework. Sackett's model, a cornerstone in evidence-based practice (EBP), emphasizes patient value and preferences alongside clinical skills and best available evidence. This framework has been widely integrated into various healthcare fields due to its influence. Historically, EBP's foundation was centered around asking questions, acquiring literature, and appraising evidence but struggled with integrating it into practice. The five steps in Sackett's model might seem straightforward, but each area encompasses a vast array of methods for reviewing literature, such as PRISMA and Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, as well as entire fields like implementation science. Implementation science, which dates back to the 1960s with Everett Rogers' Diffusion of Innovation Theory, has grown alongside EBP over the past quarter century. One way to manage EBP's complexity is through developing models and frameworks that determine resource needs, identify barriers and facilitators, and guide processes. These models provide insight into transforming evidence into clinical practice and allow organizations to assess readiness, willingness, and potential outcomes for a hospital system. While EBP and implementation science sometimes overlap, the former encompasses all five of Sackett's steps, whereas the latter typically focuses on the final two steps. A comprehensive review of EBP models and frameworks is lacking, despite published scoping reviews of implementation science. This scoping review aimed to explore how EBP models and frameworks used in healthcare settings align with the original EBP five-step model. The Arksey and O'Malley method guided this review, alongside PRISMA-ScR procedures. The primary author established the research question and inclusion and exclusion criteria before conducting the review. A single research question guided the review: Which EBP models and frameworks align with Sackett's original model? To be included in the review, English language published EBP models and frameworks needed to include the five main steps of EBP based on Sackett's model. Exclusions consisted of models or frameworks focused on specific areas unrelated to EBP. Given article text here Looking at how studies on evidence-based practice were identified and evaluated for relevance to Sackett's model, a search in major medical databases from 1990 to 2022 uncovered potential models and frameworks. These included abstracts, letters, editorials, opinion articles, and dissertations that met specific inclusion criteria. A thorough review of the literature revealed numerous studies on evidence-based practice in hospitals, nursing, and academic settings. Key features of identified models and frameworks were analyzed, focusing on alignment with Sackett's five-step EBP process. The primary author conducted data extraction and analysis, which involved mapping detailed information to identify general themes and knowledge gaps. This scoping review aimed to identify models and frameworks that align with Sackett's model, thereby providing insight into their key features and limitations. The search strategy employed a range of keywords related to evidence-based practice, including variations in spelling and terminology. Additionally, reference lists from included publications were scrutinized for relevant models and frameworks. Disagreements between authors were resolved through consensus, ensuring that only high-quality studies were included in the analysis. The search identified 6523 potentially relevant references. The primary author screened 37 full papers, including 19 models and frameworks that targeted healthcare or public health organisations. Only five models included individual clinicians. Models and frameworks were assessed and mapped. Fifteen had broad target audiences, while five focused on individual clinicians. The Iowa Model is recommended for organisational use, featuring a detailed flowchart to guide decision-making. Monash Partners Learning Health Systems Framework takes a stakeholder-driven approach, integrating research and data to promote sustainability and scalability. ARCC assesses healthcare organisation readiness for change, identifies barriers and facilitators, and implements evidence into practice. The Clinical Scholar Model focuses on developing point-of-care nurses as clinical scholars committed to patient care and knowledge development. JBI's Global Health framework generates evidence and promotes its use. Different evidence-based practice (EBP) models, such as CETEP23, Johns Hopkins21, Stetler Model17, KTA18, and EBMgt19, were reviewed to identify key components and principles. These models utilise various types of evidence, including systematic reviews, guidelines, and expert opinion, with patient values not clearly integrated in most cases. Users must possess a level of knowledge and related skills to assess evidence effectively. The process typically involves identifying a clinical practice question, searching for and appraising the evidence, planning implementation, and evaluating the outcome. Well-developed tool kits are available to guide question development, evidence-rating scales, and appraisal guides for various forms of evidence. The process of integrating patient values/preferences was not clearly covered across various models, including the Iowa Model, the I3 Model, the Model for Change, and the ACE Star Model. While these models emphasize the importance of considering patient-centered care, they often fail to explicitly incorporate patient values/preferences into their frameworks. Evidence-based practice models like the Iowa Model and the I3 Model focus on integrating evidence, clinical skill, and patient preferences/values, but may not provide clear guidance on how to do so effectively. The Model for Change emphasizes the importance of patient involvement in the change process, but patient values/preferences are not clearly integrated into its framework. Similarly, the ACE Star Model promotes the consideration of expertise and patient preference as forms of evidence, but it does not explicitly address how to integrate patient values/preferences into practice. The various Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) models and frameworks discussed in the article highlight the diversity of approaches to implementing EBP in healthcare settings. While some models, such as the San Diego 8A's EBP Model and the Tyler Collaborative Model for EBP, provide a structured process for assessing clinical problems, generating recommendations, and implementing practice changes, others focus on identifying organizational or hospital-level barriers to EBP adoption. Key features of these models include the use of change theories, mentors, and facilitators to support EBP implementation. However, most models do not explicitly address patient preference or values as evidence in the decision-making process. Instead, they emphasize the importance of systematic searching for literature, acquisition of existing sources, and appraisal of the levels of evidence. The Practice Guidelines Development Cycle is another framework that outlines a structured approach to developing clinical guidelines, including selecting clinical problems, generating recommendations, ratifying them, and implementing policies. While this cycle tolerates some discordance between EBP and clinical guidelines, institutional policies, and patient preferences, it requires documentation to ensure its success. Overall, the article highlights the need for healthcare professionals to possess a level of knowledge and related skills to assess literature and apply EBP principles effectively. The evaluation process of evidence-based practice (EBP) models and frameworks reveals significant variability among them. Most provide a general overview, but few offer detailed tools and instructions for assessing levels of evidence and implementing change. A notable exception is the Monash Partners Learning Health Systems framework, which utilizes internal and external data to measure success. This framework stands out for its emphasis on using evidence in decision-making as a benchmark for successful implementation. Many EBP models and frameworks include the five main steps of EBP as described by Sackett. However, their themes are diverse, ranging from well-developed and widely used models like the Iowa EBP model to those providing only high-level overviews, such as the ACE Star model. The lack of expertise needed to assess literature remains a consistent finding in clinician experience with EBP. Despite these variations, most models recommend pilot programs for implementing change and using evidence-based mentors and experts to assist in implementation. Patient values and preferences are discussed in 13 models, but only 7 incorporate this topic into their model or framework, and only 5 include tools and instructions. The large number of EBP models and frameworks can be overwhelming for healthcare organizations, making it challenging to determine the best tool for their needs. This review aims to better assist organizations by examining the characteristics and gaps of various models and frameworks. It has been shown that users need to have the necessary knowledge and skills to complete this step in the process. The models and frameworks used varied greatly in terms of instruction for assessing evidence, with most providing a general overview, while some recommended using EBP mentors and experts. Some models, such as ARCC, JBI, and Johns Hopkins, offered robust tools and resources that would require administrative time and financial support. However, most models did not provide sufficient resources or guidance for assessing evidence. Sackett's five-step model highlighted the importance of considering patient values and preferences when implementing EBP, which is often criticized for ignoring these aspects. While many models reported the need to include patient values and preferences, few provided adequate tools or instruction for doing so. The ARCC model integrated patient preferences and values, but it was up to the EBP mentor to accomplish this task. The inclusion of patient and family values and preferences is crucial for successful EBP implementation. This review had several strengths, including a rigorous search and literature evaluation by multiple people. However, limitations included the potential exclusion of well-developed models that did not include all five steps, such as the PARIHS framework. Healthcare organizations can support EBP by choosing a suitable model or framework and providing clear guidance for implementation. Some may find the ARCC or Clinical Scholars Model suitable due to their emphasis on mentors, while others may prefer the Johns Hopkins model for its grading tools. Evidence suggests that EBP models and frameworks may not adequately incorporate patient and family values and preferences, despite the importance of considering these factors in healthcare decision-making.22-25 The Iowa model, for instance, provides feedback loops throughout its process, but it is unclear whether this approach effectively captures patient experiences.38-41 On the other hand, some EBP models, such as JBI and Johns Hopkins, have developed tools to incorporate patient values and preferences, but these are not consistently used across all frameworks.21-25 This scoping review of 19 EBP models and frameworks highlights the need for greater clarity on how patient values and preferences can be integrated into these models, as well as consideration of EBP expertise when selecting a model or framework. The authors of this study did not involve patients or the public in designing, conducting, reporting, or disseminating their research findings. The study underwent external peer review but was not commissioned by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ). Supplemental material provided by the authors has not been vetted by BMJ and may not have undergone peer review. The opinions and recommendations presented are solely those of the authors and do not reflect the views of BMJ. BMJ disclaims any liability for reliance on this content, particularly with regards to translated materials which may not be accurate or reliable. No data is available for this study, as it is not applicable. References: 1.Guyatt GH (1991). Evidence-Based medicine. ACP Journal Club, 114(A16). 2.Djulbegovic B and Guyatt GH (2017). Progress in evidence-based medicine: a quarter century on. Lancet, 390(415–23). 3.Wolfe A (2001). Institute of medicine report: crossing the quality chasm: a new health care system for the 21st century. Policy, Politics Nurs Pract, 2(233–5). 4.Zimerman AL (2013). Evidence-Based medicine: a short history of a modern medical movement. AMA J Ethics, 15(71–6). 5.Sackett DL (1997). Evidence-Based medicine. Semin Perinatol, 21(3–5). 6.Rosswurm MA and Larrabee JH (1999). A model for change to evidence-based practice. Image J Nurs Sch, 31(317–22). 7.Bauer MS and Kirchner J (2020). Implementation science: what is it and why should I care? Psychiatry Res, 283(112376). 8.Snyder H (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: an overview and guidelines. J Business Res, 104(333–9). 9.Rogers EM (2010). Diffusion of innovations. 10.Nilsen P (2020). Making sense of implementation theories, models, and frameworks. Implement Sci, 30(53–79). 11.Schaffer MA et al (2013). Evidence-Based practice models for organizational change: overview and practical applications. J Adv Nurs, 69(1197–209). 12.Melnyk BM et al (2011). Evidence-Based practice, step by step: sustaining evidence-based practice through organizational policies and an innovative model. Am J Nurs, 111(57–60). 13.Nilsen P and Bernhardsson S (20XX). Context matters in implementation A review examining determinant frameworks that describe contextual factors influencing implementation outcomes was conducted. The findings were published in BMC Health Serv Res (2019) and Implementation Sci (2020). A methodological framework for scoping studies was also developed, as outlined in Int J Soc Res Methodol (2005). To facilitate evidence-based practice, the PRISMA-scr checklist was created (Ann Intern Med 2018). The Stetler model of research utilization was updated to promote evidence-based practice (Nursing Outlook 2001). Knowledge translation strategies were explored in audiology (Trends Amplif 2011) and healthcare management (Int J Health Care Qual Assur 2018). Evidence-Based architectural design was found to support Magnet empirical outcomes (J Nurs Adm 2010). Organizational change strategies for evidence-based practice were also identified (J Nurs Adm 2007). The updated Joanna Briggs Institute model of evidence-based healthcare was published in Int J Evid Based Healthc (2019). Models and frameworks for promoting clinical excellence through evidence-based practice were discussed, including the Iowa model of evidence-based practice (Revisions and validation worldviews on evidence-based nursing 2017) and an inductive model for evidence-based practice (Nursing Clin North Am 2009). A learning health system framework was proposed to operationalize health data and improve quality care (Front Med 2021). The articles listed explore various aspects of sustainability and implementation of evidence-based practice (EBP) in healthcare, particularly in nursing. Some studies examine the challenges and factors influencing EBP adoption, such as power dynamics, contextual factors, and consumer preferences. Others focus on developing and implementing frameworks for EBP, including strategic collaborations, quality improvement programs, and innovation models. Several articles discuss the importance of considering patient-centered care approaches and values when implementing EBP. Additionally, some studies highlight the need for a nuanced understanding of EBP implementation, acknowledging that it requires more than just providing evidence-based information to healthcare professionals. Other topics addressed include the role of policy recommendations in supporting EBP, the connection between EBM and shared decision-making, and the challenges faced by health policymakers when making evidence-based decisions. Overall, these articles contribute to a better understanding of the complexities surrounding EBP implementation and sustainability in healthcare. Research studies referenced in this article include the work by Gualandi and colleagues, which explored patients' experiences during hospital stays, as published in PLoS One (2019). Another study cited is Browman et al.'s research on practice guidelines development, appearing in the Journal of Clinical Oncology (1995). This section aggregates data citations, availability statements, and supplementary materials mentioned within this article.