

Criteria	Ratings				Pts
Part 2: Advanced Levels of Clinical Inquiry and Systematic Reviews Create a 6- to 7-slide PowerPoint presentation in which you do the following: · Identify and briefly describe your chosen clinical issue of interest. · Describe how you developed a PICO(T) question focused on your chosen clinical issue of interest. · Identify the four research databases that you used to conduct your search for the peer-reviewed articles you selected. · Describe the levels of evidence in each of the four peer-reviewed articles you selected, including an explanation of the strengths of using systematic reviews for clinical research. Be specific and provide examples.	80 to >71.0 pts Excellent The presentation clearly and accurately identifies and describes in detail the chosen clinical issue of interest. ...The presentation clearly and accurately describes in detail the developed PICO(T) question. ...The presentation clearly and accurately identifies four or more research databases used to conduct a search for the peer-reviewed articles selected. ...The presentation includes specific and relevant examples that fully support the research. ...The presentation provides a complete, detailed, and accurate synthesis of two outside resources related to the peer-reviewed articles selected, and fully integrates at least two outside resources and two or three course-specific resources that fully support the presentation.	71 to >63.0 pts Good The presentation accurately identifies and describes the chosen clinical issue of interest. ...The presentation accurately describes the developed PICO(T) question focused on the chosen clinical issue of interest. ...The presentation accurately identifies at least four research databases used to conduct a search for the peer-reviewed articles selected. ...The presentation includes relevant examples that support the research presented.	63 to >55.0 pts Fair The presentation inaccurately or vaguely identifies and describes the chosen clinical issue of interest. ...The presentation inaccurately or vaguely describes the developed PICO(T) question focused on the chosen clinical issue of interest. ...The presentation inaccurately or vaguely identifies at least four research databases used to conduct a search for the peer-reviewed articles selected. ...The presentation includes inaccurate or vague examples to support the research presented.	55 to >0 pts Poor The presentation inaccurately and vaguely identifies and describes the chosen clinical issue of interest or is missing. ...The presentation inaccurately and vaguely describes the developed PICO(T) question or is missing. ...The presentation inaccurately and vaguely identifies less than four research databases used to conduct a search for the peer-reviewed articles selected or is missing. ...The presentation includes inaccurate and vague examples to support the research presented or is missing.	80 pts

Criteria	Ratings				Pts
Resource Synthesis	5 to >4.0 pts Excellent Using proper in-text citations, the presentation clearly and accurately provides at least four peer-reviewed systematic review type articles selected, describes the levels of evidence in each of the four articles selected, including a thorough and detailed explanation of the strengths of using systematic reviews for clinical research.	4 to >3.0 pts Good Using proper in-text citations, the presentation accurately provides at least four systematic review type peer-reviewed articles selected including adequate explanation of the levels of evidence, the strengths of using a systematic review for	3 to >2.0 pts Fair Using proper in-text citations, the presentation provides a vague or inaccurate synthesis or outside resources related to the systematic review type peer-reviewed articles selected. The response minimally explains the levels of evidence and the strengths of using a systematic review and/or minimally integrates resources that may support the presentation.	2 to >0 pts Poor The presentation provides a vague and inaccurate synthesis of no outside resources related to the articles selected and fails to integrate any resources to support the presentation or is missing.	5 pts
Resource FormattingAppropriate peer-reviewed articles are included and citations use APA format.	5 to >4.0 pts Excellent Presentation includes 4 or more peer-reviewed articles selected using systematic reviews for clinical research. ...Citations use correct APA format with no errors.	4 to >3.0 pts Good Presentation includes 3 peer-reviewed articles selected using systematic reviews for clinical research. ...Citations use correct APA format with few (1-2) errors.	3 to >2.0 pts Fair Presentation includes 2 peer-reviewed articles selected using systematic reviews for clinical research. ...Citations contain several (3-4) APA format errors.	2 to >0 pts Poor Presentation includes 1 or no resources. ... Citations contain many >5 APA format errors.	5 pts
PowerPoint Presentation:The presentation is	5 to >4.0 pts Excellent	4 to >3.0 pts Good	3 to >2.0 pts Fair	2 to >0 pts Poor	5 pts

Criteria	Ratings				Pts
professional; images are appropriately attributed; images are clear. The presentation text is readable. Presentation flows well and is presented in a logical order.	The presentation is professional; images are appropriately attributed; images are clear. The presentation text is readable. Presentation flows well and is presented in a logical order.	Eighty percent of the presentation is professional; images are appropriately attributed; images are clear. The presentation text is readable. Presentation flows well and is presented in a logical order.	Sixty to seventy nine percent of the presentation follows these guidelines: presentation is professional; images are appropriately attributed; images are clear. The presentation text is readable. Presentation flows well and is presented in a logical order.	Less than sixty percent of the presentation follows these guidelines: presentation is professional; images are appropriately attributed; images are clear. The presentation text is readable. Presentation flows well and is presented in a logical order.	
Written Expression and Formatting—English Writing Standards:Correct grammar, mechanics, and proper punctuation.	5 to >4.0 pts Excellent Uses correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation with no errors.	4 to >3.0 pts Good Contains a few (one or two) grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.	3 to >2.0 pts Fair Contains several (three or four) grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.	2 to >0 pts Poor Contains many (five or more) grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors that interfere with the reader’s understanding.	5 pts
Total Points: 100					