

SYLLABUS UPDATED
 AGAIN PER GSC'S
 REQUEST (RECIEVED
 2/24/2015)

Revised Syllabus 12-11-14
 w/ Dept communication

031
 RECEIVED
 JUN 11 2014
 WSU Registrar

Washington State University
 MAJOR CURRICULAR CHANGE FORM - - COURSE
 (Submit original signed form and ten copies to the Registrar's Office, zip 1035.)

Future Effective Date: 08/01/2015 New course Temporary course Drop service course
 (effective date cannot be retroactive) There is a course fee associated with this course (see instructions)

- Variable credit _____
- Increase credit (former credit 2)
- Number (former number _____)
- Crosslisting (between WSU departments)
(Must have both departmental signatures)
- Conjoint listing (400/500)
- Request to meet Writing in the Major [M] requirement (Must have All-University Writing Committee Approval)
- Request to meet GER in _____ (Must have GenEd Committee Approval) Fulfills GER lab (L) requirement
- Professional course (Pharmacy & Vet Med only) Graduate credit (professional programs only)
- Other (please list request) _____

NURS 535 Philosophy of Nursing Science
 course prefix course no. title

credit	lecture hrs per week	lab hrs per week	studio hrs per week	prerequisite
<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>			

Description (20 words or less) _____

Instructor: Roxanne Vandermause Phone number: (509) 324-7281 Email: rvandermause@wsu.edu
 Contact: Eileen Swalling Phone number: (509) 324-7297 Email: eswalling@wsu.edu
 Campus Zip Code: 5291

- Please attach rationale for your request, a current and complete syllabus, and explain how this impacts other units in Pullman and other branches (if applicable).
- Secure all required signatures and provide 10 copies to the Registrar's Office.

Roxanne Vandermause 6/3/14 Chair/date
Patricia G. Dufield 6/5/2014 Dean/date
 _____ General Education Com/date
 _____ Chair (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary)*
 _____ Dean (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary)*
 _____ Graduate Studies Com/date
 _____ All-University Writing Com/date
 _____ Academic Affairs Com/date
 _____ Senate/date

*If the proposed change impacts or involves collaboration with other units, use the additional signature lines provided for each impacted unit and college.

NURS535

The course is considered valuable to the PhD core and in need of an additional credit (from 2 credits to 3 credits). An additional SLO and relevant assignments are included. This answers to the AACN recommendation for strong nursing science and philosophy in nursing PhD programs

31
Rec'd
12-11-14

WSU College of Nursing (CON)
Response to WSU Catalogue Initial Review of Four Syllabi for PhD in Nursing
October 30, 2014

To: Marc Evans, Professor of Statistics

From: Mel Haberman, Professor of Nursing, Acting Director of PhD in Nursing Program

031, NURS 535: Philosophy of Nursing Science (3 credits), Summer 2015

Course Specific Comments:

NURS 535 – Course Outline (week to week schedule) lists the course as occurring “summer of 2013” and meeting for 8 weeks. Please realize that a 3 credit lecture course requires 45 contact hours (lecture), and the course, as specified, doesn’t meet that criteria. There is no grade scale based on the various assignment percentages.

CON Response: The syllabus was changed to accurately state we hope to begin the course in “summer 2015.” The WSU Graduate School Grading Formula (p. 12) and CON Grading Formula (p. 12) have both been added. The Course Map (pp. 17-18) states the SLOs that indicate what the student will be able to do at the end of the course.

The Student Presentation Grading Rubric (pp. 13-14) was revised to indicate the points assigned to various assignments. The student presentation is 95% of the course’s graded activity and the section on Audience *Participation & Discussion Performance* includes 5% of the student’s grade. This 5% combines the rubric for class participation (*Discussion Performance Grading Criteria* (pp. 9-12) and the grade assigned for the facilitation of discussion during the student’s final paper presentation.

In regards to the comment that the course doesn’t meet the criteria for 45 hours of lecture, it would be impossible in our hybrid course delivery model to conduct synchronous lectures for 45 hours in the 8 week class. The class offers 18 hours of synchronous class time. Therefore, the course uses a combination of live class time plus web-based, asynchronous discussion forums that require student assignments, reading and commenting on other students’ assignments, and interaction among the instructor and class as-a-whole. The 27 hours for asynchronous delivery are added to the weekly class schedule to show total contact hours of 45 hours. These hours do not reflect the 6 weekly hours that students are expected to devote to class preparation for a 3 credit course.

Another textbook was added to justify the objective related to moral theory and nursing science (Jonsen et al., 2010). The course description was slightly changed to reflect the importance of ethical comportment.

COURSE NUMBER:	Nursing 535 Summer 2015
COURSE TITLE:	Philosophy of Nursing Science
CREDIT HOURS:	3
FACULTY:	Billie M. Severtsen Email: severt@wsu.edu Phone: Office: 509.324.7286 Mobile: 509.3896491; okay to send text messages (please identify yourself by name) Office: Spokane Nursing 222B Office hours: By appointment – please email or call me to arrange
PREREQUISITES:	Admission to doctoral program or permission
MEETING TIME:	Thursdays, 10AM – 1PM See course calendar within this document
MEETING LOCATION:	On-campus sessions: SNRS 201 Some sessions held via Polycom for distance students Some sessions are asynchronous See course calendar within this document

CATALOGUE DESCRIPTION

Examine and analyze the structure and organization of fields of knowledge in science including historical and philosophical tenets of inquiry.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Students enrolled in this course will analyze and discuss the major characteristics, classifications, functions, and structure of knowledge and will explore relationships between characteristics of knowledge, nursing inquiry, and ethical comportment. The course will include a review of positivist, paradigmatic, evolutionary, and post-empirical philosophy and inquiry and will address contemporary questions surrounding objectivism and subjectivism in comprehension and understanding and application of knowledge.

COURSE OUTCOMES

The student will be able to:

1. Systematically examine the distinguishing characteristics of different classes of knowledge.
2. Examine and analyze the character and constitution of scientific knowledge.
3. Evaluate the context(s) in which scientific knowledge develops.
4. Explore the relationships between understanding, science, inquiry, and practice.
5. Compare concepts, assumptions, and methods of the sciences.
6. Examine the relationship between moral theory and nursing science

PHILOSOPHY OF NURSING SCIENCE

From the outset of this course, we will consider how science has evolved across history, how knowledge has developed within science and within nursing, and how history lives in the work and scholarship of contemporary nurses. To begin this thoughtful and challenging work, consider the origins of the words that comprise the name of this course, Philosophy of Nursing Science.

philosophy

c. 1300, from Old French *filosofie* (12c.), from L. *philosophia*, from Greek *philosophia* "love of knowledge, wisdom," from *philo-* "loving" + *sophia* "knowledge, wisdom," from *sophis* "wise, learned."

The meaning, "system a person forms for the conduct of life" is attested from 1771.

nursing – a form of the word nurse

From about the 12th century: *nurric* "wet nurse, foster-mother to a young child," from Old French *norrice*, related to the word **nourish**.

First use of the meaning "person who takes care of sick" was recorded in England about 1590; this was a common use by about 1735.

Quantum Nursing: What we do when we offer others *our life energy, focus, and intention* through our work. (Curtain, 2010)

science

Early definition – from about 1300: "knowledge (of something) acquired by study," also "a particular branch of knowledge," from Old French *science*, from Latin *scientia* "knowledge," from *sciens* (gen. *scientis*), prp. of *scire* "to know," probably originally "to separate one thing from another, to distinguish," related to *scindere* "to cut, divide, separate."

Modern sense of "non-arts studies" is attested from 1678. The distinction is commonly understood as between *theoretical truth* (Gk. *episteme*) and *methods for effecting practical results* (*tekhne*), but in common use *science* sometimes is used for practical applications and *art* for applications of skill.

From 1725: Main modern (restricted) sense of "body of regular or methodical observations or propositions ... concerning any subject or speculation." Note that in the 17th and 18th centuries this concept commonly was called *philosophy*.

Source: Online Etymology Dictionary, <http://www.etymonline.com>; retrieved May 19, 2011.

REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS:

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*, 6th Ed. Author: Washington, D.C.

Risjord, M. W. (2009). *Nursing knowledge: Science, practice, and philosophy*. Indianapolis: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN-10: 1405184345 | ISBN-13: 978-1405184342

Rodgers, Beth L. (2004). *Developing nursing knowledge: Philosophical traditions and influences*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins. ISBN-10: 0781747082 | ISBN-13: 978-0781747080

Willis, Jerry W. (2007) *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive and Critical Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN-10: 1412927412 | ISBN-13: 978-1412927413

Jonsen, A.R., Siegler, M, Winslade, W. (2010) *Clinical Ethics; A practical approach to ethical decisions in clinical medicine*. 7th Ed. New York, NY:McGraw-Hill ISBN 978-0-07-163414-4

OTHER REQUIRED READINGS

Required reading for this course includes a variety of articles intended to supplement information that is available in the text. There is a list of these articles at the end of this document. Using the WSU library, locate these articles electronically and download them to read. Under the *Fair Use* rules of copyright law, you may obtain a single copy of any of these articles but may not distribute the articles electronically to other students.

COURSE VALUES

Teaching and learning are more about asking good questions than about finding answers. This certainly does not prevent us from *seeking* answers, and it is hoped that everyone who participates in this course will engage in that search.

This course does not present any opportunity to present *uninformed opinion* as a substitute for thoughtful, well-prepared scholarly engagement. It is expected that students will incorporate new knowledge gained through disciplined study and rigorous preparation into all course discussions whether online or in a face-to-face setting.

COURSE POLICIES

In general in this course and in all of the activities that are part of this class, all College of Nursing and Washington State University student handbook and Graduate School guidelines, academic policies, and standards of conduct apply. Students are assumed to and responsible to be aware of these policies and standards as written and available on the University websites and in University publications.

Policies that are specific to this course are described below in alphabetical order, not in order of importance. All policies carry equal importance and weight. If you do not understand something that is written here, it is your responsibility to seek clarification.

Workload

It is WSU policy that for every hour of faculty directed activities, students should expect a minimum of two hours engaged in supportive learning activities. Depending on your skills and knowledge as a learner, additional time may be required.

Attendance

The PhD program requires on-campus attendance during four mandatory summer class sessions: one each week during the first two weeks of summer session, and one each week during the last two weeks of summer session. Students will be informed of these mandatory classes about two months in advance so you can make adjustments to your family/work schedules. Additionally, two mandatory attendance sessions are delivered synchronously by Polycom. Absence from part or all of a class is handled on a case-by-case basis. Please notify faculty by email if you plan to be absent. A make-up assignment may be required for missed classes. Students are expected to arrange all other activities so that you will be on time for class sessions and so that you will be able to stay until the conclusion of each class or clinical session. The Student Performance Grading Rubric specifies the number of points assigned to class attendance.

Changes in the Syllabus

The instructor reserves the right to make changes in the syllabus at any time during the semester. Students will be notified by email when any changes to the syllabus are made. The most current syllabus will be available on the course Angel site at all times.

Classroom Etiquette

Students may not use cellular telephones during any class or clinical session. Cell phones must be in the OFF position during any class session. Exceptions will be made only to comply with disability services requests made through the Disability Resource Center.

Disability Services

WSU Disability Statement

Reasonable accommodations are available for students with a documented disability. If you have a disability and may need accommodations to fully participate in this class, please visit the Access Center on your campus. All accommodations **MUST** be approved through the appropriate Access Center. Please stop by or call 509-335-3417 to make an appointment with an Access Advisor.

WSU-Pullman Access Center
Washington Building, Room 217
509-335-3417

WSU-Vancouver Disability Services
<http://studentaffairs.vancouver.wsu.edu/student-resource-center/disability-services>
VMMC, Lower Level
360-546-9138

WSU-TriCities Disability Services
<http://www.tricity.wsu.edu/disability/>
Student Services Department, West Bldg, Room 262
509-372-7352.

WSU-Spokane Disability Services
<http://spokane.wsu.edu/students/current/StudentAffairs/disability/disabilitystatement.html>
Academic Center, Room 130
509-358-7534

Distance students may contact their 'home' campus office or may wish to access information at this website:

<http://drc.wsu.edu/default.asp?PageID=1799>

Guests

Students may not bring guests, including children, to class, without the specific permission of the professor.

Instructional Strategies

This course will use face-to-face instruction as well as synchronous and asynchronous distance technology to examine and extend theoretical dimensions of nursing science and philosophic inquiry. Active participation is expected and required. Participation should incorporate pertinent readings and thoughtful reflections; discussion will amplify understanding. Discussions – in person and online – will draw from notes, student-generated material, readings, personal reflection, spontaneous ideas, and any and all kinds of questions.

Late Assignments

With rare exception, late assignments will not be accepted for grading. Feedback will be provided for assignments turned in after the due date and that feedback will be available to students no later than the last day of the semester.

Minimal Grades

To earn a passing grade in the course, all assignments must be completed and submitted by the due date. See policy regarding late assignments, above. You must earn at least a passing grade for all assignments in order to pass the course.

WSU AND COLLEGE OF NURSING POLICIES

Academic Integrity

As an institution of higher education, Washington State University is committed to principles of truth and academic honesty. All members of the University community share the responsibility for maintaining and supporting these principles. When a student enrolls in Washington State University, the student assumes an obligation to pursue academic endeavors in a manner consistent with the standards of academic integrity adopted by the University. To maintain the academic integrity of the community, the University cannot tolerate acts of academic dishonesty including any forms of cheating, plagiarism, or fabrication. Washington State University reserves the right and the power to discipline or to exclude students who engage in academic dishonesty. You can learn more about Academic Honesty at WSU by visiting: <http://conduct.wsu.edu>.

Academic integrity violations include actions defined as “cheating” in the Washington State University Standards of Conduct for Students. See Washington Administrative Code 504-26-010. Sanctions for academic integrity violations may include receiving a failing grade for the assignment or examination, and may also include receiving a failing grade for the course. In

some cases, the violation also may lead to the student's dismissal from the WSU College of Nursing.

WSU's Campus Safety Statement

Washington State University is committed to enhancing the safety of the students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the Pullman campus. As part of this commitment, the university has prepared a Campus Safety Plan for each campus. These plans include a listing of university policies, procedures, statistics and information relating to campus safety, emergency management and the health and welfare of the campus community.

WSU-Pullman Campus Safety Plan
<http://safetyplan.wsu.edu>

WSU-Vancouver Campus Safety Plan
<http://www.vancouver.wsu.edu/safety-plan>

WSU-Tri-Cities Campus Safety Plan
<http://www.tricity.wsu.edu/safetyplan/>

WSU-Spokane Campus Safety Plan
<http://spokane.safetyplan.wsu.edu/>

The University emergency management web site at <http://oem.wsu.edu/emergencies>.

Information about emergencies can be found on the WSU ALERT site – <http://alert.wsu.edu>. Alert notices can also be found on each campus Alert Site.

All students should sign up for Emergency Alert Notification. To do so, log onto Zzusion at <http://my.wsu.edu> and register your emergency contact information for the Crisis Communication System.

EVALUATION

Some information about the evaluation criteria for assignments is provided below. Additional details about all course assignments (including requirements, due dates, and other information) will be available in the topical outline (in this syllabus), in class or on the course Angel site. If in doubt, *ask*. There is no penalty for seeking clarification, but your grade may be negatively affected if you do not prepare assignments as directed.

1. Discussion performance (including course co-leadership) (30%)
This grade will be based the quality of participation in discussions including the incorporation of course materials. Co-leadership will involve formal and informal sharing of ideas and concepts.

2. Reflective writings (30%)

Prompts will be provided to guide the completion of Discussion Forum postings in the course Angel site; these may also serve as the basis for class discussions.

3. Papers (30% total for the two papers)

Two papers will be due during the course. **The first of these (due July 1; 10%) will be a draft of the second and final paper (due July 22; 20%).** See details about Paper #1 in the Week 4 Overview and details about Paper #2

- a. Both papers must adhere rigorously to standards found in the APA Style Manual, 6th Edition (10% of the grade for each paper).
- b. Both papers must adhere to concepts of academic honesty described in the course syllabus, in the WSU Graduate Student Handbook and as generally described by the Center for Academic Integrity (<http://www.academicintegrity.org>). Any violation of academic honesty will result in failure of the course, without exception.
- c. The title of your paper must include your last name. To accomplish this, first save the document to your computer using the “Save As...” feature of your word processing program. Type your last name and whatever other title information you wish to include into the document title box.
- d. While both papers invite you to share personal and professional experiences, values, and beliefs, the central purpose of these assignments is to demonstrate your mastery of concepts that are central to the course. It is expected that you will cite resources required for this course as well as those you select to supplement your learning.

4. Presentation (10%)

This will serve as the content of the final course session. Details will be provided during one of the first two on-campus sessions.

ACADEMIC WRITING

One of the largest challenges you will face as a doctoral student is the development of your *academic voice*, or the ability to express yourself in a serious and scholarly manner. Scholarly, academic writing aims to be clear yet sophisticated, presenting thoughtful analysis of specific concepts and ideas. Please read the *APA Publication Manual's* first three chapters for a discussion of best practices in academic writing (2010). See the first week's overview for additional resources.

Content

The content of papers should reflect the level and style of content in readings and discussions. There is an expectation that as a doctoral student, you will reach outside of your comfort zone in terms of appropriation of ideas, concepts, and frameworks. The substance of papers and other writings will be weighed against the general level of discourse in class meetings and the style and density of expression of the readings.

Thought and Expression

Clear mastery of the concepts and ideas that are central to this course will be demonstrated in the development and presentation of insightful, in-depth analysis of complex ideas. Main points should be developed and supported with relevant information and references that are appropriately incorporated. As stated in the course syllabus, this course does not provide an opportunity for the expression of your *unsupported* opinion; rather, your writing should reflect your thoughtful perspective as it is informed by the integration of new knowledge from multiple sources.

The organization and logic of your writing is critical. The expectation is for well focused, well presented, and well reasoned conclusions. The writing should flow with the reader not getting lost or having to work to determine what you are saying.

There is also an expectation that your writing/thinking has an open and inclusive character when exploring alternative systems of thought, recognizing and assessing, as appropriate, their assumptions, implications, and/or practical consequences.

Technical Matters

Your writing should be clear and demonstrate a high level of vocabulary through careful word choice. Sentences should be constructed skillfully and purposefully, but simply. Transitions between paragraphs and sections are important and will be evaluated for their efficacy in weaving your concepts, themes, and purposes together. Summaries and conclusions are also vital elements of good writing and will be evaluated based on their effectiveness.

Grammar, punctuation, and spelling are expected to be flawless. Papers, unless otherwise noted are to be completed in APA style. Particular attention should be paid to margins, text spacing, heading format, in-text citations, and the reference list. Gender-neutral language is expected in all writings.

Take time to learn to format documents using Microsoft Word, the required word processing software of the College of Nursing. Avoid the use of the space bar more than one time in any single location in your document (e.g., do not use the space bar to create tables or to center text on the page.). Similarly, do not use the 'Enter' (return) key more than once between paragraphs or to locate text. *Please do not submit any written work developed using a purchased or downloaded template or containing macros.*

Grading Rubric

In general, criteria provided in the writing rubric provided in this syllabus will be used to evaluate student writing. A copy of this rubric can also be found on the course Angel site.

Discussion Performance

The success of this course, like others in the doctoral program, depends in large measure on the participation and co-leadership of students. Active participation is expected and will be evaluated. Criteria included in the rubric below will form the basis for evaluation of course discussion performance. The rubric was adapted from one in use at Carnegie-Mellon University.

Discussion Performance Grading Criteria				
Component	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Unacceptable
<i>Conduct</i>	Student shows respect for members of the class, both in speech and manner, and for the method of shared inquiry and peer discussion. Does not dominate discussion. Student challenges ideas respectfully, encourages and supports others to do the same.	Student shows respect for members of the class and for the method of shared inquiry and peer discussion. Participates regularly in the discussion but occasionally has difficulty accepting challenges to his/her ideas or maintaining respectful attitude when challenging others' ideas.	Student shows little respect for the class or the process as evidenced by speech and manner. Sometimes resorts to ad hominem attacks when in disagreement with others.	Student shows a lack of respect for members of the group and the discussion process. Often dominates the discussion or disengages from the process. When contributing, can be argumentative or dismissive of others' ideas, or resorts to ad hominem attacks.
<i>Ownership/Leadership</i>	Takes responsibility for maintaining the flow and quality of the discussion whenever needed. Helps to redirect or refocus discussion when it becomes	Will take on responsibility for maintaining flow and quality of discussion, and encouraging others to participate but either is not always effective or is effective but	Rarely takes an active role in maintaining the flow or direction of the discussion. When put in a leadership role, often acts as a guard rather than a facilitator: constrains or	Does not play an active role in maintaining the flow of discussion or undermines the efforts of others who are trying to facilitate discussion.

Discussion Performance Grading Criteria				
Component	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Unacceptable
	<p>sidetracked or unproductive. Makes efforts to engage reluctant participants. Provides constructive feedback and support to others.</p>	<p>does not regularly take on the responsibility.</p>	<p>biases the content and flow of the discussion.</p>	
<i>Reasoning</i>	<p>Arguments or positions are reasonable and supported with evidence from the readings. Often deepens the conversation by going beyond the text, recognizing implications and extensions of the text. Provides analysis of complex ideas that help deepen the inquiry and further the conversation.</p>	<p>Arguments or positions are reasonable and mostly supported by evidence from the readings. In general, the comments and ideas contribute to the group's understanding of the material and concepts.</p>	<p>Contributions to the discussion are more often based on opinion or unclear views than on reasoned arguments or positions based on the readings. Comments or questions suggest a difficulty in following complex lines of argument or student's arguments are convoluted and difficult to follow.</p>	<p>Comments are frequently so illogical or without substantiation that others are unable to critique or even follow them. Rather than critique the text the student may resort to ad hominem attacks on the author instead.</p>
<i>Listening</i>	<p>Always actively attends to what others say as evidenced by regularly building on, clarifying, or responding to</p>	<p>Usually listens well and takes steps to check comprehension by asking clarifying and probing</p>	<p>Does not regularly listen well as indicated by the repetition of comments or questions presented</p>	<p>Behavior frequently reflects a failure to listen or attend to the discussion as indicated by</p>

Discussion Performance Grading Criteria				
Component	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Unacceptable
	their comments. Often reminds group of comments made by someone earlier that are pertinent.	questions, and making connections to earlier comments. Responds to ideas and questions offered by other participants.	earlier, or frequent non sequiturs.	repetition of comments and questions, non sequiturs, off-task activities.
<i>Reading</i>	Student has carefully read and understood the readings as evidenced by oral contributions; familiarity with main ideas, supporting evidence and secondary points. Comes to class prepared with questions and critiques of the readings.	Student has read and understood the readings as evidenced by oral contributions. The work demonstrates a grasp of the main ideas and evidence but sometimes interpretations are questionable. Comes prepared with questions.	Student has read the material, but comments often indicate that he/she didn't read or think carefully about it, or misunderstood or forgot many points. Class conduct suggests inconsistent commitment to preparation.	Student either is unable to adequately understand and interpret the material or has frequently come to class unprepared, as indicated by serious errors or an inability to answer basic questions or contribute to discussion.

GRADING

Numerical points are either rounded up or down using 0.5 as the cut point. Assignment and final grades are posted in Angel. From WSU Graduate School Policies: "No graded courses of "B-" or below may be dropped from a program of study for an advanced degree nor can a course be repeated for a higher grade if the final grade is "C" or higher. Any course listed on the program of study for which a grade of C(-) or below is earned must be repeated for a letter grade, not on a Pass/Fail basis." Grades are not rounded numerically either up or down.

Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Letter Grade	Numeric Score
A	95-100 %	C	73-75%

A-	90-94 %	C-	70-72 %
B+	86-89 %	D+	66-69 %
B	83-85 %	D	60-65 %
B-	80-82 %	F	< 60 %
C+	76-79 %		

Student Presentation

Each student will prepare at least one presentation during the semester. The early presentation or presentations (if one is required) will be marked as part of the student grade for Discussion Performance (5% of course grade); the final presentation will be marked to total 100 possible points in the class.

The rubric below forms the basis of the process that will be used by faculty and other students to evaluate those presentations. It was adapted from one in wide use at Washington State University.

Student Presentation Grading Rubric		
Category and Percentage	Specific Criteria	Grade
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic addresses assignment specifications • Content presented is comprehensive, accurate, and evidence-based • Key points are noted and culturally relevant • Topic is researched adequately • Confidence/comfort with topic matter as evidenced by response to questions 	3 points maximum
Organization/ Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation is well-organized, clear, and effectively structured • An appropriate introduction is used to gain the audience's attention and explain the purpose of the presentation 	2 points maximum
Use of Visual Aids/Participant Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual aids are used where appropriate • Power point slides are appropriately professional given the presentation's context • Power point slides are easy to visualize • Media are used correctly, i.e. overheads, videos, computer-generated slides, charts, etc. • Visual aids contribute to the overall effectiveness of the presentation 	1.5 points maximum

Student Presentation Grading Rubric		
Category and Percentage	Specific Criteria	Grade
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference list and website links are provided to audience 	
Style/ Presentation/ Appearance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional/Business Professional dress as if you were presenting at a national convention Nonverbal cues/gestures are appropriate to presentation and flow of ideas Content knowledge/confidence are evident 	1.5 points maximum
Audience Participation, Discussion Performance & Attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presenter(s) involved the audience and solicited feedback Questions from the audience are effectively addressed and answered correctly The presenter created an environment that facilitated questions Participation in classes during mandatory attendance dates. 	1 point maximum
Adherence to Time Limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time was used well/not rushed The presenter(s) stayed within the allotted time limit (plus or minus 5 minutes). 1 point per minute over or under allotted will be deducted from total points 	1 point maximum
	Total Points Possible	10

Written Communication Rubric

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum. *Source: Association of American Colleges and Universities*

	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Unacceptable for Graduate Work
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of Faculty or self as audience)
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	Demonstrates detailed attention to and	Demonstrates consistent use of	Follows expectations appropriate to a	Attempts to use a consistent system for

	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Unacceptable for Graduate Work
<i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	basic organization and presentation.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

COURSE MAP

Student Learning Outcomes. At the End of the Course, the Student will be Able to:	Program Outcome	Demonstration of Student Learning (assignments, presentations, etc.)
1. Systematically examine the distinguishing characteristics of different classes of knowledge.	Contribute to advancing nursing science and practice through clinical research	O-line presentation, Week 3 Online posting/reflection, Week 4
2. Examine and analyze the character and constitution of scientific knowledge.	Analyze, construct, and test theoretical frameworks that guide nursing research design, methodology, data analyses, and the transfer of new knowledge into practice.	In-class discussion, Weeks 1, 2, & 7 Online posting/reflection, Weeks 1 & 3
4. Explore the relationships between understanding, science, inquiry, and practice.	Implement innovative research designs, methodologies, leadership skills, health education, and/or lifestyle modifications techniques to address the health care needs of vulnerable populations and disparities in the access to or delivery of health care.	In-class discussion, Weeks 1, 7, & 8 Online posting/reflection, Week 3 Online posting/reflection, Week 5 Final paper: personal ontology of nursing In-class presentation, Week 8
3. Evaluate the context(s) in which scientific knowledge develops.	Create effective interdisciplinary collaborations to foster research and the transfer of evidence-based knowledge into best clinical practices.	In-class discussions, Weeks 1-8 Paper #1 and related posting

<p>5. Compare concepts, assumptions, and methods of the sciences.</p> <p>6. Examine the relationship between moral theory and nursing science</p>	<p>Synthesize knowledge from a variety of disciplines to create research designs and methods for nursing science and to address ethical, social, cultural, political, and professional issues.</p> <p>Demonstrate an awareness and appreciation for the moral/ethical implications of research as applied to one's own research interest and methodology</p>	<p>Online discussion, Weeks 2 & 3 Final paper: personal ontology or nursing</p> <p>Online discussion, final paper and oral presentation</p>
<p>Addressed in other courses including NURS 524, 526, 527, 528, 529, and 589.</p>	<p>Implement proven and emerging technologies to enhance nursing research and education.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

N535: PHILOSOPHY OF NURSING SCIENCE
SUMMER 2015
COURSE OUTLINE

Week/Date	Topic/Content	Learning Activities
Student Preparation for Week 1	Introduction to the course	Read and be familiar with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Syllabus • Chapters 1, 2, & 3 (Risjord, 2010) • Chapter 1 (Rodgers, 2005) • Week 1 Overview (provided by email; also available on course Angel site) Reflect on the questions/topics provided in the Week 1 Overview document. Be prepared to discuss these in class.
Faculty directed activities (3 hours) Week 1 June 6 10 AM – 1 PM On-campus session, Spokane	Introductions Overview of course Course, faculty, and student expectations Philosophy... Nursing... Science... Introduction to Epistemology and the Philosophy of Science	In-class discussion – readings and reflective questions, other topics
Student Preparation for Week 2	Finding time for reading	Read and reflect on the Week 2 overview, available on course Angel site

	<p>Reassuring yourself that you made the right decision to earn the PhD</p>	<p>Read and be familiar with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction, Chapters 1, 2, & 3 (American Psychological Association, 2010) • Re-Affirming and re/conceptualizing disciplinary knowledge as the foundation for doctoral education (Banks-Wallace, Despins, Adams-Leander, McBroom, & Tandy, 2008). • Quantum nursing I-V (Curtin, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2010d, 2010e) • A paradigm for the production of practice-based knowledge (Reed & Lawrence, 2008). • Values and the nursing standpoint. Chapters 4, 5, 6, & 7 (Risjord, 2010) • Jonsen: Chapter 1 - Introduction <p>Post a brief discussion in response to the prompt on the course Discussion Board. Use this as a test posting to learn about the Discussion Forums as well as an opportunity to reflect briefly on the work we've completed to this point. This is a required – but ungraded – posting.</p> <p>Deadline: June 11 at 5 PM</p>
<p>Faculty directed activities (3 hours) Week 2 June 13 10 AM – 1 PM On-campus session, Spokane</p>	<p>The nursing standpoint Practice values, disciplinary knowledge, value-laden science, standpoint epistemology, the nursing standpoint</p>	<p>In-class discussion; see Week 2 overview for reflective questions that may be posed in class</p>

	<p>Ongoing consideration of the study of philosophy as part of the research doctorate</p> <p>The nursing standpoint</p> <p>Approach to the study of philosophic traditions and their influence on knowledge development</p> <p>Writing in the doctoral program</p>	
<p>Student Preparation for Week 3</p>	<p>Reflect on your nursing career to this point as it relates to the readings about the history of philosophy and science.</p>	<p>Read and reflect on the Week 3 overview, available on course Angel site</p> <p>Read (preferably in this order) and be familiar with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classical philosophy through Toulmin's idea of science; Chapters 2-8 (Rodgers, 2005) • Human knowledge: Its nature, sources, and limits – Section III optional (Moser & vanderNat, 2003) • <i>Nursing theory and the philosophy of science</i>; Chapters 8-10 (Risjord, 2010)
<p>Faculty directed activities (6 hours)</p> <p>Week 3</p> <p>June 20</p> <p>Asynchronous, online</p>	<p>Sources and development of belief, justification, and knowledge in light of historical philosophical developments</p>	<p>Three Discussion Forum Postings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the first two postings, respond to the question sets posed below. • Each posting should be between 100 and 500 words; please include references. • Post these in the appropriate Discussion Board Forum on the course Angel site • Postings #1 & 2 Due Date: Wednesday, June 19, 11:55PM

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posting #3 Due Date: Due Date: Saturday, June 22, 11:55 PM. <p>Posting #1 should address these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have the philosophical school of Logical Positivism and <i>the received view</i> of science informed our present-day understanding of science? Of nursing scholarship? What arguments can be made <i>against</i> the received view of science in nursing? <p>Posting #2 should address these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the readings, your reflections, and, if you are enrolled in NURS 524, conversations you have had about nursing research this semester. Is it possible to describe relationships between qualitative and quantitative research using understanding you have gained through the readings you completed for this week? If so, give examples; if not, provide your rationale. <p>Posting #3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read your classmates' postings in the Angel Discussion Board. • Respond thoughtfully to <i>at least one colleague</i>, highlighting areas of agreement or disagreement with the position they have taken for one or both of the questions.
Student Preparation for Week 4		<p>Read and reflect on the Week 4 overview, available on course Angel site</p> <p>Read, reflect on the questions posed in the Week 4 overview, and be prepared to discuss in class:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapters 2 – 8 (Rodgers, 2005) (previously assigned). • Part IV: The idea of nursing science, Chapters 11, 12, & 13 (Risjord, 2010) • Knowledge for the good of the individual and society: Linking philosophy, disciplinary goals, theory, and practice (McCurry, Hunter Revell, & Roy, 2009). • Just caring (Hussey) • (Gortner, 1990). Nursing values and science: Toward a science philosophy. In Polifroni & Welch, Eds., <i>Perspectives on Philosophy of Science in Nursing</i>, p. 25-33). <p>Begin work on Paper #1 – See guidelines posted on the course Angel site (and below)</p>
<p>Faculty directed activities (3 hours) Week 4 June 27 10 AM – 1 PM On-campus session, Spokane OR Polycom</p>	<p>Historical perspectives on nursing as related to philosophy, science, discipline Nursing and the philosophy of science</p>	<p>In-class discussion – readings and reflective questions, other topics Continue work on Paper #1</p>

<p>Student Preparation for Weeks 5 & 6 First Paper</p>	<p>What is your epistemology?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare a thoughtful, scholarly, well-referenced paper that conforms to the instructions provided in the <i>First Paper Guidelines</i> document available on the course Angel site. Absolute due date/time for the paper: 7/7/2013, no later than 4 PM 2. Prepare an abstract of your paper and post that abstract in the appropriate discussion forum. The abstract should be no more than 200 words and should summarize the paper you submit for grading. Absolute due date/time for posting your abstract: 7/7/2013, no later than 4:30 PM 3. Read all the abstracts submitted by your colleagues. Respond thoughtfully to a minimum of two colleagues with comments or questions that will provide effective feedback and suggestions for future consideration and/or improvement. Absolute due date/time for posting your response: 7/10/2013, no later than 11:55 PM 4. Review feedback provided by your colleagues. Respond as necessary, posting any comments or questions you may have about your colleagues' work. <p>Read and reflect on the Weeks 5 & 6 overview, available on course Angel site</p>
---	-----------------------------------	---

		<p>In preparation for these two weeks' learning activities, read (or review if you have already read):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chapters 9 – 13 (Rodgers, 2005).• Chapters 14 – 18 (Risjord, 2010)• Chapters 1 – 3 (Willis, 2007).• <i>Warrantable evidence in nursing science</i> (Forbes et al., 1999).• Browne, A.J. ((2000). The potential contributions of critical social theory to nursing science. <i>Canadian Journal of Nursing Research</i>, 32, 35-55.• Villarruel, A.M., Bishop, T.L., Simpson, E.M., Jemmott, L.S., & Fawcett, J. (2001). Borrowed theories, shared theories, and the advancement of nursing knowledge. <i>Nursing Science Quarterly</i>, 14, 158-163.• <i>Connecting philosophy and practice: Implications of two philosophic approaches to pain for nurses' expert clinical decision making</i> (Pesut & McDonald, 2007).• <i>The informational basis for nursing intuition: Philosophical underpinnings</i> (Effken, 2007)• <i>The evidence-based practice ideologies</i> (Mantzoukas, 2007).• <i>Professional knowledge and the epistemology of reflective practice</i> (Kinsella, 2009). <p><i>A paradigm for the production of practice-based knowledge</i> (Reed & Lawrence, 2008).</p>
--	--	--

<p>Faculty directed activities (10 hours) Week 5 July 4 Asynchronous, online</p>	<p>The <i>nursing paradigm</i> Sources of knowledge development in nursing Truth in nursing science Thinking about practice: Evidence-based? Reflectively grounded? Other options? Thinking about research – role, value, epistemology</p>	<p>Thoughtful, referenced, Discussion Forum entry that addresses these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the concept of evidence-based practice have a place in nursing knowledge development? If so, what constitutes appropriate evidence (that is, could/should form the basis for the development of new knowledge)? • Does the concept of reflective practice have a place in nursing knowledge development? If so, what (if any) tenets could/should guide the development of a body of knowledge about the value of reflective practice in nursing knowledge development? • Compare/contrast the value of EBP and RBP in developing nursing knowledge. <p>Deadline for initial posting: July 9, 10 AM Note: Your Discussion Board post should be in the range of 200-500 words and should include references as appropriate. Read all of your colleagues' Discussion Board entries made in response to this assignment. Be prepared to comment or ask questions about these during class.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Faculty directed activities (3 hours) Week 6 July 11 10 AM – 1 PM On-campus session, Spokane OR Polycom</p>	<p>The <i>nursing paradigm</i> Sources of knowledge development in nursing Truth in nursing science Thinking about practice: Evidence- based? Reflectively grounded? Other options? Thinking about research – role, value, epistemology</p>	<p>In-class discussion; see Weeks 5 & 6 overview for reflective questions that may be posed in class</p>
<p>Student Preparation for Week 7</p>		<p><i>In preparation for class</i>, be prepared to discuss:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chapter 14 (Rodgers, 2005). In this chapter Rodgers considers how the future of nursing knowledge development may be shaped by methodologies that reflect contemporary philosophy. 2. Chapter 9 (Willis, 2007). 3. Chapter 19 (Risjord, 2010) 4. Listen to the audiofile: (Abumrad, 2011): http://www.onthemedial.org/2012/jun/29/decline-effect-and-scientific-truth/ This approximately 18-minute presentation comes from a one-hour radio show from the same date. You can locate the entire program here: http://www.onthemedial.org/2012/jun/29/ 5. Chapter 1 (Smith, 2011) – on course Angel site (notice all fronts pages are included in the .pdf file. The required bit includes only pages numbered 1-29) 6. The following articles; as you read these, consider how these concepts and ideas may

		<p>affect your work as a nurse researcher and scholar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The truth wears off (Lehrer, 2010b) and the follow-on Q&A (Lehrer, 2010a) b. Complex adaptive systems: A concept analysis (Holden, 2005) c. The value of combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in nursing research... (Foss & Ellefsen, 2002) d. A treatise on nursing knowledge development for the 21st century: Beyond postmodernism (Reed, 1995). e. Reinstating the ‘Queen’: Understanding philosophical inquiry in nursing (Pesut & Johnson, 2007).
<p>Student Preparation for Week 7 and Paper #2</p>	<p>What is your ontology of important research-related phenomena?</p>	<p>Thoughtful, scholarly, well-referenced paper that conforms to the instructions provided in the <i>Final Paper Guidelines</i> document available on the course Angel site.</p> <p>Absolute due date/time for the paper: 7/21/2013, no later than 4 PM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Prepare an abstract of your paper and post that abstract in the appropriate discussion forum. The abstract should be no more than 200 words and should summarize the paper you submit for grading. <p>Absolute due date/time for posting your abstract: 7/21/2013, no later than 4:30 PM</p>

		<p>6. Read all the abstracts submitted by your colleagues. Respond thoughtfully to a minimum of two colleagues with comments or questions that will provide effective feedback and suggestions for future consideration and/or improvement.</p> <p>Absolute due date/time for posting your response: 7/23/2013, no later than 11:55 PM</p>
<p>Faculty directed activities (3 hours lecture, 5 hours online discussion)</p> <p>Week 7 July 18 10 AM – 1 PM On-campus session, Spokane</p>	<p>The Future(s) of Philosophy and Nursing Science</p>	<p>In-class discussion; see Week 7 overview for reflective questions that may be posed in class</p> <p>Faculty directed discussion forum related to the future of philosophy and nursing science.</p>
<p>Student Preparation for Week 8</p>	<p>Presentations: Research-Related Epistemology and Ontology</p>	<p>Review feedback provided by your colleagues about the abstract you posted for Paper #2. Respond as necessary, posting any comments or questions you may have about your colleagues' work. Reflect on your understanding of the epistemology and ontology of nursing and on your current thinking about the value of evidence-based and reflective-based practice. Incorporate feedback into your presentation.</p> <p>Prepare a presentation that conforms with the guidelines provided in the <i>Presentation Guidelines</i> document available on the course Angel site. Note that this presentation need not</p>

		<p>involve slides, must engage your colleagues, and must not exceed the established time limit.</p> <p>Please bring your laptop computer to class if possible to allow for completion of course evaluations.</p>
<p>Faculty directed activities (3 hours lecture, 6 hours online discussion) Week 8 July 25 10 AM – 1 PM (3 hours) On-campus session, Spokane</p>		<p>In-class presentations</p> <p>Faculty directed discussion forum related to Research-Related Epistemology and Ontology.</p>

Course Readings

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington,

D.C.: Author.

Banks-Wallace, J., Despina, L., Adams-Leander, S., McBroom, L., & Tandy, L. (2008). Re-Affirming and re/conceptualizing disciplinary knowledge as the foundation for doctoral education. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 31, 67-78.

Curtin, L. (2010a). Healing the wounds: Quantum nursing V. *American Nurse Today*, 6(7), 44.

Curtin, L. (2010b). Quantum Nursing. *American Nurse Today*, 5, 71-72.

Curtin, L. (2010c). Quantum nursing II: Our "field" of influence. *American Nurse Today*, 6(1), 56.

Curtin, L. (2010d). Quantum nursing III: Connecting on the same wavelength. *American Nurse Today*, 6(3), 64.

Curtin, L. (2010e). Quantum nursing IV: Giving the patient a "quantum edge". *American Nurse Today*, 6(5), 56.

Effken, J. (2007). The informational basis for nursing intuition: Philosophical underpinnings. *Nursing Philosophy*, 8, 187-200.

Forbes, D. A., King, K. M., Kushner, K. E., Letourneau, N. L., Myrick, A. F., & Profetto-McGrath, J. (1999). Warrantable evidence in nursing science. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 29, 373-379.

Goldstein, R. (2014). *Plato at the googleplex; why philosophy won't go away*. Random House LLC

- Gortner, S. (1990). Nursing values and science: Toward a science philosophy. In C. Polifroni & M. Welch (Eds.), *Perspectives on philosophy of science in nursing: An historical and contemporary anthology* (pp. 25-33). Philadelphia: Lipincott, Williams & Wilkins.
- Hussey, T. Just caring. *Nursing Philosophy*, 13(1), 6-14.
- Kinsella, E. A. (2009). Professional knowledge and the epistemology of reflective practice. *Nursing Philosophy*, 11, 3-14.
- Litchfield, M. C. (2008). A practice discipline that's here and now. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 31, 79-91.
- Mantzoukas, S. (2007). The evidence-based practice ideologies. *Nursing Philosophy*, 8, 244-255.
- McCurry, M. K., Hunter Revell, S. M., & Roy, C. (2009). Knowledge for the good of the individual and society: Linking philosophy, disciplinary goals, theory, and practice. *Nursing Philosophy*, 11, 42-52.
- Moser, P. K., & vanderNat, A. (2003). Human knowledge: Its nature, sources, and limits. In P. K. v. Moser, A. (Ed.), *Human knowledge: Classical and contemporary approaches* (3rd ed., pp. 582). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pesut, B., & McDonald, H. (2007). Connecting philosophy and practice: Implications of two philosophic approaches to pain for nurses' expert clinical decision making. *Nursing Philosophy*, 8, 256-263.
- Reed, P. G. (1995). A treatise on nursing knowledge development for the 21st century: Beyond postmodernism. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 17, 70-84.

Reed, P. G., & Lawrence, L. A. (2008). A paradigm for the production of practice-based knowledge. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 16, 422-432.

Risjord, M. (2010). *Nursing knowledge: Science, practice, and philosophy*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rodgers, B. L. (2005). *Developing nursing knowledge: Philosophical traditions and influences*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins.

Willis, J. W. (2007). *Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.