

Unfolding Case

Unfolding cases utilize clinical scenarios that are valuable for developing critical thinking and problem solving competencies for the nursing student (Feingold, Calaluca, & Kallen, 2004). Utilizing a holistic rubric allows the instructor to focus on the element of critical thinking aside from the additional content of knowledge and technical skill. A purposive judgment of critical thinking includes addressing the behaviors of analysis, interpretation, evaluation, inference, explanation, and metacognitive self-regulation (Landis, Swain, Friehe, & Coufal, 2007). Drs. Peter and Noreen Facione developed the “Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric” as a reliable tool to assess these behaviors in the context of critical thinking (Facione & Facione, 2009). The Facione (2009) rubric was modified and utilized as an assessment tool for the unfolding care regarding blunt abdominal trauma.

Unfolding Case Rubric

Table 2: BLUNT ABDOMINAL TRAUMA UNFOLDING CASE RUBRIC	
Level	Description
4	<p>Consistently does all or almost of the following:</p> <p>Accurately interprets evidence, statements, information and questions Identifies the prominent reasons and claims Thoughtfully analyses and evaluates major assessment findings and differential diagnoses Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions Justifies key results and procedures; explains assumptions and reasons Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reason lead</p>
3	<p>Does most or many of the following:</p> <p>Accurately interprets evidence, statements, information, and questions Identifies relevant arguments and claims Offers analysis and evaluations of obvious assessment findings and differential diagnoses Draws warranted, non fallacious conclusions Justifies some results or procedures; explains reasons Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reason lead</p>
2	<p>Does most or many of the following:</p> <p>Misinterprets evidence, statements, and information, questions Fails to identify strong, relevant counterarguments Ignores or superficially evaluates assessment findings and differential diagnoses Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions Justifies few results or procedures; seldom explains reasons Regardless of the evidence, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions</p>
1	<p>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</p> <p>Offers biases interpretations of evidence, statements, and questions or personal point of view Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counterarguments Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious assessment findings and differential diagnoses Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons Regardless of the evidence, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconception Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason</p>

References

- Facione, P. A., & Facione, N. C. (2009). *Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric*. Retrieved from Insight Assessment: www.insightassessment.com
- Feingold, C. E., Calaluce, M., & Kallen, M. A. (2004). Computerized patient model and simulated clinical experiences: Evaluation with baccalaureate nursing students. *Journal of Nurse Education*, 43, 156-163.
- Hueckel, R., & Wilson, D. (2007). The child with respiratory dysfunction. In M. J. Hockenberry, & D. Wilson, *Wong's nursing care of infants and children* (8th ed., pp. 1314-1386). Saint Louis, MO: Elsevier.
- King, J. E. (2004). Blunt abdominal trauma. In S. D. Melander, *Caes studies in critical care nursing: a guide for application and review* (3rd ed., pp. 430-445). Saint Louis, MO: Elsevier.
- Landis, M., Swain, K. D., Friehe, M. J., & Coufal, K. L. (2007). Evaluating critical thinking in class and online: Comparison of the Newman Method and the Facione Rubric. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 28 (3), 135-143.
- Linn, R., & Grounlund, N. (2005). *Measurement and assessment in teaching*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- M, K. J., & DeWitt, D. A. (2009). Strategies for assessing/evaluating learning outcomes. In D. M. Billings, & J. A. Halstead, *Teaching in nursing: A guide for faculty* (3rd ed., pp. 409-428). Saint Louis, MO: Elsevier.
- Mertler, C. A. (2003). *Classroom assessment*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak.
- Miller, M. D., Linn, R. L., & Gronlund, N. E. (2009). *Measurment and assessment in teaching* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Oermann, M. H., & Gaberson, K. B. (2009). *Evaluation and testing in nursing education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Walsh, C. R. (2004). Diabetic ketoacidosis. In S. D. Melander, *Case studies in critical care nursing: a guide for application and review* (3rd ed., pp. 337-350). Saint Louis, MO: Elsevier.

brandon
machal
.me