

Background

- ❖ Nurses need to make clinical judgments in their role in providing safe and quality care
- ❖ There are increasing patient safety incident reports in Indonesia due to care management problems/service delivery problems (Daud, 2020)
- ❖ Quality and standards of nurses' clinical learning vary in Indonesia
- ❖ Newly graduated nurses are not practice-ready and lack clinical judgment skills

Purpose

- ❖ Develop clinical judgment in newly graduated nurses by implementing Tanner's clinical judgment model
- ❖ Tanner's clinical judgment model helps preceptors address dimensions of four clinical judgment skills (noticing, interpreting, responding, and reflecting)

Method

- ❖ Population: 32 newly graduated nurses
- ❖ Setting: 3 hospitals in Indonesia
- ❖ An experimental design with a pre-test/post-test
- ❖ Intervention group: scheduled post-conferences each shift with guided high-level, open-ended questions for two consecutive weeks (n = 16)
- ❖ Control group: previous practice of post-conferences in weekly meetings (n = 16)
- ❖ Clinical judgment levels were measured before and after two weeks using case studies and the Lasater Clinical Judgment Rubric (LCJR)

Results

- Total number of respondents was 32 (12 respondents from Hospital A, 10 respondents from Hospital B, and 10 respondents from Hospital C)
- Most of the respondents was female (84.37%)
- Average age: 22 years old (min 21; max 24)

Average Scores of Pre- and Post-tests on Lasater Clinical Judgment Rubric of Control and Intervention Groups (N = 32)

| Dimension (Scale: 1 – 4) | Control Group | | | | Intervention Group | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----|--------------------|-----|-----------|-----|
| | Pre-test | | Post-test | | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| | Median | Min-Max | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Focused observation | 2.0 | 1.0 – 2.0 | 2.31 | .47 | 1.75 | .68 | 2.68 | .60 |
| Recognizing deviations from expected patterns | 2.0 | 1.0 – 2.0 | 2.31 | .47 | 1.87 | .61 | 2.68 | .47 |
| Information seeking | 2.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 2.18 | .40 | 2.12 | .50 | 2.87 | .50 |
| Prioritizing data | 2.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 2.06 | .44 | 1.81 | .54 | 2.81 | .65 |
| Making sense of the data | 2.0 | 1.0 – 2.0 | 2.06 | .44 | 1.68 | .47 | 2.50 | .51 |
| Calm, confident manner | 2.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 2.25 | .57 | 2.06 | .25 | 2.68 | .47 |
| Clear communication | 2.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 2.18 | .65 | 2.18 | .40 | 2.81 | .75 |
| Well-planned intervention/ flexibility | 2.0 | 1.0 – 2.0 | 1.87 | .34 | 1.93 | .44 | 2.68 | .60 |
| Being skillful | 2.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 2.06 | .57 | 2.18 | .54 | 2.68 | .60 |
| Evaluation/ self-analysis | 2.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 2.18 | .54 | 2.37 | .50 | 2.93 | .44 |
| Commitment to improvement | 2.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 2.31 | .60 | 2.25 | .44 | 3.18 | .54 |

- Paired sample *t*-test (Intervention group): Significant difference in the mean of clinical judgment score from before and after intervention (p -value <.001)
- Wilcoxon signed ranks test (Control group): Significant difference in the mean of clinical judgment score from pre-test and post-test (p -value <.001)
- Independent sample *t*-test: No significant difference between the pre-test results of the intervention or control group (p -value .0647)
- Independent sample *t*-test: Significant difference in the mean post-test clinical judgment scores: intervention group > control group by 6.75 points; CI 95% (4.18-9.31) (p -value <.001)

Discussion

- ❖ Intervention and control groups both increased clinical judgment scores from pre- to post-test
- ❖ The increase in the intervention group's score was much more significant.
- ❖ Preceptors posed more in-depth questions frequently and spontaneously in the intervention group
- ❖ High-level questions encouraged newly graduated nurses to think critically in a learning environment.

Conclusion

- ❖ Preceptor guidelines following Tanner's clinical judgment model can assist newly graduated nurses in developing clinical judgment skills
- ❖ LCJR, a tool to assess and evaluate the development of clinical judgment, can be utilized to provide feedback to preceptors and preceptees, detailing targeted areas in need of improvement.



Acknowledgements:

Dr. P. Callaway, Project Advisor
 Dr. C. Sommers, Project Mentor

References available upon request