

## Differences between Quality Improvement & Research Projects

	QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	RESEARCH
<b>PROCESS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rapid cycle process:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Plan</li> <li>○ Do</li> <li>○ Study</li> <li>○ Act</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Form hypothesis or research question</li> <li>• Develop protocol/IRB approval/collect data</li> <li>• Analyze and interpret data</li> <li>• Implement into practice change as appropriate</li> </ul>
<b>PURPOSE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a systematic, data-guided approach to improve processes or outcomes immediately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• systematic inquiry that uses disciplined methods to answer questions or problems with a goal of developing, refining, and expanding a body of knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>RELEVANCE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• systematic inquiry that uses disciplined methods to answer questions or problems with a goal of developing, refining, and expanding a body of knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• broadly generalizable</li> <li>• publication of study results with a description of how they contribute to the body of knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>FUNDING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• often unfunded</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• usually requires a source</li> <li>• some research is unfunded</li> </ul>
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• usually restricted to internal participants</li> <li>• sometimes external stakeholders or experts may be consulted</li> <li>• sample size depends on number of intervention/program recipients but are typically small convenience samples</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may include individuals outside your setting</li> <li>• sample size depends on design stage of research (i.e.. pilot testing or exploratory study versus testing), and research question</li> </ul>
<b>KEY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clearly define the outcome that needs to be improved, identify how the outcome will be measured, and develop a plan for implementing an intervention and collecting data before and after the intervention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• scientific inquiry to answer specific research questions or test hypotheses using disciplined, rigorous methods</li> </ul>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• typically doesn't require an extensive one</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• systematic, comprehensive review to answer questions about a burning/compelling phenomenon</li> <li>• gaps typically provide the impetus for developing a specific research question(s) a hypothesis(es), or both</li> </ul>
<b>STUDY METHODS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mixed methods may apply</li> <li>• protocol may be flexible and confounding variables are acknowledged but not controlled</li> <li>• typically rapid process limited by the availability of local resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quantitative (numeric, QN), qualitative (verbal, QL), &amp; mixed methods using both</li> <li>• QN studies tend to explore relationships among a set of variables related to the phenomenon QL studies seek to understand the deeper meaning of the involved variables</li> <li>• protocol typically remains unchanged through the course of the study to limit confounding</li> <li>• may take considerable time</li> </ul>
<b>SHARING OF FINDINGS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• communicated within the organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• broad dissemination</li> <li>• publications, presentations, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>APPLICATION OF FINDINGS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• change local practice</li> <li>• improve local program design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• contribute to body of knowledge that collectively informs practice and/or policy</li> <li>• may also be relevant locally</li> </ul>
<b>REB REVIEW</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sometimes due to ethical issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all human subject research</li> </ul>
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. implementing a process to remove urinary catheters within a certain time frame</li> <li>2. developing a process to improve wound-care documentation</li> <li>3. improving the process for patient education for a specific chronic disease</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. conducting a systematic review of studies on preventing catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTI)</li> <li>2. randomized controlled trial exploring new wound care methods</li> <li>3. QL study to investigate the lived experiences of patients with a specific chronic disease</li> </ol>