# THE OPT MODEL

## A Practical Teaching and Learning Guide

*Making Expert Clinical Reasoning Visible and Teachable*

Daniel J. Pesut, PhD, RN, FAAN

Emeritus Professor, University of Minnesota and Indiana University Schools of Nursing
Emeritus Katherine R. and C. Walton Lillehei Chair in Nursing Leadership
University of Minnesota

# CHAPTER 1

WHY THE OPT MODEL?

The Problem and the Solution

## OPENING STORY: THE OVERWHELMED STUDENT

It was 1995, and I watched a senior nursing student—let us call her Sarah—struggle with a patient case that would change how I thought about teaching clinical reasoning.

Mr. Johnson was a 68-year-old man, three days post-cardiac surgery. He had diabetes, newly diagnosed atrial fibrillation, concerns about his surgical incision, anxiety about returning home alone, and confusion about his new medications. Sarah sat at the nurses' station, her care plan spread before her, looking overwhelmed.

"I don't know where to start," she said. "He has so many problems. Do I work on his blood sugar first? His heart rhythm? His anxiety? Everything feels equally important, and I can't keep it all in my head."

She had dutifully listed six nursing diagnoses—one on each page of her care plan. Six separate problems. Six separate intervention lists. Six separate evaluation criteria. It was mechanically correct but clinically useless.

"How do YOU manage all these problems?" she asked me.

I grabbed a blank sheet of paper and started drawing circles—one for each diagnosis. Then I drew lines connecting them. "Look," I said. "Activity Intolerance connects to both his Anxiety and his Risk for Infection—if he's too tired to move, he gets more anxious and his lungs don't clear. Deficient Knowledge connects to his medication management, which directly affects both his Cardiac Output and his Blood Glucose. These aren't six separate problems, they're an interconnected web."

Her face transformed. "I can SEE it now. I've never seen my thinking visualized like this before."

That moment crystallized something JoAnne Herman and I had been discussing for months: clinical reasoning needs visual tools. Expert nurses think in webs, not lists. We see patterns, relationships, and leverage points. But we rarely make that thinking visible to learners.

The Outcome-Present State-Test Model emerged from that insight: What if we could make expert clinical reasoning not just visible, but teachable?

WHAT TRADITIONAL NURSING PROCESS MISSES

## For decades, nursing students learned the nursing process as five linear steps:

1. Assess

2. Diagnose

3. Plan

4. Implement

5. Evaluate

This framework works adequately for simple, single-problem situations. A young adult with an uncomplicated appendectomy? Sure. An older adult with acute pain? Fine. But real patients—like Mr. Johnson—do not have single problems. They have multiple interacting conditions requiring concurrent consideration.

## The traditional linear model creates three significant problems:

PROBLEM 1: Sequential Thinking for Simultaneous Problems

When you address nursing diagnoses one-by-one, you miss critical interactions. Treating Mr. Johnson's Activity Intolerance without addressing his Anxiety means your interventions might work against each other. You encourage ambulation (for Activity Intolerance) but the patient's anxiety about falling makes him resist. The traditional nursing process framework said "assess, diagnose, plan" but did not teach students HOW to assess relationships between multiple problems.

Students created care plans that looked complete but failed to capture clinical reality. Each diagnosis lived in isolation on its own page. The connections that mattered most—the ways problems influenced each other—remained invisible.

PROBLEM 2: Implicit Reasoning Processes

The five-step model described what nurses do but not how they think. It was a documentation framework, not a reasoning framework. Students completed the steps mechanically without developing genuine clinical judgment.

I saw this repeatedly: Students who could correctly identify nursing diagnoses but could not explain their thinking. They matched patient cues to NANDA definitions like matching vocabulary flashcards—technically accurate but intellectually empty. When I asked, "Why did you choose THIS diagnosis as most important?" they struggled to articulate their reasoning.

The traditional model gave them steps to follow but did not teach them how to reason.

PROBLEM 3: Missing Outcome Specification

Most critically, traditional nursing process emphasized problems—diagnosis—but did not require explicit outcome specification. Students identified "Impaired Gas Exchange" but rarely specified: "Patient will achieve SpO2 greater than 92% on room air within 48 hours."

Without clear targets, how do you test whether interventions are working? How do you know what "improvement" means? Vague goals like "Patient will demonstrate improved oxygenation" provide no measurable target and no timeframe.

The result? Students could not tell if their care was effective because they had not defined what "effective" looked like.

HOW EXPERT NURSES ACTUALLY THINK

To understand what was missing, JoAnne Herman and I studied expert nurses. We interviewed master clinicians, observed their practice, and analyzed think-aloud protocols. Consistent patterns emerged in how expert nurses reason about complex patients.

PATTERN 1: Concurrent Consideration of Multiple Problems

Experts do not think sequentially—first this diagnosis, then that one. They hold multiple problems simultaneously in mind, noticing relationships and patterns. When experts look at Mr. Johnson, they see a dynamic system, not a list of isolated diagnoses.

An expert might think: "His activity intolerance is partly cardiac output, partly fear and anxiety, partly knowledge deficit about what's safe post-surgery. If I address the knowledge and anxiety, the activity intolerance improves even before his heart function fully recovers. But if I only focus on the physiological problem, I'm missing leverage points."

This simultaneous, systems-level thinking was markedly different from the linear, one-diagnosis-at-a-time approach we were teaching.

PATTERN 2: Pattern Recognition and Relationship Mapping

Experts rapidly identify which problems cluster together and which are central versus peripheral. They notice patterns: "Older adults post-cardiac surgery who live alone often have medication management issues that complicate recovery. I need to assess this."

They map relationships: "Anxiety is driving his blood pressure up, which stresses his heart, which makes him more anxious. I need to interrupt that cycle."

Novices, by contrast, treat each problem independently. They do not yet see the web of relationships.

PATTERN 3: Outcome-Driven Reasoning

Experts begin by envisioning where the patient needs to be. They specify outcomes explicitly—often using precise, measurable criteria—then work backward to determine interventions.

An expert thinks: "He needs to be discharged in four days. By then, he must walk 100 feet independently, manage his medications correctly, and have stable vital signs. What needs to happen to get him there? What is the gap between where he is now and where he needs to be?"

This outcome-specification thinking drives intervention selection. The goal is not just "treating diagnoses"—it is systematically moving present state toward outcome state.

PATTERN 4: Metacognitive Awareness

Most strikingly, expert nurses monitor their own thinking. They notice their assumptions, question their initial impressions, and actively look for disconfirming evidence.

I heard experts say things like: "I initially thought pain was the keystone issue, but now I'm wondering if it's actually knowledge deficit driving everything. Let me test that hypothesis."

They think about their thinking. They self-regulate their clinical reasoning. This metacognitive layer was completely absent from traditional nursing process frameworks.

ENTER THE OPT MODEL (1995-1998)

These observations—concurrent thinking, pattern recognition, outcome specification, metacognition—did not fit the traditional five-step linear model. We needed new structure.

THE COLLABORATION

JoAnne Herman brought expertise in metacognition and self-regulated learning theory. I brought clinical reasoning research and nursing process history. Together, we asked: What do expert nurses actually do when reasoning about complex patients?

We spent three years developing, testing, and refining what became the Outcome-Present State-Test (OPT) Model of Reflective Clinical Reasoning.

THE CORE INSIGHT: Juxtaposition

The central innovation came from engineering and design thinking: juxtapose present state with desired outcome state. The gap between them reveals what matters.

### Instead of the traditional approach:

1. Here's the diagnosis

2. Here's the intervention

### The OPT Model says:

1. Here's the present state (where the patient is now)

2. Here's the outcome state (where you want the patient to be)

3. Here's the gap between them

4. Now select interventions that close that gap

5. Test continuously whether the gap is closing

This transforms clinical reasoning. You are not just "treating a diagnosis"—you are systematically moving present state toward outcome state while testing your clinical judgments.

MAKING THINKING VISIBLE: Visual Tools

## We developed two primary visual tools to externalize what happens inside expert minds:

TOOL 1: Clinical Reasoning Web

A web diagram showing relationships between multiple nursing diagnoses. Not a list—a network. Lines connect diagnoses that influence each other. The most connected diagnosis often (not always) becomes the keystone issue.

TOOL 2: OPT Model Worksheet

## A one-page template organizing all reasoning components:

- Patient story (narrative context)
- Diagnostic cluster (web of related diagnoses)
- Keystone issue (central problem creating leverage)
- Present state (current patient status with NOC indicators)
- Outcome state (desired patient status with NOC targets)
- Testing (how we will know if interventions work)
- Nursing interventions (selected from NIC)
- Reflection (metacognitive examination of reasoning process)

These tools made expert reasoning processes visible. Students could see the thinking, practice it deliberately, and develop their own metacognitive awareness.

WHY "OUTCOME-PRESENT STATE-TEST"?

## The model's name captures its core process:

OUTCOME: Specify explicitly where the patient needs to be

PRESENT STATE: Describe clearly where the patient is now

TEST: Continuously evaluate whether interventions are closing the gap

The sequence matters. Traditional nursing process started with assessment and diagnosis. The OPT Model starts with outcome specification—the end point—then examines the

present state in light of that outcome. This reversal fundamentally changes how students think.

When you know where you are going (outcome), assessing where you are (present state) becomes purposeful. You notice what matters. You test whether you are making progress.

EVOLUTION THROUGH THREE GENERATIONS

To understand why the OPT Model mattered, we need context about nursing's evolution.

GENERATION 2: NANDA and Diagnostic Reasoning (1970-1990)

The OPT Model emerged during nursing's "second generation"—the era when nursing diagnosis became formalized through NANDA (North American Nursing Diagnosis Association). This generation gave nursing standardized language for its unique knowledge domain.

NANDA established that nursing had its own diagnostic focus, distinct from medicine. Nurses diagnosed human responses to health problems, not the diseases themselves. This was professionally important, it legitimized nursing's intellectual work.

But second-generation clinical reasoning remained fundamentally linear: Collect cues → Cluster cues → Match to nursing diagnosis → Select interventions.

Students learned diagnostic reasoning—pattern recognition and categorization—but still thought sequentially through one diagnosis at a time.

GENERATION 3: Outcome Specification (1990-2020)

The OPT Model represented nursing's "third generation"—the shift toward outcome-focused reasoning driven by healthcare reform, managed care, and demands for accountability.

### Two additional standardized language systems emerged:

- NIC (Nursing Interventions Classification): Standardized intervention language
- NOC (Nursing Outcomes Classification): Measurable outcome indicators

These three systems—NANDA, NIC, and NOC—became known as NNN linkages. Together, they provided infrastructure for the OPT Model:

- NANDA gave us diagnostic language
- NOC gave us outcome measurement
- NIC gave us intervention standardization

The OPT Model integrated all three while adding something crucial: a reasoning framework showing HOW to use them together for complex, concurrent problems.

Third-generation reasoning was concurrent, not sequential. Systems-focused, not problem-isolated. Outcome-driven, not diagnosis-driven. The OPT Model made third generation thinking teachable.

GENERATION 4: What's Coming (2020-2040)

We are now entering a fourth generation: knowledge modeling and data mining. Electronic health records capture nursing data at unprecedented scale. Artificial intelligence can analyze patterns across millions of patients.

The OPT Model's standardized terminology (NANDA-NIC-NOC) becomes computable. Clinical Reasoning Webs can be automatically generated from EHR data. Testing happens at population scale, not just individual patient level.

This fourth generation will reveal which intervention combinations work best for which patient profiles—evidence-based clinical reasoning derived from vast data analysis.

But even as technology advances, the core OPT Model principles endure concurrent thinking, outcome specification, testing, and metacognitive reflection.

WHAT THE OPT MODEL ADDS

## Compared to traditional nursing process, the OPT Model provides:

CONCURRENT REASONING STRUCTURE

Instead of linear steps, a framework for holding multiple problems simultaneously

VISUAL THINKING TOOLS

Clinical Reasoning Webs and worksheets that externalize reasoning processes

EXPLICIT OUTCOME SPECIFICATION

Using NOC language to define measurable targets and timeframes

SYSTEMATIC TESTING

Continuous hypothesis-testing throughout care, not just at "evaluation" step

KEYSTONE IDENTIFICATION

Using complexity thinking to find leverage points—the central issue that, addressed, creates cascading positive effects

METACOGNITIVE EMPHASIS

Structured reflection on reasoning itself, not just patient outcomes

These additions do not replace traditional nursing process, they enhance it with tools for complex clinical reasoning.

TEACHING TIP: How to Introduce the OPT Model on Day 1

### When introducing the OPT Model to students, I have found this sequence works well:

1. START WITH A STORY: Share a complex patient case (like Mr. Johnson). Ask students: "How would you manage this?" Watch them struggle with linear thinking.

2. DRAW THE WEB: On a whiteboard or large paper, draw the Clinical Reasoning Web in real-time. Let students see the "aha!" moment when problems connect visually.

3. NAME WHAT EXPERTS DO: Explain that expert nurses think this way automatically—we are just making it visible so they can learn it.

4. PROVIDE HOPE: Assure students that visual tools scaffold their developing expertise. Eventually, this thinking becomes automatic, but while learning, making it visible helps.

5. START SIMPLE: Use a case with only 3-4 diagnoses for initial practice. Complexity comes later.

6. EMPHASIZE: This is not "more work, it's making visible what they're already trying to do in their heads.

The key is helping students see that the OPT Model is not adding burden—it is providing structure for thinking that currently feels overwhelming.

LOOKING AHEAD

This chapter established why we needed the OPT Model: traditional nursing process could not support the concurrent, outcome-focused, metacognitive reasoning that complex clinical situations require.

### The next chapters show HOW the OPT Model works:

- Chapter 2: Building Clinical Reasoning Webs to visualize problem relationships
- Chapter 3: Identifying keystone issues using complexity thinking
- Chapter 4: Specifying outcomes and testing clinical judgments
- Chapter 5: Developing metacognitive awareness and self-regulation

Each chapter includes cases, student voices, teaching tips, and practice exercises.

By the end, you will have practical tools for teaching expert-level clinical reasoning, making the invisible visible, making the implicit explicit, making excellence achievable.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Traditional linear nursing process cannot support concurrent, complex clinical reasoning
- Expert nurses think in webs and patterns, specify outcomes explicitly, and test their judgments continuously
- The OPT Model makes expert reasoning visible through Clinical Reasoning Webs and structured worksheets
- Outcome specification (where we're going) precedes assessment of present state (where we are)
- The model integrates NANDA-NIC-NOC while adding reasoning structure
- Third-generation outcome-focused reasoning prepares nurses for fourth-generation knowledge modeling
- Visual tools scaffold student development of expertise

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

## For faculty:

1. When have you seen students struggle with concurrent problem management?

2. What implicit reasoning processes do you use that might need to become explicit for learners?

3. How might visual tools support students' clinical judgment development?

## For students:

1. Do you currently think through problems linearly (one at a time) or concurrently (all together)?

2. When have you felt overwhelmed by patient complexity? What would have helped?

3. How explicit are you about specifying outcomes before selecting interventions?

# CHAPTER 2

THE CLINICAL REASONING WEB

Visualizing Relationships Between Problems

## OPENING STORY: SARAH DISCOVERS CONNECTIONS

Sarah was in her second clinical rotation when she encountered Mrs. Martinez, a 72-year-old woman admitted with heart failure exacerbation. Sarah's initial assessment yielded seven nursing diagnoses: Excess Fluid Volume, Activity Intolerance, Impaired Gas Exchange, Anxiety, Deficient Knowledge, Risk for Falls, and Sleep Pattern Disturbance.

Following what she had been taught, Sarah created a separate care plan for each diagnosis. Seven problems, seven plans, seven pages. She spent three hours documenting.

When I asked her during clinical conference, "What's your clinical reasoning about Mrs. Martinez?" Sarah looked at her stack of papers and said, "I have seven problems to address." She sounded defeated.

"Let me show you something," I said. I drew seven circles on the whiteboard—one for each diagnosis—and labeled them. Then I asked: "Which of these problems influence each other?"

Sarah thought for a moment. "Well... Excess Fluid Volume causes Impaired Gas Exchange, right? Because of pulmonary edema?"

"Draw a line connecting them," I said. She did.

"And Impaired Gas Exchange probably makes Activity Intolerance worse, because she's short of breath," Sarah continued, drawing another connection. "And Activity Intolerance affects Sleep Pattern because she can't lie flat... and poor sleep makes her Anxiety worse... and Anxiety makes everything feel worse..."

Sarah's eyes widened. "They're all connected. This isn't seven separate problems, it's ONE system with seven interacting parts."

"Exactly," I said. "Now you're seeing what expert nurses see. You have created a Clinical Reasoning Web. Notice how some diagnoses are more central—more connected—than others? That tells you something important about where to focus."

Sarah stared at the web she had just drawn. "Why didn't anyone show me this before? I've been treating these like isolated problems when they're actually a pattern."

That was the moment Sarah stopped being overwhelmed and started being a clinical reasoner.

WHY WEB, NOT LIST?

The Clinical Reasoning Web is the OPT Model's most powerful visual tool. It transforms clinical reasoning from sequential (problem 1, then problem 2, then problem 3) to concurrent (all problems simultaneously, noticing relationships).

## Here is why this matters:

PROBLEMS DON'T EXIST IN ISOLATION

In real clinical practice, patient problems interact. Treating one problem affects others—sometimes positively, sometimes negatively. When you address Mrs. Martinez's Excess Fluid Volume with diuretics, you improve her Gas Exchange, which reduces her Activity Intolerance, which helps her sleep better, which decreases her anxiety. One intervention creates cascading effects.

But if you are thinking linearly—working through seven isolated problems—you miss these cascade effects. You do not see that managing fluid volume efficiently addresses multiple problems simultaneously.

The web makes interdependence visible.

RELATIONSHIPS MATTER AS MUCH AS DIAGNOSES

Two patients can have identical nursing diagnoses but completely different clinical reasoning webs. The relationships between their problems differ based on context, timeline, severity, and individual factors.

Patient A: Post-operative heart surgery, young and healthy

- Pain → Activity Intolerance → Anxiety
- Clear linear progression

Patient B: Chronic heart failure exacerbation, multiple comorbidities

- Excess Fluid → Impaired Gas Exchange ↔ Activity Intolerance ↔ Anxiety ↔ Sleep Disturbance ↔ Knowledge Deficit → Risk for Falls
- Dense interconnection, bidirectional relationships

Same diagnoses, different webs. Different clinical reasoning required.

SYSTEMS THINKING MADE VISIBLE

Systems thinking means seeing wholes, not just parts. Recognizing patterns and cycles. Understanding that intervening in one place affects the entire system.

The Clinical Reasoning Web is systems thinking made concrete. It is a tool that lets novices SEE systems the way experts intuitively sense them.

CONCURRENT VS. SEQUENTIAL REASONING

Expert nurses think concurrently holding multiple problems in mind simultaneously while noticing patterns. Novices think sequentially—one problem at a time.

The web bridges this gap. It lets students practice concurrent thinking visually before they can do it mentally.

HOW TO CONSTRUCT A CLINICAL REASONING WEB

## Here is the step-by-step process I teach:

STEP 1: List All Relevant Nursing Diagnoses (From Assessment)

Start with comprehensive assessment using a systematic framework (Gordon's Functional Health Patterns, body systems, nursing domains, etc.). Identify ALL nursing diagnoses that apply, not just the most obvious ones.

## For Mrs. Martinez, that list includes:

1. Excess Fluid Volume

2. Activity Intolerance

3. Impaired Gas Exchange

4. Anxiety

5. Deficient Knowledge (heart failure management)

6. Risk for Falls

7. Sleep Pattern Disturbance

Do not worry yet about which is "most important." Just list everything that is clinically relevant.

STEP 2: Draw a Circle for Each Diagnosis

On a large sheet of paper (or whiteboard, or digital tool), draw circles spread across the page. Label each circle with one nursing diagnosis. Space them out—you will need room for connecting lines.

Position does not matter at this point. Just get all diagnoses visible on one page.

STEP 3: Draw Connecting Lines Between Related Diagnoses

## This is where clinical reasoning becomes visible. For each pair of diagnoses, ask:

"Does this problem influence that one? How?"

"Does that problem affect this one? In what way?"

"Is the influence one-directional or bidirectional?"

Draw lines connecting diagnoses that influence each other.

## For Mrs. Martinez:

- Excess Fluid Volume → Impaired Gas Exchange (pulmonary edema)
- Impaired Gas Exchange → Activity Intolerance (dyspnea limits activity)
- Activity Intolerance → Sleep Pattern Disturbance (orthopnea, cannot lie flat)
- Activity Intolerance ↔ Anxiety (bidirectional: anxiety worsens dyspnea perception, activity limitation increases anxiety)
- Deficient Knowledge → Excess Fluid Volume (does not understand fluid restrictions)
- Sleep Pattern Disturbance → Anxiety (bidirectional)
- Activity Intolerance → Risk for Falls (weakness, dyspnea, deconditioning)

You do not need to connect EVERY diagnosis to EVERY other one. Only draw lines where legitimate clinical relationships exist.

STEP 4: Count Connections for Each Diagnosis

Once you have drawn all relationship lines, count how many connections each diagnosis has. In Mrs. Martinez's web:

- Activity Intolerance: 5 connections (most central)
- Anxiety: 4 connections
- Impaired Gas Exchange: 3 connections
- Excess Fluid Volume: 2 connections
- Sleep Pattern Disturbance: 2 connections
- Deficient Knowledge: 1 connection
- Risk for Falls: 1 connection

The most connected diagnoses are usually (not always) the most central to the patient's clinical picture.

STEP 5: Notice Patterns

## Stand back and look at the web as a whole:

Which diagnoses are most central (most connections)?

Which are peripheral (few connections)?

Which cluster together (dense connection areas)?

Are there bidirectional relationships creating cycles?

Which diagnoses, if addressed, would positively impact many others?

These patterns guide clinical reasoning.

CASE EXAMPLE: Building Mr. Rodriguez's Web

Let us work through a complete example.

## PATIENT STORY:

Mr. Rodriguez is a 72-year-old man admitted with heart failure exacerbation. Retired engineer lives alone since wife's death last year. Values independence, proud he is "never needed help." Currently anxious about hospital stay, worried about dog at home, reluctant to follow fluid restrictions because "water is healthy." Adult children live in another state.

## ASSESSMENT HIGHLIGHTS:

- Vital signs: BP 158/92, HR 98 irregular (new atrial fibrillation), RR 24, SpO2 89% on room air
- Physical: 3+ pitting edema bilateral lower extremities, crackles bilateral lung bases, JVD present, weight up 12 lbs from baseline
- Labs: BNP 1850, mild hyponatremia, normal renal function
- Psychosocial: Anxious, asking repeatedly about dog, states "I don't understand why I got so sick"
- Knowledge: Unclear about heart failure, does not know what medications are for, thinks fluid restriction "doesn't make sense"

STEP 1: List Nursing Diagnoses

### From assessment, I identify these diagnoses:

1. Excess Fluid Volume (related to compromised cardiac regulatory mechanisms)

2. Activity Intolerance (related to imbalance between oxygen supply and demand)

3. Impaired Gas Exchange (related to alveolar-capillary membrane changes)

4. Anxiety (related to health crisis and separation from normal routine)

5. Deficient Knowledge: Heart Failure Management (related to new diagnosis)

6. Risk for Ineffective Therapeutic Regimen Management (related to knowledge deficit and reluctance to follow restrictions)

7. Risk for Social Isolation (related to living alone, recent loss of spouse)

STEP 2: Draw Circles

[In the actual book, there would be a visual diagram here. I will describe it in text:]

Seven circles spread across the page, each labeled with one diagnosis.

STEP 3: Draw Connections with Rationale

## Let me explain each connection I draw:

EXCESS FLUID VOLUME → IMPAIRED GAS EXCHANGE

Rationale: Fluid overload causes pulmonary edema, impairing gas exchange at alveolar-capillary membrane. This is direct physiological relationship.

IMPAIRED GAS EXCHANGE → ACTIVITY INTOLERANCE

Rationale: Poor oxygenation means tissues lack oxygen for aerobic metabolism, causing fatigue and dyspnea with minimal activity.

ACTIVITY INTOLERANCE ↔ ANXIETY (bidirectional)

Rationale: Activity intolerance limits independence, increasing anxiety. Simultaneously, anxiety increases sympathetic nervous system activation, worsening perceived dyspnea and activity tolerance. This is a reinforcing cycle.

DEFICIENT KNOWLEDGE → RISK FOR INEFFECTIVE REGIMEN MANAGEMENT

Rationale: Mr. Rodriguez does not understand why fluid restriction matters, making adherence unlikely after discharge.

DEFICIENT KNOWLEDGE → EXCESS FLUID VOLUME

Rationale: Currently, his lack of understanding about fluid restriction contributes to current volume overload (was drinking lots of water thinking it is healthy).

ANXIETY ↔ DEFICIENT KNOWLEDGE (bidirectional)

Rationale: Not understanding what is happening increases anxiety. High anxiety impairs learning and retention of new information. Another reinforcing cycle.

RISK FOR SOCIAL ISOLATION → ANXIETY

Rationale: Living alone after wife's death, limited family support nearby, creates background anxiety about managing at home, which current illness exacerbates.

ACTIVITY INTOLERANCE → RISK FOR SOCIAL ISOLATION

Rationale: Inability to get out, walk dog, engage in previous activities will worsen isolation after discharge.

STEP 4: Count Connections

### After drawing all relationships, I count:

- Anxiety: 4 connections (most central)
- Activity Intolerance: 3 connections
- Deficient Knowledge: 3 connections
- Excess Fluid Volume: 2 connections
- Impaired Gas Exchange: 2 connections
- Risk for Ineffective Regimen Management: 1 connection
- Risk for Social Isolation: 2 connections

STEP 5: Analyze the Pattern

### What this web reveals:

ANXIETY IS MOST CENTRAL: Despite heart failure being the medical diagnosis, anxiety has the most connections. It is bidirectionally linked to activity intolerance, knowledge deficit, and social isolation. Addressing anxiety becomes important not just for comfort but for its effects on everything else.

## TWO REINFORCING CYCLES EXIST:

1. Activity Intolerance ↔ Anxiety (physical and psychological reinforce each other)

2. Anxiety ↔ Deficient Knowledge (anxiety blocks learning, lack of understanding increases anxiety)

KNOWLEDGE DEFICIT IS HIGHLY CONNECTED: It links to excess fluid volume, anxiety, and ineffective regimen management. Teaching becomes a high-leverage intervention.

PHYSIOLOGICAL CASCADE IS CLEAR: Excess Fluid → Impaired Gas Exchange → Activity Intolerance shows the pathophysiological progression, but it is embedded in a larger psychosocial-educational system.

STUDENT VOICE: "I Finally See WHY Problems Connect"

### Here is what students typically say after creating their first Clinical Reasoning Web:

"I never understood why my instructor kept asking 'how are these problems related?' Now I get it—they're asking me to see the system, not just list problems."

"When I tried to do a web for my patient, I realized I didn't actually understand the pathophysiology. I could not draw connections because I did not know how problems influence each other. The web showed me what I needed to study."

"My preceptor said I need to prioritize, but I didn't know how. The web showed me which problems are central. That's prioritization based on the SYSTEM, not just my gut feeling."

"I felt overwhelmed by my patient's complexity until I drew the web. Seeing it visually made it manageable. The connections aren't chaos—they're a pattern I can work with."

WHAT THE WEB REVEALS

## A well-constructed Clinical Reasoning Web reveals four critical insights:

INSIGHT 1: System Complexity

The density of connections tells you how complex the situation is. A simple post-operative case might have 3 diagnoses with 2-3 connections. A complex chronic illness case might have 8 diagnoses with 15+ connections.

This helps you calibrate your reasoning and adjust your care plan realistically. You cannot address 15 interconnected problems in a 12-hour shift. The web helps you see what you are dealing with.

INSIGHT 2: Central vs. Peripheral Issues

Diagnoses with many connections are usually more central to the patient's clinical picture. Peripheral diagnoses (few connections) may still need addressing but are not driving the overall situation.

In Mr. Rodriguez's case, Social Isolation is clinically relevant, but peripheral compared to the densely connected triad of Anxiety-Activity Intolerance-Deficient Knowledge.

This does not mean ignoring peripheral issues. It means recognizing what is driving the system.

INSIGHT 3: Problem Clusters

Often, diagnoses cluster together—groups of problems densely interconnected within the cluster but less connected to problems outside it.

Mr. Rodriguez has a PHYSIOLOGICAL CLUSTER (Excess Fluid Volume → Impaired Gas Exchange → Activity Intolerance) and a PSYCHOSOCIAL-EDUCATIONAL CLUSTER (Anxiety ↔ Deficient Knowledge → Risk for Ineffective Management).

These clusters might require different intervention strategies. The physiological cluster needs medical management and physical care. The psychosocial-educational cluster needs teaching, counseling, and support planning.

INSIGHT 4: Leverage Points

Some diagnoses, when addressed, create positive cascading effects throughout the web. These are leverage points where intervention has disproportionate impact.

### In Mr. Rodriguez's case, Deficient Knowledge is a leverage point. Teaching him about heart failure:

- Reduces Anxiety (understanding decreases fear)
- Improves Excess Fluid Volume (he'll follow fluid restriction)
- Increases likelihood of Effective Regimen Management
- May indirectly improve Activity Intolerance (confident patients engage more)

Identifying leverage points guides keystone issue selection (Chapter 3).

COMMON CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

Students encounter predictable difficulties when learning to create Clinical Reasoning Webs. Here is how to address them:

CHALLENGE 1: "I Don't Know Which Diagnoses Connect"

STUDENT SAYS: "I can see that my patient has Pain and Anxiety, but I don't know if they're related or how."

### SOLUTION: Ask yourself questions:

- Does the pain make anxiety worse? (Pain increases sympathetic response, feels threatening)
- Does anxiety make pain worse? (Anxiety lowers pain threshold, increases muscle tension)
- If one improved, would the other improve? (Controlling pain often reduces anxiety)

If the answer is yes to any of these, they are connected. Draw the line. As you learn more pathophysiology and psychology, connections become clearer.

CHALLENGE 2: "My Web Is Too Messy/Complicated"

STUDENT SAYS: "I drew lines everywhere and now I have a tangled mess. I can't see any pattern."

### SOLUTION: This usually means one of two things:

Option A: You are drawing connections that are not clinically significant. Ask: "Does this REALLY influence that, or am I drawing lines just because they're both present?" Be more selective. Only draw meaningful clinical relationships.

Option B: Your patient truly is complex with many interconnected problems. That is OK, the web is accurately representing complexity. Do not simplify artificially. Instead, look for clusters. Circle groups of diagnoses that are densely connected within the group.

CHALLENGE 3: "Everything Connects to Everything"

STUDENT SAYS: "All my diagnoses seem related to each other. Should I draw lines connecting all of them?"

SOLUTION: Not. While complex patients have multiple interactions, not everything directly affects everything else. Ask: "Is this a DIRECT influence or an indirect influence through other problems?"

Example: Does Pain directly influence Risk for Falls, or does Pain → Activity Intolerance → Weakness → Risk for Falls (indirect through intermediate steps)?

Draw direct relationships. The indirect ones become visible through the pathway.

CHALLENGE 4: "How Many Connections Is Too Many?"

STUDENT ASKS: "Should every diagnosis have at least one connection? Is there a maximum?"

ANSWER: There is no magic number. Some diagnoses might be isolated (Risk for Aspiration in a patient who also has unrelated chronic pain does not influence each other). That is clinically accurate.

Central diagnoses often have 4-6 connections in complex cases. More than 8-10 connections to a single diagnosis means you are over-connecting, or the diagnosis is too broad.

Use clinical judgment, not rules.

TEACHING TIP: Scaffolding Web Construction

## I scaffold web construction across curriculum:

FIRST SEMESTER: Simple Cases

- 2-3 diagnoses maximum
- Clear, obvious connections (Pain → Activity Intolerance)
- Mostly one-directional relationships
- Focus: Just practicing the skill of drawing connections

SECOND SEMESTER: Moderate Complexity

- 4-6 diagnoses
- Some bidirectional relationships
- Begin noticing which diagnoses are more central
- Focus: Analyzing the pattern, not just drawing it

SENIOR YEAR: Complex Cases

- 6-10 diagnoses
- Multiple bidirectional cycles
- Clustering patterns

- Leverage point identification
- Focus: Using the web for clinical decision-making

This progression prevents overwhelming students while building capability.

PRACTICE EXERCISE: Build Your Own Web

CASE: Mr. Thompson, 58-year-old with newly diagnosed Type 2 diabetes

## BRIEF ASSESSMENT:

- A1C 9.8%, fasting glucose 245 mg/dL
- BMI 34, sedentary lifestyle, works desk job
- Recent blurred vision episodes (resolved after glucose control)
- States: "I don't understand how this happened. I feel fine most of the time."
- No previous health problems, no current medications
- Lives with spouse and teenage children
- Concerned about diet changes affecting family meals

STEP 1: What nursing diagnoses might apply? (List at least 5)

STEP 2: On paper, draw circles for each diagnosis

STEP 3: Which diagnoses influence each other? Draw connecting lines and write brief rationale for each connection

STEP 4: Count connections for each diagnosis

STEP 5: Which diagnosis(es) appear most central? Why?

STEP 6: Do you see any clusters? Any reinforcing cycles?

(Answers and completed web appear in Appendix B)

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Clinical Reasoning Web visualizes relationships between multiple nursing diagnoses
- Problems do not exist in isolation, they interact and influence each other
- Central diagnoses (many connections) vs. peripheral diagnoses (few connections)
- Clusters show groups of densely interconnected problems
- Leverage points are diagnoses where intervention creates cascading positive effects
- Web construction follows five steps: list, draw circles, connect with lines, count connections, analyze pattern
- Scaffolding from simple to complex cases supports student development
- The web is a thinking tool, not just a documentation requirement

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

## For faculty:

1. How might you integrate web construction into existing clinical courses?

2. What level of complexity is appropriate for your students' developmental stage?

3. How could you use webs in clinical debriefing or simulation debriefing?

## For students:

1. Which connections were easy to see? Which were harder to identify?

2. Did the web reveal anything about your patient that you had not noticed before?

3. How does visualizing relationships change your thinking about intervention priorities?

# CHAPTER 3

IDENTIFYING THE KEYSTONE ISSUE

Finding the Leverage Point

OPENING STORY: Two Students, Same Patient, Different Keystones—Both Valid

During clinical conference, two students—Marcus and Jennifer—presented their reasoning about the same patient, Mrs. Chen, a 68-year-old woman recovering from a fall that resulted in a hip fracture.

Marcus went first, displaying his Clinical Reasoning Web on the screen. He had identified six diagnoses: Acute Pain, Impaired Physical Mobility, Risk for Falls, Anxiety, Deficient Knowledge (fall prevention), and Risk for Social Isolation (lives alone, fearful of falling again).

"My keystone issue is Acute Pain," Marcus explained. "It has five connections in the web—the most of any diagnosis. Pain is preventing her from participating in physical therapy, which means her mobility is not improving. Pain is also making her anxious and affecting her sleep. If I can't control her pain, nothing else will improve."

Jennifer presented next. Her web was identical to Marcus's—same six diagnoses, same connections.

"My keystone issue is Anxiety," Jennifer said. "Here's why: Mrs. Chen is catastrophizing about falling again. She is saying things like 'I'll end up in a nursing home' and 'I can't live independently anymore.' Her fear is making her resist physical therapy even when pain is controlled. She is not absorbing fall prevention education because she is too anxious to focus. The anxiety is driving everything else."

The other students looked confused. "But you both can't be right," one said. "Which keystone is correct?"

I smiled. "Actually, they both might be right. This is where clinical judgment comes in. Let me ask you both: What is your rationale for your choice? What led you to pick that particular diagnosis as keystone?"

Marcus explained: "When I talked to Mrs. Chen, she kept saying 'it hurts too much.' Pain was her primary complaint. And when we gave her, better pain control this morning, she was willing to try walking. Pain seemed like the entry point."

Jennifer added: "But later in the day, even with pain controlled at 3/10, she refused to get out of bed. She told me 'What if I fall again? I will break the other hip.' The physical therapist

said Mrs. Chen has the strength to walk but not the confidence. That's when I realized anxiety was more central than I initially thought."

I turned to the group. "Notice what both students did well: They used the web to identify potential keystones, but they didn't stop there. They used clinical judgment—talking with the patient, observing over time, consulting with the team. The web showed them both Pain and Anxiety were highly connected. Clinical judgment helped them interpret which was more central in this specific context and at this specific time.

Here is the truth: For Mrs. Chen, addressing either Pain OR Anxiety could be the keystone, depending on assessment findings and timeframe. Early post-op, Pain might be keystone. Three days later, with pain controlled, Anxiety might become the keystone.

Keystone selection requires both complexity thinking AND clinical judgment. That's what makes clinical reasoning an art, not just a science."

WHAT IS A KEYSTONE ISSUE?

The term "keystone" comes from architecture and ecology. In an arch, the keystone is the central stone that holds all others in place—remove it and the arch collapses. In an ecosystem, a keystone species is one whose impact on the ecosystem is disproportionately large relative to its abundance.

### In clinical reasoning, a keystone issue is:

THE DIAGNOSIS THAT, IF SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESSED, CREATES POSITIVE CASCADING EFFECTS THROUGHOUT THE SYSTEM

It is the leverage point. The place where intervention has ripple effects across multiple other problems. The diagnosis that, improved, makes other problems easier to manage or spontaneously improve.

## KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF KEYSTONES:

NOT ALWAYS THE MOST CONNECTED: The diagnosis with the most connections in your web is often a good candidate for keystone, but not automatically. Clinical judgment matters.

CREATES CASCADING EFFECTS: Addressing the keystone should not just improve that one problem—it should positively affect multiple other diagnoses.

AMENABLE TO INTERVENTION: A keystone must be something nursing can actually influence. If you cannot intervene effectively, it cannot be your leverage point.

CLINICALLY SIGNIFICANT: It must matter to the patient's outcomes, safety, or quality of life. Theoretically central but clinically minor diagnoses are not keystones.

CONTEXTUAL: Keystones can change over time as the patient's situation evolves. What's keystone on Day 1 might not be keystone on Day 5.

WHY KEYSTONE IDENTIFICATION MATTERS

Identifying the keystone issue provides focus. You cannot address eight diagnoses equally and simultaneously. You need priorities. But prioritizing by urgency alone ("which problem will kill them first?") misses the systems perspective.

Keystone thinking asks: "Which problem, if I address it well, will create the most positive system-wide change?"

This is different from traditional nursing priority frameworks like Maslow's hierarchy (physiological first, then safety, then psychosocial). Maslow helps with life-threatening situations, but for complex chronic patients, keystone thinking often reveals that psychosocial or educational issues are the actual leverage points.

FOUR CRITERIA FOR KEYSTONE SELECTION

When students ask, "How do I know which diagnosis is the keystone?" I give them four criteria. The keystone issue should meet most or all of these:

CRITERION 1: Connection (But Not Only Connection)

Look at your Clinical Reasoning Web. Which diagnoses have the most connections? These are candidates for keystone.

### But do not stop there. A highly connected diagnosis might not be the keystone if:

- It is a consequence rather than a cause
- It is not amenable to intervention
- Other diagnoses, though less connected, have greater cascade potential

CRITERION 2: Impact (Cascading Effects)

Ask: "If this diagnosis improves, what else gets better?"

Trace through the web. If addressing Diagnosis X would positively affect four other diagnoses, but addressing Diagnosis Y would only affect one other, X has greater cascade potential.

Example: In Mr. Rodriguez's case (Chapter 2), addressing Deficient Knowledge creates cascading effects:

- Knowledge → Better Fluid Management → Reduced Excess Fluid Volume
- Knowledge → Reduced Anxiety (understanding decreases fear)
- Knowledge → Better long-term regimen management

- Knowledge → Increased confidence → Improved Activity Tolerance

Compare that to addressing Sleep Pattern Disturbance, which has fewer connections and more limited cascade effects.

CRITERION 3: Amenability to Nursing Intervention

Even if a diagnosis is highly connected and would create cascading effects, it is not a useful keystone if you cannot intervene effectively.

Example: In a patient with multiple problems stemming from severe dementia, you might identify that dementia is central to everything. But you cannot reverse dementia. It is not amenable to intervention. Your keystone needs to be something you CAN influence, Caregiver Role Strain, which you CAN address and which WOULD improve multiple outcomes.

Ask: "Can I realistically make meaningful progress on this diagnosis during the timeframe I have?"

CRITERION 4: Salience (What Matters to Patient/Family)

The keystone should be meaningful to the patient. Clinical priorities that ignore patient values and goals often fail.

Ask the patient: "What bothers you most? What would make the biggest difference in your life right now?"

Sometimes what is clinically central aligns with what matters to the patient. Sometimes it does not. When there's mismatch, you need to negotiate. But patient perspective must inform keystone selection.

Example: You might identify Activity Intolerance as physiologically central, but the patient's primary concern is getting home to care for their grandchildren. Family Processes or Social Isolation might be more salient keystones even if they are less connected in your web.

CASE ANALYSIS: Three Patients, Different Keystones

Let us examine three cases showing how keystone selection requires clinical judgment applying the four criteria.

CASE A: Post-Operative Patient—Jason, 19, Appendectomy

### CLINICAL REASONING WEB (3 diagnoses):

- Acute Pain (6/10)
- Anxiety (worried about missing school)
- Deficient Knowledge (activity restrictions, wound care)

## CONNECTIONS:

- Pain → Activity limitations → Anxiety (about recovery time)
- Deficient Knowledge → Anxiety (uncertainty about what is normal)
- Pain ↔ Anxiety (bidirectional)

## KEYSTONE ANALYSIS:

Connection: All three are moderately connected (2-3 connections each)

### Impact: Pain has strongest cascade potential—if pain controlled:

- Can mobilize (reducing complications)
- Anxiety decreases (less symptomatic distress)
- Can engage in learning (attention freed from pain)

Amenability: Pain is highly amenable—this is acute post-op pain, responsive to analgesics and positioning

Salience: Jason's primary complaint is pain ("it hurts to move")

KEYSTONE: Acute Pain

RATIONALE: Meets all four criteria. Addressing pain creates cascading benefits for activity, anxiety, and learning. This is straightforward case where the most obvious choice is correct.

CASE B: Newly Diagnosed Diabetic—Maria, 45

### CLINICAL REASONING WEB (7 diagnoses):

- Unstable Blood Glucose
- Impaired Tissue Integrity (foot infection)
- Deficient Knowledge: Diabetes Management
- Caregiver Role Strain (caring for mother with dementia)
- Anxiety
- Risk for Ineffective Health Management
- Powerlessness

### CONNECTIONS (complex web):

- Caregiver Role Strain → limited time for self-care → Unstable Glucose
- Deficient Knowledge → Unstable Glucose + Impaired Tissue Integrity
- Anxiety ↔ Unstable Glucose (stress hormones)
- Powerlessness → Risk for Ineffective Management
- All interrelated in complex pattern

## KEYSTONE ANALYSIS:

Connection: Deficient Knowledge has 4 connections; Caregiver Role Strain has 3; Anxiety has 3

### Impact:

- Knowledge would improve glucose control, tissue healing, self-management, and reduce anxiety
- Caregiver strain addresses: time for self-care, but does not fix knowledge gap
- Anxiety: reduces stress response, but does not provide skills

### Amenability:

- Knowledge: Highly amenable during 5-day hospitalization
- Caregiver strain: Partially amenable (can connect to resources but cannot eliminate caregiving responsibilities)
- Anxiety: Moderately amenable

Salience: Maria says: "I don't understand what I'm supposed to do. It feels overwhelming."

KEYSTONE: Deficient Knowledge: Diabetes Management

RATIONALE: While Caregiver Role Strain is important and contextually significant, Knowledge is the keystone because:

1. It is highly amenable during hospitalization

2. Creates strongest cascade effects

3. Patient identifies not understanding as primary concern

4. Knowledge empowers her to manage within constraints of caregiving role

Note: You do not ignore Caregiver Strain—you address it as part of the care plan. But Knowledge is the leverage point that makes everything else more manageable.

CASE C: Heart Failure Exacerbation—Mrs. Chen (Complex)

### CLINICAL REASONING WEB (8 diagnoses):

- Excess Fluid Volume
- Activity Intolerance
- Decreased Cardiac Output
- Impaired Gas Exchange
- Deficient Knowledge
- Caregiver Role Strain (daughter)
- Powerlessness
- Anxiety

### CONNECTIONS: Dense, complex web with two clusters:

- Physiological cluster: Cardiac Output ↔ Fluid Volume ↔ Gas Exchange ↔ Activity
- Psychosocial cluster: Caregiver Strain ↔ Powerlessness ↔ Anxiety ↔ Knowledge

## KEYSTONE ANALYSIS—TWO VALID OPTIONS:

OPTION A: Excess Fluid Volume

- Addresses immediate physiological crisis
- Creates cascading physiological improvements
- Highly amenable to medical/nursing intervention
- Acute priority

OPTION B: Ineffective Health Management (if added to web)

- Addresses root cause of repeated readmissions
- Creates cascading improvements in long-term outcomes
- Requires addressing knowledge, caregiver support, and psychosocial factors
- Chronic priority

STUDENT DECISION: Depends on timeframe and context

ACUTE PHASE (Days 1-2): Excess Fluid Volume is keystone

Focus: Diuresis, symptom management, stabilization

TRANSITION PHASE (Days 3-5): Shift toward Deficient Knowledge or Family Processes

Focus: Teaching, discharge planning, preventing readmission

RATIONALE: Keystone changes as patient condition changes. Both students in our opening story were right—at different points in the care trajectory.

This demonstrates why clinical judgment is essential. The web shows candidates. Context determines which is keystone right now.

WHEN STUDENTS DISAGREE ABOUT KEYSTONE

This happens frequently, and it is pedagogically valuable. When two students select different keystones for the same patient, it creates opportunity for deep discussion.

### As faculty, do not rush to tell students who's "right." Instead, use Socratic questioning:

"Tell me your reasoning. Why did you select that diagnosis as keystone?"

"What evidence supports your choice? What did the patient tell you?"

"If you addressed that keystone successfully, what would improve? Trace the cascade effects through your web."

"What's the timeframe you're considering? Would your keystone choice change if you were planning care for 24 hours versus 5 days?"

"What makes this amenable to intervention? What is your plan?"

"Did the patient tell you what matters most to them? How does that inform your choice?"

### Often, exploring these questions reveals that:

BOTH KEYSTONES ARE VALID: Different students are reasoning about different timeframes or emphasizing different cascade effects. Both reasonable.

ONE STUDENT HAS STRONGER RATIONALE: Through discussion, it becomes clear one choice has better evidence or more comprehensive cascade thinking.

THE WEB NEEDS REVISION: Sometimes keystone disagreement reveals that one student's web is missing important connections or diagnoses.

STUDENT'S ASSUMPTIONS ARE VISIBLE: Keystone selection makes thinking visible. A student who always chooses physiological diagnoses might need coaching to consider psychosocial leverage points.

THE GOAL ISN'T UNIFORMITY: The goal is defensible reasoning. Students should be able to articulate why they chose their keystone using the four criteria.

STUDENT VOICE: "Realizing There's Not One Right Answer"

"I was so relieved when Dr. Pesut said both keystones could be valid. I thought clinical reasoning meant finding THE right answer, like a math problem. Realizing it's about defensible judgment based on evidence—that's what made me feel like a real nurse instead of just a student following rules."

"The scariest thing was when my keystone was different from my preceptor's. But when I explained my reasoning, she said 'That's actually a really thoughtful analysis.' She went with her choice because she had more information about the family, but she respected mine. That taught me that experienced nurses can see things differently and both be good clinicians."

"I used to just pick the first diagnosis on my list or whatever seemed most 'medical.' Learning to think about cascade effects changed everything. Now I actually think through the SYSTEM before deciding priorities."

"When I realized keystones can change over time, it made sense why my patient seemed different on Day 3 versus Day 1. I was not seeing it wrong before—the situation evolved. The web showed me that evolution."

TEACHING TIP: Using "Fishbowl" Discussions

## One effective teaching strategy for keystone reasoning:

SETUP: Three students, same patient, different keystone selections. Sit them in center of classroom (fishbowl). Other students observe.

## PROCESS:

1. Each student presents their Clinical Reasoning Web and keystone choice (5 min each)

2. Students in fishbowl discuss: "How did we see this differently? What led to different conclusions?" (10 min)

3. Observer students ask questions or share their reasoning (10 min)

4. Faculty facilitates synthesis, highlighting good clinical judgment regardless of final choice (5 min)

## BENEFITS:

- Makes reasoning processes visible
- Shows that disagreement can be productive
- Models professional dialogue
- Reduces anxiety about "getting it wrong"

COMMON PITFALLS IN KEYSTONE SELECTION

## Students make predictable errors when learning keystone identification. Here is how to avoid them:

PITFALL 1: Defaulting to Physiological Issues

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: Student always picks the most "medical" diagnosis as keystone—Impaired Gas Exchange, Decreased Cardiac Output, etc.—even when psychosocial or educational issues are more central.

WHY IT HAPPENS: Students feel more confident with physiological reasoning. Psychosocial issues feel "soft" or secondary.

HOW TO ADDRESS: Challenge students: "What if addressing the psychosocial issue would actually improve the physiological one more than directly treating the physiological issue?" Use cases where this is clearly true.

EXAMPLE: Patient with COPD exacerbation whose primary issue is Anxiety → hyperventilation → worse gas exchange. Addressing Anxiety IS addressing gas exchange—more effectively than just oxygen.

PITFALL 2: Choosing Based on Connection Count Alone

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: "This diagnosis has 6 connections and that one has 4, so the 6-connection one is my keystone."

WHY IT HAPPENS: It is concrete and easy. Counting feels objective.

HOW TO ADDRESS: Show cases where the most connected diagnosis is not the best keystone. Use the four criteria framework explicitly.

EXAMPLE: Pain might have many connections but be a consequence of other issues. Addressing the underlying issue (knowledge deficit leading to poor positioning, anxiety increasing pain perception) is the better keystone.

PITFALL 3: Ignoring Patient Perspective

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: Clinically sound keystone selection that completely misses what matters to patient.

WHY IT HAPPENS: Students are focused on "getting it right" clinically and forget to ask patient.

HOW TO ADDRESS: Make "What does the patient say matters most?" a required part of keystone justification. Show cases where patient-identified priorities reveal keystones students missed.

EXAMPLE: Student identifies Activity Intolerance as keystone for elderly patient. But patient's stated priority is "I'm worried my husband can't manage at home without me." Caregiver Role Strain (of patient's husband) or Family Processes might be more salient keystone.

PITFALL 4: Unchanging Keystones

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: Student identifies keystone on Day 1 and never reconsiders even when patient situation evolves.

WHY IT HAPPENS: Students think keystone selection is a one-time decision, like picking a diagnosis.

HOW TO ADDRESS: Explicitly teach that keystones can change. Build "keystone reassessment" into daily clinical rounds. Ask: "Is your keystone still the keystone, or has it changed?"

EXAMPLE: Post-op patient where Day 1 keystone is Pain, Day 3 keystone shifts to Deficient Knowledge as pain resolves, and discharge planning begins.

COMPLEXITY THINKING: How Keystones Work

The concept of keystone issues comes from complexity science and systems thinking. Understanding why keystones work helps students identify them more effectively.

LEVERAGE POINTS IN COMPLEX SYSTEMS

Donella Meadows, a systems theorist, taught that in complex systems, some intervention points have much greater impact than others. These are leverage points.

In clinical systems, keystone issues are leverage points. Intervening there changes the system's behavior more efficiently than intervening at other points.

### Why? Because of:

INTERCONNECTION: Keystones are densely connected to other problems

CAUSATION: Keystones often drive or maintain other problems

FEEDBACK LOOPS: Addressing keystones interrupts reinforcing cycles

RESOURCE EFFICIENCY: Limited time/resources have maximum impact when focused on keystones

CASCADING EFFECTS AND POSITIVE CYCLES

### When you address a keystone issue effectively, you create positive cascading effects:

Keystone improves → Connected problem A improves → Which improves connected problem B → Which further improves the keystone → Creating an upward spiral

Example: Teaching Mrs. Martinez about heart failure (keystone: Deficient Knowledge)

→ She follows fluid restriction → Fluid volume improves

→ She's less short of breath → Activity tolerance increases

→ She feels more confident → Anxiety decreases

→ She engages more in self-care → Knowledge deepens → UPWARD SPIRAL

This is why keystone selection matters so much. It is not just about prioritizing, it is about creating system-wide positive change.

PRACTICE EXERCISE: Keystone Selection with Rationale

CASE: Mr. Thompson, 58, newly diagnosed Type 2 diabetes (from Chapter 2)

## REMINDER:

- A1C 9.8%, fasting glucose 245 mg/dL

- BMI 34, sedentary lifestyle
- Blurred vision episodes (resolved)
- States: "I don't understand how this happened"
- No previous health problems
- Concerned about diet changes affecting family

### YOUR CLINICAL REASONING WEB (from Chapter 2 exercise) identified multiple diagnoses. Now:

STEP 1: Look at your web. Which diagnoses have the most connections?

### STEP 2: Apply the four criteria to your top 2-3 candidates:

- Connection: How connected is it?
- Impact: What would improve if you addressed this?
- Amenability: Can you effectively intervene?
- Salience: What does Mr. Thompson say matters?

STEP 3: Select your keystone issue and write 1-paragraph rationale explaining your choice using the four criteria.

STEP 4: Trace the cascade effects: If you successfully address this keystone, what specific improvements would you expect in other diagnoses?

(Sample answer with rationale appears in Appendix B)

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Keystone issue is the diagnosis that, addressed, creates positive cascading effects throughout the system
- Keystone selection requires both Clinical Reasoning Web analysis AND clinical judgment
- Four criteria guide selection: Connection, Impact, Amenability, Salience
- Multiple valid keystones may exist depending on timeframe and context
- Keystones can change as patient situation evolves
- Most connected diagnosis is often but not always the keystone
- Patient perspective must inform keystone selection
- Keystone thinking is application of complexity science and systems thinking to clinical reasoning
- Goal is defensible reasoning, not uniformity of choice

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

### For faculty:

1. How do you currently teach prioritization? How might keystone thinking enhance your approach?

2. When students disagree about keystones, how do you facilitate learning from that disagreement?

3. How might you assess students' keystone reasoning beyond just their final choice?

### For students:

1. Was your keystone selection primarily based on connection count, or did you use all four criteria?

2. Did you ask the patient what matters most to them? How did that inform your choice?

3. How might your keystone change if you were planning care for 8 hours versus 5 days?

4. Can you trace specific cascade effects your keystone would create?

# CHAPTER 4

OUTCOME SPECIFICATION AND TESTING

The Engine of Clinical Reasoning

OPENING STORY: From Hoping to Specifying

Jessica was three weeks into her medical-surgical clinical rotation when she had a moment of uncomfortable self-awareness. During clinical conference, her instructor asked: "What outcomes are you working toward with your patient?"

Jessica consulted her care plan. "I want Mrs. Lewis's pain to improve, her mobility to get better, and her anxiety to decrease."

"Those are nice wishes," her instructor said gently, "but they're not outcomes. What does 'improve' mean? How much better? By when? How will you know if you have achieved it?"

Jessica stared at her care plan. She had written goals like "Patient will demonstrate improved pain control" and "Patient will verbalize decreased anxiety." They sounded professional. They matched the examples in her textbook. But her instructor was right, they were vague hopes, not measurable outcomes.

"I honestly don't know," Jessica admitted. "I guess I've been hoping things get better and then checking if they did. But I have not been specific about what 'better' looks like."

Her instructor pulled out the NOC (Nursing Outcomes Classification) book. "Here's Pain Level as an outcome. It uses a 5-point scale. Mrs. Lewis is currently at a 4—Severe pain. What is a realistic target for three days from now?"

Jessica thought about Mrs. Lewis's situation—major abdominal surgery, currently day 2 post-op. "Maybe... a 2? Moderate pain?"

"Good. That is specific. Now we have something to test. Let us write: 'Patient will achieve Pain Level score of 2 (Moderate) within 72 hours, measured using NOC Pain Level indicators.' That is an outcome we can test every shift. We'll know if our pain management plan is working."

Jessica rewrote her care plan with specific, measurable outcomes. Three days later, when Mrs. Lewis achieved Pain Level 2 exactly on schedule, Jessica felt something new—not just hope that care was working, but evidence that it was.

"This is what expert nurses do differently," her instructor explained. "They don't hope for improvement, they specify exactly what improvement looks like, then systematically test whether they're achieving it. That's the difference between guessing and clinical reasoning."

## WHY EXPLICIT OUTCOMES MATTER

For decades, nursing students learned to write "goals" or "expected outcomes" as part of care plans. But many of these goals were so vague they could not actually be measured or tested:

- "Patient will demonstrate improved breathing"
- "Patient will have adequate nutrition"
- "Patient will express understanding"

These sound professional, but what do they mean? How do you test them?

The OPT Model requires explicit outcome specification using measurable criteria. Here is why that matters:

## VAGUE GOALS CAN'T BE TESTED

If your goal is "improve breathing," how do you know if you have achieved it? The patient feels slightly better? Respiratory rate dropped from 26 to 24? SpO2 increased from 89% to 91%? All of those are "improvement," but they represent very different clinical situations.

Without specific, measurable outcomes, testing becomes subjective impression rather than systematic evaluation.

## MEASURABLE TARGETS ENABLE TESTING

When you specify "Patient will achieve SpO2 ≥92% on room air within 48 hours," you have a testable hypothesis:

- Clear target: SpO2 ≥92%
- Specific timeframe: 48 hours
- Defined conditions: room air (not supplemental O2)

Every shift, you test: Are we moving toward this target? If not, why not? Do we need to adjust our interventions or reconsider our keystone?

## NOC PROVIDES STANDARDIZED LANGUAGE

The Nursing Outcomes Classification (NOC) system gives us standardized, measurable outcomes with indicators rated on 5-point scales:

1 = Severely compromised / Severe deviation from normal range

2 = Compromised / Substantial deviation

3 = Moderately compromised / Moderate deviation

4 = Mildly compromised / Mild deviation

5 = Not compromised / compromised / Any deviation from normal range

### Using NOC ensures outcomes are:

- Measurable (specific scales)
- Comparable (same language across nurses)
- Sensitive to nursing intervention (outcomes nurses can influence)
- Linked to diagnoses (NOC-NANDA linkages exist)

OUTCOMES GUIDE INTERVENTION SELECTION

When you know your destination (outcome state), selecting the route (interventions) becomes purposeful. You are not just "treating the diagnosis “you’re selecting interventions” most likely to close the gap between present and outcome states.

This transforms intervention planning from "What's typically done for this diagnosis?" to "What will move my patient from present state to outcome state most effectively?"

PRESENT STATE VS. OUTCOME STATE: The Core Move

The OPT Model's central innovation is juxtaposition: placing present state next to outcome state so the gap between them becomes visible and actionable.

## TRADITIONAL APPROACH:

1. Identify diagnosis

2. Select interventions for that diagnosis

3. Hope they work

4. Evaluate later

## OPT MODEL APPROACH:

1. Describe present state clearly (where patient is NOW)

2. Specify outcome state explicitly (where patient needs to BE)

3. The GAP between them reveals what interventions must accomplish

4. Test continuously whether gap is closing

This reversal—starting with the END point—fundamentally changes clinical reasoning.

DESCRIBING PRESENT STATE

Present state is your baseline. It is where the patient is right now, described using the same measures you will use for outcome state.

If you are going to measure pain using NOC Pain Level scale, describe present state using that scale. If you are tracking activity tolerance, use NOC Activity Tolerance indicators for both present and outcome states.

## USING NOC INDICATORS:

NOC provides specific indicators for each outcome. For example, NOC Outcome "Knowledge: Disease Management" includes indicators like:

- Description of disease
- Description of disease process
- Description of benefits of disease management
- Description of signs and symptoms
- Description of prescribed medications
- Description of medication therapeutic effects
- Description of medication side effects

### Each indicator is rated 1-5. Present state might show:

- Description of disease: 2 (Limited knowledge)
- Signs and symptoms: 2 (Limited knowledge)
- Medications: 1 (No knowledge)
- Side effects: 1 (No knowledge)

This specific baseline lets you target teaching and measure improvement precisely.

SPECIFYING OUTCOME STATE

### Outcome state answers three questions:

WHERE? What specific NOC score or clinical indicator?

WHEN? What is the realistic timeframe?

UNDER WHAT CONDITIONS? (Room air? With assistive device? Independently?)

## EXAMPLE - SPECIFIC OUTCOME STATEMENTS:

VAGUE: "Patient will have improved oxygenation"

SPECIFIC: "Patient will achieve SpO2 ≥92% on room air (NOC Respiratory Status: Gas Exchange score of 4 - Mildly compromised) within 48 hours"

VAGUE: "Patient will ambulate better"

SPECIFIC: "Patient will ambulate 100 feet in hallway with rolling walker, achieving Activity Tolerance score of 3 (Moderately compromised), without dyspnea >5/10, within 72 hours"

VAGUE: "Patient will understand diabetes"

SPECIFIC: "Patient will achieve Knowledge: Diabetes Management score of 4 (Substantial knowledge) as evidenced by ability to demonstrate glucose monitoring, describe medication regimen, and verbalize sick-day management within 5 days"

Notice the difference. Specific outcomes are testable. You will know definitively whether you achieved them.

THE GAP: What Interventions Must Accomplish

Once you have described present state and specified outcome state, the gap between them reveals what your interventions must accomplish.

EXAMPLE: Maria's Diabetes Knowledge

### PRESENT STATE:

- Knowledge: Diabetes Management: 2 (Limited knowledge)
- Cannot demonstrate glucose monitoring
- Does not know names or purposes of medications
- Unaware of hypoglycemia symptoms
- No understanding of sick-day management

### OUTCOME STATE (5 days):

- Knowledge: Diabetes Management: 4 (Substantial knowledge)
- Demonstrates glucose monitoring accurately
- Names medications and explains purposes
- Lists hypoglycemia symptoms and treatment
- Describes sick-day management plan

### THE GAP reveals teaching needs:

- HOW to monitor glucose (psychomotor skill)
- WHAT medications do (knowledge)
- WHY this matters (motivation)
- WHEN to call provider (safety)

Interventions from NIC Teaching: Disease Process and Teaching: Prescribed Medication are selected specifically to close this gap.

COMPLETE CASE: Maria's Diabetes

Let us walk through complete outcome specification for Maria, the 45-year-old with newly diagnosed diabetes and foot infection (from Chapter 2).

KEYSTONE ISSUE: Deficient Knowledge: Diabetes Management

## PRESENT STATE (Admission):

NOC OUTCOME: Knowledge: Diabetes Management

Overall Score: 2 (Limited knowledge)

### Specific Indicators:

- Description of diabetes: 2 (Can say "blood sugar too high" but no real understanding)
- Signs and symptoms: 2 (Knows she "gets tired" but does not connect to glucose)
- Prescribed medications: 1 (Knows metformin name, not purpose or dosing)
- Medication side effects: 1 (No knowledge)
- Proper use of insulin: 1 (Hasn't started insulin yet, no knowledge)
- Monitoring procedures: 1 (Watched nurse check glucose, never done herself)
- Hypoglycemia prevention: 1 (No knowledge)
- Hyperglycemia prevention: 1 (Thinks "don't eat sugar")
- Actions to take if symptoms occur: 1 (No knowledge “Call 911?")
- Available support resources: 1 (No knowledge)

NOC OUTCOME: Blood Glucose Level

- Mean glucose: 245 mg/dL (elevated)
- Variation from normal range: 2 (Substantial)

NOC OUTCOME: Tissue Integrity: Skin

- Tissue perfusion (foot): 2 (Compromised)
- Skin lesions present: 2 (Substantial—infected wound)

NOC OUTCOME: Anxiety Level

- Overall: 4 (Mild anxiety but present)
- Restlessness: 4
- Verbalized anxiety: 3 (Moderate states "I don't know how to do this")

NOC OUTCOME: Health Beliefs: Perceived Control

- Belief that actions influence outcomes: 2 (Slightly positive—feels helpless)

## OUTCOME STATE (Discharge: Day 5):

NOC OUTCOME: Knowledge: Diabetes Management

Overall Score: 4 (Substantial knowledge)

### Specific Indicators:

- Description of diabetes: 4 (Explains what diabetes is, why control matters)
- Signs and symptoms: 4 (Lists hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia symptoms accurately)
- Prescribed medications: 4 (Names all medications, explains purposes, correct timing)

- Medication side effects: 3 (Aware of major side effects to watch for)
- Proper use of insulin: 4 (Demonstrates technique accurately)
- Monitoring procedures: 4 (Demonstrates glucose monitoring accurately, records results)
- Hypoglycemia prevention: 4 (Explains prevention and treatment)
- Hyperglycemia prevention: 4 (Describes diet, medication, activity relationship)
- Actions to take if symptoms occur: 4 (Lists specific actions, when to call provider)
- Available support resources: 4 (Has diabetes educator contact, support group info)

NOC OUTCOME: Blood Glucose Level

- Mean glucose: <180 mg/dL
- Variation from normal range: 3 (Moderate improving)

NOC OUTCOME: Tissue Integrity: Skin

- Tissue perfusion: 3 (Moderately compromised—healing progressing)
- Skin lesions: 3 (Moderate—wound size decreased, no signs of infection)

NOC OUTCOME: Anxiety Level

- Overall: 2 (Moderate anxiety—down from mild)
- Verbalized anxiety: 2 (States "I feel more confident now")

NOC OUTCOME: Health Beliefs: Perceived Control

- Belief that actions influence outcomes: 4 (Often positive “I can manage this")

## INTERVENTIONS SELECTED (NIC) TO CLOSE GAPS:

- Teaching: Disease Process (5602)
- Teaching: Prescribed Medication (5616)
- Teaching: Psychomotor Skill (5618) - for insulin administration and glucose monitoring
- Blood Glucose Management (2120)
- Anxiety Reduction (5820)
- Decision-Making Support (5250)
- Support System Enhancement (5440)

These interventions are chosen specifically to close the identified gaps between present and outcome states.

TESTING: The Hypothesis-Testing Process

Testing is the OPT Model's engine. It is not just "evaluation" (the traditional fifth step of nursing process). It is ongoing, systematic hypothesis-testing throughout care delivery.

THE HYPOTHESIS: If we implement these interventions effectively, present state will move toward outcome state according to our specified timeline.

## TESTING ASKS:

- Are NOC scores improving?
- Is the gap closing?
- Are we on track to meet our timeframe?
- If not, why not?
- Do we need different interventions?
- Was our keystone selection accurate?
- Are there barriers we did not anticipate?

TESTING IS CONTINUOUS, NOT ENDPOINT

Traditional "evaluation" happens at the end: Did we achieve the goal? Yes or no?

OPT testing happens throughout: Are we moving toward the outcome? What do we need to adjust?

This continuous testing enables mid-course corrections. You do not wait five days to discover your teaching plan is not working, you test daily and adjust.

DAILY TESTING EXAMPLE: Maria's Knowledge Development

### Here's how testing tracked Maria's progress day by day:

### DAY 1 (Admission):

PRESENT STATE: Knowledge score 2, Glucose 245, Anxiety 4, Tissue Integrity 2

## INTERVENTIONS:

- Initial teaching: What is diabetes? Why control matters?
- Demonstrated glucose monitoring (Maria observed)
- Anxiety reduction: Validated feelings, established rapport
- Wound care initiated

## TESTING:

- Knowledge: Still 2 (too early to expect change)
- Glucose: 220-260 range (infection and stress affecting control)
- Anxiety: Still 4 (high—new diagnosis overwhelming)
- Tissue Integrity: Wound culture obtained, IV antibiotics started

ANALYSIS: On track. Initial teaching provided foundation. Anxiety was high but expected validation helped. Glucose elevated but expected given infection and no insulin yet.

## DAY 2:

PRESENT STATE: Knowledge 2→2.5, Glucose 195-240, Anxiety 4→3, Tissue Integrity 2

## INTERVENTIONS:

- Teaching: Reviewed yesterday's content
- Maria practiced glucose monitoring with supervision (3 attempts)
- Started on insulin—taught injection technique
- Discussed hypoglycemia symptoms and treatment
- Wound care continued

## TESTING:

- Knowledge: 2.5 (beginning understanding—asking good questions)
- Glucose: 195-240 (improving infection responding, insulin on board)
- Anxiety: 3 (moderate “I’m scared of giving myself shots")
- Tissue Integrity: 2 (wound stable, antibiotics working)

ANALYSIS: Good progress. Maria is receptive to learning. Anxiety about insulin normal—need to address. Glucose trending right direction. Wound showing early response.

ADJUSTMENTS: Focus tomorrow on insulin confidence. Break down steps. Have Maria watch video of insulin administration. Address fear directly.

## DAY 3:

PRESENT STATE: Knowledge 2.5→3, Glucose 180-215, Anxiety 3, Tissue Integrity 2→2.5

## INTERVENTIONS:

- Maria gave herself insulin injection (supervised—nervous but successful)
- Taught medication schedule with memory aids
- Discussed diet-medication-activity relationship
- Problem-solved barriers: work schedule, caregiving for mother
- Wound care, dressing change—Maria observed

## TESTING:

- Knowledge: 3 (moderate knowledge—understanding connections)
- Glucose: 180-215 (good progress)

- Anxiety: 3→2.5 (decreased after successful injection “I did it!")
- Tissue Integrity: 2.5 (wound healing evident, less drainage)

ANALYSIS: Significant progress. Maria's confidence is growing. She is making connections between concepts. Identified real-world barriers early—can address them.

KEY INSIGHT: Talking about caregiving stress revealed that her mother's adult day program could provide respite for Maria's self-care. Referred to social work.

## DAY 4:

PRESENT STATE: Knowledge 3→3.5, Glucose 165-195, Anxiety 2.5→2, Tissue Integrity 2.5→3

## INTERVENTIONS:

- Reviewed all content with emphasis on "what if" scenarios
- Maria demonstrated complete glucose check and insulin injection independently
- Discussed return-to-work plan
- Connected with diabetes educator for outpatient follow-up
- Social work consult completed mother enrolled in day program 3 days/week
- Taught wound care—Maria will do at home

## TESTING:

- Knowledge: 3.5 (substantial to good knowledge—can explain rationale)
- Glucose: 165-195 (excellent progress)
- Anxiety: 2 (moderate—manageable level)
- Tissue Integrity: 3 (moderate compromise—healing well)

ANALYSIS: At goal. Maria's statement: "I don't have to be perfect, I just need to be consistent" shows mature understanding. Addressed perfectionism that could sabotage adherence.

ADJUSTMENTS: Tomorrow focus on consolidation—review everything, answer remaining questions, ensure confidence, complete discharge planning.

## DAY 5 (Discharge):

PRESENT STATE: Knowledge 3.5→4, Glucose 155-180, Anxiety 2, Tissue Integrity 3

## TESTING AGAINST OUTCOME STATE:

- Knowledge: 4 (GOAL ACHIEVED—demonstrates all skills accurately, verbalizes understanding)

- Glucose: 155-180 (GOAL ACHIEVED—<180 target met)
- Anxiety: 2 (GOAL ACHIEVED—down to moderate from mild)
- Tissue Integrity: 3 (GOAL ACHIEVED—moderate compromise, healing trajectory established)

## FINAL EVALUATION:

✓ All outcome states achieved within specified timeframe

✓ Maria verbalized confidence: "I have a plan now. I know what to do."

✓ Support systems in place (diabetes educator, social work, mother's respite care)

✓ Follow-up appointments scheduled

✓ Written materials and contact numbers provided

SUCCESS: The gap between present state (Day 1) and outcome state (Day 5) was systematically closed through targeted interventions with continuous testing and adjustment.

WHAT MADE TESTING EFFECTIVE

### Several factors made this testing process work:

SPECIFIC BASELINES: Knowing exact NOC scores on Day 1 gave us concrete comparison points

DAILY MEASUREMENT: We did not wait until Day 5—we tested every day and adjusted

MULTIPLE INDICATORS: We tracked knowledge, glucose, anxiety, wound healing—all relevant outcomes

ANALYSIS AFTER EACH TEST: We did not just collect numbers, we interpreted them and adjusted plans

FLEXIBILITY: When we discovered caregiving barriers (Day 3), we adjusted by adding social work consult

REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS: We expected anxiety Day 1, gradual knowledge building, glucose improvement tied to infection resolution

PATIENT-CENTERED: Maria's statement about "being consistent, not perfect" showed her understanding—we incorporated that wisdom into ongoing teaching

STUDENT VOICE: "Testing Every Day Made Me Actually Notice"

"Before learning the OPT Model, I wrote goals on my care plan and then basically forgot about them until post-conference when my instructor asked if I met them. I would look at my patient and think 'Yeah, they seem better I guess?' But I was not really testing systematically.

Now I check NOC scores every shift. I notice small changes. When my patient's Activity Tolerance went from 2 to 2.5 in one day, I could see progress even though they still had a long way to go. That's motivating for me AND for them."

"The daily testing caught problems early. My patient's knowledge score was not improving Day 2 to Day 3. Testing made that visible. I realized my teaching was not working—I was using too much medical terminology. I adjusted my approach and Day 4 showed improvement. Without daily testing, I would have kept ineffective teaching for the whole week."

"What surprised me was how testing affected my relationship with patients. When I could say 'Your pain score is down from 7 to 4—that's real progress!' they felt encouraged. When testing showed we were not meeting goals, I could say 'Let's figure out why together.' It became collaborative, not me just doing care to them."

COMMON TESTING MISTAKES

Students make predictable errors when learning to test clinical judgments. Here is how to avoid them:

MISTAKE 1: Waiting Until "Evaluation" to Test

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: Student writes outcome for five days from now, then waits until Day 5 to check if it was met.

WHY IT'S PROBLEMATIC: No opportunity for mid-course correction. If interventions are not working, you discover this only when it is too late to adjust.

HOW TO AVOID: Test daily (or every shift). Ask: "Are we on track? Is present state moving toward outcome state at expected pace?"

MISTAKE 2: Not Measuring Against Specific Outcomes

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: "My patient seems better" without referencing actual NOC scores or specific indicators.

WHY IT'S PROBLEMATIC: Subjective impressions are not reliable. Two nurses might disagree about whether patient "seems better."

HOW TO AVOID: Always test against the specific NOC indicators you established. If you said, "Pain Level score of 2 by Day 3," check actual Pain Level score, not general impression.

MISTAKE 3: Giving Up on Interventions Too Quickly

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: Testing shows no improvement after one day. Student concludes interventions are not working and wants to change everything.

WHY IT'S PROBLEMATIC: Many interventions take time. Teaching does not produce knowledge overnight. Activity tolerance improves gradually. Anxiety reduction requires relationship building.

HOW TO AVOID: Set realistic timeframes. Expect gradual change. Only conclude interventions are not working after reasonable trial period AND analysis of why.

MISTAKE 4: Not Considering If Keystone Selection Was Wrong

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: Testing repeatedly shows outcomes not being met, but student keeps same interventions and same keystone.

WHY IT'S PROBLEMATIC: Sometimes the problem is not intervention selection—it is keystone selection. You are addressing a peripheral issue when a more central issue is driving everything.

HOW TO AVOID: Include in your testing analysis: "Is this still the right keystone? Should I reconsider?" Refer back to Clinical Reasoning Web. What am I missing?

MISTAKE 5: Ignoring Patient Input During Testing

WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE: Testing shows "improvement" by NOC scores, but patients reports feeling worse or identifies different priorities.

WHY IT'S PROBLEMATIC: Clinical measures and patient experience should align. When they do not, investigate why. You are measuring the wrong outcomes.

HOW TO AVOID: Always ask patient: "How do you feel about your progress? What is most important to you right now?" Include patient perception as testing data.

REALISTIC OUTCOME SPECIFICATION

One of the hardest skills for students is setting realistic outcomes—ambitious enough to represent meaningful improvement but achievable within realistic timeframes given patient circumstances.

TOO AMBITIOUS: "Patient with severe COPD exacerbation will achieve SpO2 95% on room air within 24 hours"

Reality: Severe COPD patients may never achieve 95%, and 24 hours is too soon. More realistic: "SpO2 ≥88% on 2L O2 within 48 hours"

TOO MINIMAL: "Patient post-cardiac surgery will ambulate 10 feet with assist within 5 days"

Reality: Most cardiac surgery patients can do this Day 2-3. More realistic: "Ambulate 200 feet independently within 5 days"

JUST RIGHT: Considers patient's baseline, diagnosis, typical trajectory, available resources, and timeframe.

## FACTORS INFLUENCING REALISTIC OUTCOMES:

## PATIENT FACTORS:

- Age and baseline functional status
- Severity of current condition
- Comorbidities
- Cognitive status
- Motivation and engagement
- Support systems

## SYSTEM FACTORS:

- Length of stay available
- Resources (PT, OT, diabetes educator, etc.)
- Equipment availability
- Staffing levels

## EVIDENCE:

- What do research and clinical guidelines suggest is achievable?
- What's typical trajectory for this diagnosis?

## CLINICAL JUDGMENT:

- What's this specific patient's situation?
- What does interdisciplinary team think is realistic?
- What does patient identify as realistic and important?

TEACHING TIP: Using Daily Testing Logs in Clinical Education

### One effective teaching strategy:

### DAILY TESTING LOG: Students document:

- Today's Date/Shift
- Keystone Issue
- Outcome State Targeted

- Today's NOC Scores (or relevant measures)
- Change from Previous Day (improved/same/worse)
- Analysis: Why? What is working? What is not?
- Adjustments Planned

This structured log makes testing visible and forces systematic analysis. During clinical conference, students share logs and discuss reasoning.

### Benefits:

- Makes testing routine, not afterthought
- Creates data showing progress over time
- Develops analytical thinking
- Provides concrete discussion points for debriefing

WHEN OUTCOMES AREN'T MET

Sometimes, despite good interventions and continuous testing, outcomes are not met within specified timeframes. This is not necessarily failure, it is clinical reality that requires analysis.

## POSSIBLE REASONS:

## OUTCOME WAS UNREALISTIC:

- Timeframe too short
- Target too ambitious given patient's actual condition
- Did not account for unexpected complications

Solution: Revise outcome to reflect reality. Extend timeframe or adjust target.

## INTERVENTIONS WEREN'T EFFECTIVE:

- Chosen interventions did not address actual barriers
- Implementation was not consistent or high-quality
- Patient did not engage with interventions

Solution: Analyze why interventions did not work. Select different approaches. Address engagement barriers.

## KEYSTONE WAS WRONG:

- Selected diagnosis was not actually central to system
- Different issue emerged as more important
- Clinical situation changed

Solution: Return to Clinical Reasoning Web. Reassess keystone. Select different leverage point.

## BARRIERS EMERGED:

- Social determinants of health (transportation, finances, housing)
- Health literacy lower than assessed
- Family dynamics complicated adherence
- System issues (discharge too early, resources unavailable)

Solution: Identify and address barriers. May need social work, case management, advocacy.

## PATIENT'S CONDITION DETERIORATED:

- New complication developed
- Underlying disease progressed
- Unexpected adverse event

Solution: Reassess entire situation. New Clinical Reasoning Web may be needed. Outcomes must reflect new reality.

THE KEY: Analyze WHY outcomes were not met, not just that they were not. That analysis guides next steps.

PRACTICE EXERCISE: Outcome Specification and Testing

CASE: Mr. Thompson, 58, newly diagnosed Type 2 diabetes (from previous chapters)

You identified your keystone issue in Chapter 3. Now specify outcomes and test them.

STEP 1: Write present state using specific NOC indicators for your keystone issue

- Include at least 3-4 specific indicators with scores

STEP 2: Write outcome state for 7 days from now

- Use same NOC indicators
- Specify realistic targets
- Include timeframe

STEP 3: List the GAP between present and outcome state

- What specifically needs to change?
- What knowledge/skills/resources are missing?

STEP 4: Select 3-4 NIC interventions that would address this gap

STEP 5: Create a testing schedule

- How often will you measure NOC indicators?
- What would indicate you are on track?
- What would indicate you need to adjust?

### STEP 6: Imagine Day 3. Testing shows no improvement in knowledge scores. Analyze:

- What might explain this?
- What would you adjust?
- How would you know if adjustment worked?

(Sample answers appear in Appendix B)

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Explicit outcome specification using NOC provides measurable targets and enables testing
- Present state (where patient is) and outcome state (where patient needs to be) define the gap interventions must close
- Testing is continuous throughout care, not just endpoint evaluation
- Daily testing enables mid-course corrections and adjustment
- Realistic outcomes account for patient factors, system factors, evidence, and clinical judgment
- When outcomes are not met, analyze why—the analysis guides next steps
- Testing makes clinical reasoning visible and improvable
- The gap between present and outcome state reveals what interventions must accomplish

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

### For faculty:

1. How do you teach outcome specification? How might NOC enhance your teaching?

2. What strategies help students develop skill in setting realistic outcomes?

3. How could you incorporate daily testing into clinical education expectations?

### For students:

1. Were your outcomes specific and measurable enough to actually test?

2. Did you test daily, or did you wait until the end to evaluate?

3. When testing showed you were not on track, did you adjust? What did you learn from that?

4. How did testing affect your confidence in your clinical judgment?

# CHAPTER 5

REFLECTION AND METACOGNITION

Thinking About Your Thinking

OPENING STORY: Jake's "Aha" Moment

Jake was a confident student—consistently high grades, quick to identify diagnoses, efficient with time management. But during his critical care rotation, something happened that changed how he understood clinical reasoning.

He was caring for Mr. Patterson, a 62-year-old recovering from complications after cardiac surgery. Jake identified Acute Pain as the keystone issue and implemented a comprehensive pain management plan. By Day 3, Mr. Patterson's pain was controlled at 3/10—Jake's target outcome achieved.

But Mr. Patterson was getting worse. He was increasingly withdrawn, barely eating, refusing physical therapy despite pain control. The cardiologist questioned whether Mr. Patterson was developing depression.

During clinical conference, Jake's instructor asked him to reflect on his reasoning: "Jake, walk me through your thinking. How did you select Acute Pain as your keystone?"

Jake explained: "It had the most connections in my web. Pain was affecting his mobility, sleep, appetite, everything. So, I addressed it first. And I was successful—his pain is controlled now."

"What assumptions were you making?" his instructor probed.

Jake paused. He had not thought about assumptions. "I assumed... that if I controlled the pain, everything else would improve?"

"And did it?"

"No," Jake admitted. "He's actually worse in some ways."

"What were you not seeing?"

Jake thought hard. Then it hit him: "I was seeing what I was confident addressing. Pain is concrete, there is a scale, medications, interventions I know. But when Mr. Patterson talked about feeling like 'half a person' after surgery and being 'useless,' I did not know what to do with that. So, I focused on pain because I felt competent there."

His instructor nodded. "You just did something most students resist—you examined your own thinking process. You noticed that your comfort level was directing your clinical

reasoning, not just the patient's needs. That is metacognition. That's the kind of reflection that transforms good students into excellent nurses."

Jake rewrote his Clinical Reasoning Web. This time, he identified Risk for Situational Low Self-Esteem related to loss of independence as the keystone. When he addressed Mr. Patterson's identity crisis and grief—not just his pain—everything shifted. Mr. Patterson began engaging in rehabilitation, eating better, planning for recovery.

Later, Jake wrote in his reflection journal: "I realized I was avoiding the hard emotional work by hiding behind the 'easy' physiological stuff. My discomfort was directing my reasoning—and I did not even notice until I reflected on my assumptions. This is what metacognition means. It's uncomfortable but powerful."

WHAT IS METACOGNITION?

### Metacognition means "thinking about thinking." It is the capacity to:

- Observe your own reasoning processes
- Notice your assumptions and biases
- Monitor whether your thinking strategies are working
- Adjust your approach when needed
- Reflect on why you think the way you do

### In clinical reasoning, metacognition is the difference between:

- THINKING: "This patient needs pain management"
- THINKING ABOUT THINKING: "Why did I immediately focus on pain instead of the psychosocial issues he's describing? What drove that choice? Was it the best clinical judgment or my comfort level?"

Metacognition adds a crucial layer to the OPT Model. You are not just building Clinical Reasoning Webs and selecting keystones, you are examining HOW you are doing that work and WHY you are making the choices you make.

WHY EXPERTS REFLECT NOVICES DON'T (YET)

Research on expertise development shows a clear pattern: Novices focus on completing tasks. Experts focus on improving their thinking about tasks.

## NOVICE THINKING:

"Did I finish my care plan? Check. Did I give medications on time? Check. Did I document? Check."

Focus: Task completion

## EXPERT THINKING:

"Why did I miss that patient's subtle change in status? What was I paying attention to that caused me to miss that? How can I improve my noticing next time?"

Focus: Process improvement

The difference is metacognitive awareness. Experts have developed the habit of examining their own reasoning. They self-regulate—noticing when their thinking is not working and adjusting.

Students do not naturally do this. It must be explicitly taught.

THE THREE LEVELS OF REFLECTION

### Not all reflection is equally powerful. There are three levels, each deeper than the last:

LEVEL 1: Content Reflection - What Happened?

### This is where most students begin. Content reflection describes events, actions, and outcomes:

- "I assessed my patient"
- "Blood pressure was elevated"
- "I notified the physician"
- "Patient was anxious"
- "I provided reassurance"

Content reflection is narrative: What did I do? What happened? What were the outcomes?

This level is necessary but not sufficient. It describes but does not analyze.

LEVEL 2: Process Reflection - How Did I Think About It?

### Process reflection examines the reasoning processes behind actions:

- "What assumptions did I make about the elevated blood pressure?"
- "Why did I interpret the patient's behavior as anxiety rather than something else?"
- "What pattern was I looking for when I assessed?"
- "What framework organized my thinking?"

Process reflection asks: HOW was I thinking? What strategies did I use? What influenced my interpretation?

This level begins to make thinking visible.

LEVEL 3: Premise Reflection - Why Do I Think That Way?

### Premise reflection examines the foundational beliefs, values, and frameworks that shape thinking:

- "Why do I prioritize physiological problems over psychosocial ones?"
- "What cultural assumptions am I making about what 'good' patients do?"
- "Where did my beliefs about what matters in nursing come from?"
- "What am I not questioning that I should be?"

Premise reflection asks: WHY do I think this way? What beliefs and values underlie my reasoning? What am I taking for granted?

This is the deepest level—examining the operating system, not just the programs running on it.

## PROGRESSION THROUGH LEVELS:

Students typically need to master Level 1 (describing what happened) before moving to Level 2 (analyzing how they thought about it), and Level 2 before Level 3 (examining why they think that way).

Scaffolding matters. Do not ask novice students to do premise reflection before they can do content reflection. Build the skill progressively.

METACOGNITIVE QUESTIONS FOR EACH OPT COMPONENT

The OPT Model provides structure for metacognitive reflection. Here are questions for examining your thinking about each component:

## ABOUT YOUR CLINICAL REASONING WEB:

## CONTENT LEVEL:

- What diagnoses did I include in my web?
- What connections did I draw?
- Which diagnoses were most connected?

## PROCESS LEVEL:

- What connections did I see immediately versus what took longer to recognize?
- What influenced which problems I noticed first?
- Did I look for disconfirming evidence or only confirming evidence?
- How did I decide which connections were clinically significant?

### PREMISE LEVEL:

- What assumptions am I making about how problems relate?
- Am I privileging physiological connections over psychosocial ones? Why?
- What frameworks (from previous learning or experience) organized how I saw this web?
- What relationships might I be missing because of my current understanding?

## ABOUT YOUR KEYSTONE SELECTION:

### CONTENT LEVEL:

- What keystone did I select?
- Why did I choose that diagnosis?
- How many connections did it have?

### PROCESS LEVEL:

- What factors influenced my keystone choice beyond the web structure?
- Did I consider the patient's perspective, or only clinical factors?
- Am I comfortable with ambiguity, or did I need certainty?
- How did I weigh the four criteria (connection, impact, amenability, salience)?

### PREMISE LEVEL:

- What am I assuming about making a problem "important"?
- Am I choosing based on my comfort level or patient need?
- What would someone from a different background (culturally, professionally) see as keystone?
- What values underlie my prioritization?

## ABOUT YOUR OUTCOME SPECIFICATION:

### CONTENT LEVEL:

- What outcomes did I specify?
- What NOC indicators did I use?
- What timeframes did I set?

### PROCESS LEVEL:

- Were my outcomes truly patient-centered, or were they what I thought should matter?

- Did I set realistic or idealistic targets?
- How did my values shape what I defined as "outcome"?
- Did I consult the patient about what outcomes matter to them?

### PREMISE LEVEL:

- What am I assuming defines "success" in nursing care?
- Whose outcomes am I prioritizing—mine, the patient's, the institution's?
- What outcomes am I not considering because they are not measured?
- How do my cultural assumptions about health shape outcome definition?

## ABOUT YOUR TESTING:

### CONTENT LEVEL:

- What did testing reveal?
- Did outcomes improve, stay the same, or worsen?
- What adjustments did I make?

### PROCESS LEVEL:

- When did I notice changes? What did I initially miss?
- Did I interpret data objectively or to confirm my plan?
- How quickly did I adjust when things were not working?
- What made me decide interventions were not effective versus needing more time?

### PREMISE LEVEL:

- What am I assuming about how quickly change should occur?
- Am I judging "success" by task completion or meaningful patient change?
- How do I handle when outcomes are not met—as my failure or as information?
- What beliefs about nursing effectiveness influence my interpretation of testing data?

SELF-REGULATION STRATEGIES

Self-regulation means monitoring and controlling your own learning and clinical reasoning. It involves three phases: before, during, and after clinical reasoning.

BEFORE CLINICAL REASONING: Setting the Stage

### PREVIEW:

- What do I already know about this type of patient situation?

- What similar cases have I encountered?
- What resources might I need?

## PLANNING:

- What is my reasoning strategy for approaching this patient?
- How will I organize my assessment?
- What do I need to pay special attention to?

## SETTING INTENTION:

- What am I trying to learn from this experience?
- What specific skill or reasoning process am I working to develop?
- What challenge am I ready to take on?

These questions create mindful readiness rather than reactive scrambling.

DURING CLINICAL REASONING: Monitoring and Adjusting

## MONITORING:

- Is my reasoning working? Am I making progress?
- What am I noticing? What might I be missing?
- Is my Clinical Reasoning Web making sense?
- Does my keystone selection feel right?

## ADJUSTING:

- What do I need to reconsider?
- Should I gather more information?
- Do I need to consult someone?
- What assumptions should I question?

## NOTICING:

- What am I feeling right now?
- Is anxiety or confidence affecting my judgment?
- Am I rushing or avoiding something?
- What is my gut telling me?

These questions create awareness in the moment, enabling real-time adjustments.

AFTER CLINICAL REASONING: Evaluating and Learning

## EVALUATING:

- What worked well? What did not?
- Did my Clinical Reasoning Web capture the important relationships?
- Was my keystone selection effective?
- Did my outcomes make sense?

## CONNECTING:

- How does this case relate to past experiences?
- What patterns am I seeing across multiple patients?
- What theory or research does this connect to?

## GENERALIZING:

- What did I learn about clinical reasoning itself?
- How has my thinking evolved?
- What will I do differently next time?
- What questions do I still have?

These questions extract maximum learning from each experience.

CASE EXAMPLE: Emma's Metacognitive Reflection

Let us examine how one student used metacognitive reflection to transform her reasoning.

## PATIENT SITUATION:

Mrs. Robinson, 78, had dementia, admitted after fall resulting in hip fracture. Surgery completed. Family conflict about discharge planning—daughter wants nursing home, son insists mother comes home with him.

## EMMA'S INITIAL CLINICAL REASONING WEB:

- Acute Pain (post-surgical)
- Impaired Physical Mobility
- Risk for Falls
- Chronic Confusion
- Risk for Injury
- Family Processes, Interrupted

EMMA'S INITIAL KEYSTONE: Acute Pain

RATIONALE: "Pain had 4 connections in my web. It is affecting her mobility, which increases fall risk. Pain is making her more confused. And pain is distressing to everyone. If I control pain, everything else should improve."

## INTERVENTIONS IMPLEMENTED:

- Multimodal pain management
- Repositioning schedule
- Ice and elevation
- Patient-controlled analgesia when appropriate
- Non-pharmacological pain relief

## TESTING (DAY 3):

Pain controlled at 3/10 consistently. Pain management successful.

BUT: Patient increasingly agitated. Pulling at IV. Refusing physical therapy. Family conflict escalating—loud arguments in room. Daughter demanding nursing home placement "because she's so difficult." Son blaming medical team.

## EMMA'S INITIAL REACTION:

"I'm frustrated. I did everything right for pain management. Her pain is controlled. Why isn't she cooperating? Why is the family so difficult?"

## INSTRUCTOR INTERVENTION:

"Let's reflect on your reasoning, Emma. Tell me your assumptions about this case."

### EMMA'S METACOGNITIVE REFLECTION (Guided):

## LEVEL 1 - CONTENT REFLECTION:

"I selected Acute Pain as keystone. I implemented pain interventions. Pain is now controlled at 3/10. But the patient is agitated and uncooperative."

## LEVEL 2 - PROCESS REFLECTION:

"When I think about HOW I approached this case... I focused immediately on pain because it was obvious and measurable. I felt confident managing pain—I know medications, I know assessment scales.

The family conflict made me uncomfortable. I did not know what to do with their arguments, so I left the room. The patient's dementia scared me—I have never cared for someone with significant cognitive impairment before.

I realize now that I chose pain as keystone because it was something I could control. Not because it was the most central issue in the system."

## LEVEL 3 - PREMISE REFLECTION:

"Why did I avoid the family and cognitive issues? I think... I believe that 'real' nursing is physical care—pain, wounds, medications. That is what I have been taught to value and feel confident doing.

I am realizing I have unconsciously ranked problems: Physiological is most important, then safety, then psychosocial last. But for Mrs. Robinson, the family conflict and her cognitive status are actually driving everything.

I was also assuming that if I managed the 'medical' issues well, the family would calm down. But their conflict is not about pain control, it is about grief, guilt, and disagreement about their mother's future. I need different skills for that."

## REVISED UNDERSTANDING:

"When I redrew my Clinical Reasoning Web paying attention to what I'd been avoiding, I realized Family Processes, Interrupted, should have been my keystone. Here is why:

The family conflict is creating chaos in the room, which increases Mrs. Robinson's agitation (dementia patients are sensitive to environmental stress). Her agitation makes pain management harder and makes her refuse physical therapy. The family's unresolved grief and guilt about considering nursing home placement is creating moral distress for everyone.

If I facilitate family communication and help them process their feelings, Mrs. Robinson's environment becomes calmer, her agitation decreases, she can engage in therapy, and discharge planning can proceed."

## REVISED INTERVENTIONS:

- Requested family meeting with social work
- Validated each family member's concerns separately
- Helped them understand dementia's impact on personality
- Explained that nursing home is not "giving up, it’s providing safety
- Created calm environment for patient (reduced stimulation)
- Consistent caregivers when possible

## OUTCOMES (DAY 5):

- Family had productive meeting, and agreed on skilled nursing facility trial
- Mrs. Robinson is less agitated in calmer environment
- Began engaging with physical therapy
- Family conflict reduced
- Discharge planning proceeding

## EMMA'S REFLECTION ON THE REFLECTION:

"This was the most important learning experience of my clinical rotation. Not because I learned about dementia or family systems (though I did). But because I learned about MY thinking.

I learned that my discomfort was directing my clinical reasoning—and I did not even notice. I was avoiding complexity by focusing on what felt manageable. Pain management felt safe. Family conflict felt overwhelming.

Metacognition—examining my own assumptions and reactions—helped me see what I was missing. Now when I feel strongly pulled toward a particular keystone, I ask myself: Is this clinical judgment or my comfort level?

I also learned that reflection can be uncomfortable. Realizing I had chosen pain because it was 'safe' rather than because it was the true keystone who wanted to admit failure. But my instructor reframed it: 'You did not fail—you noticed your pattern and corrected it. That is what expert nurses do.'"

### WHAT EMMA LEARNED (Her Own Words):

"1. Emotions influence reasoning, not just logic. My anxiety about family conflict and dementia shaped what I paid attention to.

2. Comfort ≠ Correctness. Just because I felt confident managing something does not mean it was the most important thing.

3. Metacognition reveals hidden assumptions. I had unconsciously ranked physiological>safety>psychosocial. That ranking is not always clinically appropriate.

4. Complexity requires sitting with discomfort. I wanted to simplify (just manage pain!) when the situation required holding multiple difficult things simultaneously.

5. Reflection transforms experience into learning. Without reflection, I might have just thought 'difficult patient, difficult family' and moved on. Reflection showed me my thinking patterns."

STUDENT VOICE BOXES

"I Thought Reflection Meant Writing About What I Did"

"My first nursing instructor required 'reflective journals' but all she wanted was: What did you do today? How did it go? That is not reflection—that's documentation practice.

When Dr. Pesut taught metacognitive reflection, he asked questions I had never considered: Why did you focus on that? What assumptions were you making? What framework organized your thinking? Those questions were so much harder but also so much more valuable. I finally understood what reflection actually means."

"Asking WHY I Thought That Was Uncomfortable But Powerful"

"I hate admitting I'm wrong or that my reasoning was influenced by fear or discomfort. It is vulnerable. But when I forced myself to ask 'Why did I choose that keystone? Was it really the best choice or was I avoiding something harder?' I discovered patterns I did not know existed.

Now I can catch myself. When I immediately jump to a physiological diagnosis, I pause and ask: Is this truly the keystone or am I retreating to familiar territory?"

"I Realized I Was Avoiding Uncertainty"

"Metacognition showed me that I was choosing simple keystones because they felt certain. Acute Pain is measurable, there is a number. But Spiritual Distress or Risk for Complicated Grieving? Those are ambiguous and hard to measure.

Noticing that pattern helped me get comfortable with uncertainty. Sometimes the keystone IS ambiguous. That is clinical reality. Avoiding it because it's uncomfortable isn't good nursing."

"Reflection Changed My Relationship With Mistakes"

"I used to see mistakes as failures. Now I see them as information about my thinking. When I missed something important, instead of just feeling bad, I ask: What was I paying attention to that caused me to miss that? How can I adjust my reasoning next time?

That shift—from 'I'm bad at this' to 'My thinking needs adjustment here'—made me less defensive and more curious."

TEACHING METACOGNITION

Metacognition does not develop spontaneously. It must be explicitly taught. Here are strategies that work:

STRATEGY 1: Think-Aloud Protocols (Faculty Modeling)

### Faculty verbalize their thinking process while solving clinical problems:

"I'm looking at this patient's assessment data, and I notice I'm immediately drawn to the elevated respiratory rate. Let me pause and ask myself: Why am I focusing on that? Is it

because it is the most important problem, or because respiratory is familiar territory for me?

Actually, I notice the patient mentioned feeling hopeless earlier. I glossed over that because I am less confident with mental health issues. But that statement might be more significant than the respiratory rate. Let me reconsider..."

By verbalizing internal dialogue, faculty model metacognitive awareness. Students learn: This is what expert thinking sounds like.

STRATEGY 2: Paired Reflection (Students Compare Reasoning)

### Two students present the same case:

- How did each draw their Clinical Reasoning Web?
- What keystones did each select?
- Why did they reason differently?

Then analyze: What assumptions led to different conclusions? What did each notice or miss?

This makes it visible that reasoning is interpretive, not automatic. Different nurses can see the same patient differently—both reasonably—based on what they attend to.

STRATEGY 3: Journaling With Specific Prompts

Generic journaling ("What did you learn today?") produces superficial reflection. Specific prompts focus on metacognition:

## EFFECTIVE PROMPTS:

- "Describe a moment when you felt uncertain. How did you handle that uncertainty? What does that reveal about your thinking?"
- "Identify an assumption you made about your patient. Where did that assumption come from? Was it accurate?"
- "When did you adjust your reasoning today? What triggered that adjustment?"
- "What problem did you avoid addressing? Why? What made it uncomfortable?"

Prompts should push students toward process and premise reflection, not just content.

STRATEGY 4: Debriefing Focused on Thinking, Not Just Doing

Traditional debriefing: "What did you do? How did it go? What would you do differently?"

Metacognitive debriefing: "What were you thinking? What assumptions were you making? How did you decide? What influenced your interpretation? What would you think differently next time?"

The shift from DOING to THINKING makes reasoning visible and improvable.

WHAT DOESN'T WORK

## Some approaches to "reflection" do not develop metacognition:

INEFFECTIVE: Generic "Reflect on Your Learning"

Without specific prompts or frameworks, students write vague generalities: "I learned a lot today. It was interesting. I need to study more."

These do not examine thinking processes. They are superficial.

INEFFECTIVE: Reflection as Punishment for Mistakes

"You made an error. Write a reflection about what you did wrong."

This creates defensiveness, not curiosity. Students write what they think you want to hear, not genuine examination of their reasoning.

INEFFECTIVE: Faculty Telling Students What They Should Have Thought

"You should have thought about X, not Y."

This replaces student thinking with faculty thinking. It does not develop their metacognitive capacity, it just makes them dependent on you.

INEFFECTIVE: Metacognition Without Safe Environment

If students fear judgment or consequences for admitting uncertainty, they will not engage honestly with metacognitive reflection. They will perform compliance, not genuine self-examination.

Safety is essential. Students must trust that examining their thinking honestly (even when it reveals mistakes) will be met with curiosity, not criticism.

TEACHING TIP: Scaffolding Reflection From Simple to Complex

## Like all OPT Model skills, metacognitive reflection should be scaffolded:

### NOVICE STUDENTS (First Semester):

- Focus on content reflection: What happened? What did you do?
- Introduce simple process questions: Why did you choose that intervention?
- Use structured prompts extensively

### INTERMEDIATE STUDENTS (Second Semester):

- Emphasize process reflection: How did you think about this?
- Begin premise reflection with guidance: Where do your assumptions come from?
- Reduce structure, expect more independent reflection

## ADVANCED STUDENTS (Senior Year):

- Expect premise reflection: Why do you think that way? What are you taking for granted?
- Challenge automatic thinking: "You said that quickly—what's beneath that answer?"
- Students should self-generate metacognitive questions

PRACTICE EXERCISE: Metacognitive Analysis of Your Own Reasoning

Think about a recent patient case where your reasoning did not go as expected outcomes were not met, keystone selection was challenging, or you felt uncertain.

STEP 1: Content Reflection

- What happened? Describe the situation, your reasoning, and the outcome.

STEP 2: Process Reflection

- How did you think about this case?
- What assumptions did you make?
- What influenced your Clinical Reasoning Web and keystone selection?
- What framework organized your thinking?
- When did you adjust your reasoning? What triggered that?

STEP 3: Premise Reflection

- Why do you think the way you do about this type of situation?
- What beliefs or values influenced your priorities?
- What are you taking for granted?
- What would someone with a different background see differently?
- What are you not questioning that you should be?

STEP 4: Learning Extraction

- What did this analysis reveal about your thinking patterns?
- What will you pay attention to next time?
- What question should you consistently ask yourself?

This exercise builds metacognitive muscle. The more you practice thinking about thinking, the more automatic it becomes.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Metacognition is thinking about observing your own reasoning processes
- Three levels of reflection: Content (what happened), Process (how I thought), Premise (why I think that way)
- Metacognition transforms experience into learning and good nurses into expert nurses

- Self-regulation involves monitoring and adjusting your thinking before, during, and after clinical reasoning
- Each OPT Model component offers opportunities for metacognitive reflection
- Metacognition must be explicitly taught through modeling, prompting, and structured practice
- Safe learning environments are essential students must trust that honest self-examination is valued
- Reflection should be scaffolded from simple content reflection to complex premise reflection
- The goal is developing independent capacity for examining and improving one's own thinking

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

## For faculty:

1. How do you teach reflection currently? How might you deepen it toward metacognition?

2. What strategies could you use to make expert thinking processes visible to students?

3. How do you create safe spaces for honest self-examination?

## For students:

1. What patterns do you notice in your own clinical reasoning?

2. When did you realized your comfort level was directing your thinking?

3. What assumptions do you consistently make? Where do they come from?

4. How has metacognitive reflection changed your clinical reasoning?

# CHAPTER 6

PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER

The Complete OPT Model in Action

This chapter presents three complete cases demonstrating the full OPT Model from beginning to end, progressing from simple to complex:

CASE 1: BEGINNER LEVEL - Jason, 19, Post-Operative Appendectomy

## PATIENT STORY:

Jason is a 19-year-old college sophomore admitted 24 hours ago for uncomplicated laparoscopic appendectomy. He is anxious about missing classes and upcoming exams. Lives in dorm, active in intramural sports, healthy.

## CLINICAL REASONING WEB:

### Three diagnoses with moderate connections:

- Acute Pain (6/10, incisional)
- Anxiety (worried about academics, recovery time)
- Deficient Knowledge (activity restrictions, wound care, return to sports)

## CONNECTIONS:

- Pain → Activity limitations → Anxiety about recovery timeline
- Pain ↔ Anxiety (bidirectional: pain increases distress, anxiety lowers pain threshold)
- Deficient Knowledge → Anxiety (uncertainty about what is normal)

KEYSTONE ISSUE: Acute Pain

RATIONALE: Most connected (3 connections), highly amenable to intervention, patient's primary complaint, addresses physiological priority, creates cascade (pain control → mobilization → anxiety reduction → can focus on learning)

### PRESENT STATE (using NOC):

- Pain Level: 4 (Severe pain) - reports 6/10, grimacing with movement
- Activity Tolerance: 2 (Compromised) - walks to bathroom with assistance only
- Knowledge: Procedures/Treatment: 2 (Limited) - unclear about restrictions, wound care
- Anxiety Level: 4 (Mild) - worried but manageable

## OUTCOME STATE (24 hours):

- Pain Level: 2 (Moderate pain) - 3/10 or less
- Activity Tolerance: 3 (Moderately compromised) - walking hallway independently
- Knowledge: Procedures/Treatment: 4 (Substantial) - verbalizes understanding
- Anxiety Level: 2 (Moderate anxiety) - reduced worry

## INTERVENTIONS (NIC):

- Pain Management (1400)
- Teaching: Prescribed Activity/Exercise (5612)
- Anxiety Reduction (5820)
- Wound Care (3660)

## TESTING OVER 24 HOURS:

Hour 4: Pain 5/10 with PO meds, walked to bathroom, asking questions

Hour 8: Pain 4/10, walked to nurse's station, less guarding

Hour 12: Pain 3/10, anxiety decreased, confidence about home care

Hour 24: Outcome state achieved - Pain 3/10, walking independently, ready for discharge

## REFLECTION:

This straightforward case demonstrates basic OPT Model application. Clear keystone, linear progress, predictable outcomes. Good introduction showing all components working together.

- -

CASE 2: INTERMEDIATE LEVEL - Mrs. Chen, 68, Heart Failure Exacerbation

## PATIENT STORY:

Mrs. Chen lives with daughter and grandchildren. Multiple prior admissions for heart failure. Diabetes, hypertension, arthritis. Limited English proficiency (daughter usually translates). Financially stressed, medication non-adherence due to costs. Daughter works full-time, and providing care is stressful.

### CLINICAL REASONING WEB (8 diagnoses):

### Complex web with two distinct clusters:

## PHYSIOLOGICAL CLUSTER:

- Excess Fluid Volume (SOB, edema, weight gain)
- Activity Intolerance (dyspnea on exertion)
- Decreased Cardiac Output (EF 30%)
- Impaired Gas Exchange (crackles, low SpO2)

## PSYCHOSOCIAL-EDUCATIONAL CLUSTER:

- Deficient Knowledge (HF management, limited English)
- Caregiver Role Strain (daughter overwhelmed)
- Ineffective Health Maintenance (cost-related non-adherence)
- Powerlessness (frequent readmissions, feels out of control)

Dense interconnections within and between clusters.

### KEYSTONE DECISION - Two Valid Options:

OPTION A: Excess Fluid Volume (addresses immediate crisis)

OPTION B: Ineffective Health Maintenance (addresses readmission pattern)

STUDENT DECISION: Ineffective Health Maintenance

RATIONALE: While fluid volume is urgent, pattern of readmissions due to non-adherence makes long-term effectiveness keystone. Timeframe is 5-day hospitalization focused on preventing readmission.

## PRESENT STATE & OUTCOME STATE:

[Multiple NOC indicators across physiological, knowledge, caregiver, and self-management domains]

## INTERVENTIONS:

- Physiological: Fluid management, medication administration, oxygen therapy
- Educational: Teaching in patient's language, written materials with pictures
- Support: Social work consult for medication assistance programs, community resources
- Family: Involving daughter in teaching, respite care options

### TESTING (Non-linear):

Day 1-2: Focus on fluid volume, physiological stabilization

Day 3: Discovered medication costs are barrier → social work intervention

Day 4: Daughter education session → relief finding resources exist

Day 5: Comprehensive discharge plan including medication assistance, follow-up

Caregiver strain reduced, patient/family confident

## REFLECTION:

Demonstrates complexity: multiple valid keystones, non-linear progress, systems issues (finances, language, caregiver strain) beyond bedside care. Shows clinical judgment required when "textbook" approach is insufficient.

- -

CASE 3: ADVANCED LEVEL - Mr. Washington, 58, ICU with Ethical Complexity

## PATIENT STORY:

Septic shock, prolonged ICU stay (3 weeks), multiple organ dysfunction. Previously healthy, sudden catastrophic illness. Family divided: Wife wants "everything done," adult children questioning continued aggressive treatment. Patient's wishes unclear - no advance directive. Staff experiencing moral distress. Prognosis is poor but uncertain.

### CLINICAL REASONING WEB (12+ diagnoses possible):

### Highly interconnected web spanning:

- Critical physiological issues (Impaired Gas Exchange, Decreased Cardiac Output, Acute Confusion, etc.)
- Family system issues (Decisional Conflict, Complicated Grieving, Family Coping strain)
- Communication breakdown (Impaired Verbal Communication from intubation)
- Staff issues (Moral Distress mentioned but impacts care)

### KEYSTONE IDENTIFICATION - Most Challenging:

INITIAL STUDENT CHOICE: Impaired Gas Exchange

RATIONALE: "Most critical physiologically, requires ventilator management, affects everything else"

AFTER REFLECTION: Decisional Conflict (Family)

RATIONALE: "Family's unresolved goals of care drive everything. Aggressive treatment continues without clarity about patient's wishes. Staff providing aggressive care they question ethically. Family paralyzed. Until decisional conflict resolves, nothing else can be addressed appropriately."

## PRESENT STATE:

- Family: Decisional Conflict score 2 (Substantial conflict)
- No consensus on goals, different family members make different requests
- Staff moral distress escalating

## OUTCOME STATE:

- Decisional Conflict: 4 (Mild conflict) - family reaches consensus consistent with patient values
- Clear goals of care documented
- Care plan aligned with goals
- Staff feel ethically supported

## INTERVENTIONS:

- Facilitated family meeting with palliative care, social work, chaplain
- Elicited patient's values/preferences from family stories
- Helped family understand prognosis realistically
- Validated all family members' grief and concerns
- Created space for family to process together
- Supported staff debriefing about moral distress

## TESTING:

### Different kind of testing - not physiological measures but:

- Are productive conversations happening?
- Is family finding clarity?
- Has consensus emerged?
- Do family members feel heard?

### OUTCOME (Day 7):

Family meeting identified patient's stated values: "He never wanted to be dependent on machines."

Consensus reached on time-limited trial (1 week) with transition to comfort care if no improvement.

Staff supported by ethical consultation.

Care plan honored patient's values.

## REFLECTION:

Demonstrates OPT Model's scalability to complex ethical/systems issues. Keystone can be psychosocial/ethical, not physiological. Clinical reasoning extends beyond bedside to family systems and care team dynamics. Testing criteria differ for ethical keystones versus physiological ones.

- -

## COMPARING THE THREE CASES:

## PROGRESSION IN COMPLEXITY:

Beginner (Jason): 3 diagnoses, clear connections, obvious keystone, linear progress, short timeframe (24 hours), physiological focus

Intermediate (Mrs. Chen): 8 diagnoses, clustered connections, multiple valid keystones, non-linear progress, moderate timeframe (5 days), systems issues (financial, language, caregiver)

Advanced (Mr. Washington): 12+ diagnoses, dense interconnection, ambiguous keystone requiring depth reflection, extended timeframe, ethical complexity, team/family systems central

LESSON: OPT Model scales from simple to complex. Same framework applies, but clinical judgment becomes increasingly sophisticated.

- -

## COMMON STUDENT QUESTIONS ANSWERED:

Q: Do I really need to do the web every time?

A: While learning, yes making thinking visible is essential. Eventually it becomes automatic mental process, but external web supports learning.

Q: What if my keystone differs from my instructor's?

A: Defend your reasoning using the four criteria. Multiple valid keystones often exist. Goal is defensible judgment, not uniform answers.

Q: Can keystone change over time?

A: Absolutely. As patient progresses, different issues become central. Day 1 keystone may differ from Day 5 keystone.

Q: What if I cannot achieve outcome state in timeframe?

A: Analyze why. Outcome unrealistic? Interventions ineffective? Keystone wrong? Unexpected barriers? Analysis guides next steps.

Q: Does every diagnosis need connections?

A: No. Peripheral diagnoses may exist independently. The web shows what matters most, not exhaustive connections.

- -

# CHAPTER 7

INTEGRATION WITH CARE COORDINATION

From Individual to Systems Thinking

This brief chapter shows how the OPT Model extends to care coordination through the CCCR (Care Coordination Clinical Reasoning) Systems Model.

## WHY CARE COORDINATION REQUIRES SYSTEMS THINKING:

### Modern healthcare is complex:

- Care happens across multiple settings (hospital, home, clinic, specialty offices)
- Multiple providers involved (physicians, nurses, therapists, social workers)
- Transitions are high-risk moments
- Resources and insurance create constraints
- Family/community systems matter

Individual patient OPT Model reasoning is necessary but insufficient. Care coordination requires thinking at THREE LEVELS simultaneously:

## THE CCCR THREE-LEVEL FRAMEWORK:

## LEVEL 1: PATIENT-CENTERED SYSTEMS THINKING

- Individual OPT Model application
- Clinical Reasoning Web for patient problems
- Keystone identification
- Outcome specification and testing
- This is foundation—everything we have learned in Chapters 1-6

## LEVEL 2: TEAM-CENTERED SYSTEMS THINKING

- Interprofessional clinical reasoning
- Understanding competing values among team members (Competing Values Framework)
- Value exchanges: What does each discipline contribute? What do they need?
- Communication across professional boundaries
- Shared decision-making

## LEVEL 3: ORGANIZATIONAL-CENTERED SYSTEMS THINKING

- System constraints (length of stay, resources, policies)
- Organizational context (culture, priorities, barriers)
- Discharge planning and transition management
- Community resources and social determinants
- Advocacy when system barriers impede patient-centered care

BRIEF CASE EXAMPLE: Mrs. Martinez Post-Hospital

### PATIENT-LEVEL OPT MODEL (Level 1):

Keystone: Deficient Knowledge about HF management

Outcome: Patient demonstrates self-management skills

Interventions: Teaching, skill development

Testing: Knowledge scores improving

### BUT CARE COORDINATION REQUIRES MORE (Levels 2 & 3):

### TEAM-LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS (Level 2):

- Cardiologist wants aggressive medication management
- Home health nurse assesses home safety, medication adherence
- Physical therapist concerned about activity tolerance, fall risk
- Social worker addressing financial barriers to medication costs
- Pharmacist reviewing medication reconciliation

Each sees different priorities. Care coordination = integrating these perspectives, not just adding them.

### ORGANIZATIONAL-LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS (Level 3):

- Insurance approves only 2 weeks home health
- Medication costs prohibitive without assistance program
- Transportation to follow-up cardiology appointment problematic
- Community resources: Senior center, meal delivery, support group

Care coordinator must navigate these systems to support patient success.

## THE CCCR MODEL WEB:

### Similar to OPT Clinical Reasoning Web, but expanded:

- Patient care needs (what OPT Model addresses)
- Team resources and constraints (what each discipline offers/needs)
- Organizational factors (policies, resources, barriers)

- Community resources (what exists, how to access)

All interconnected. Care coordination reasoning identifies keystone issues at SYSTEM level, not just patient level.

## EXAMPLE KEYSTONE AT SYSTEM LEVEL:

Not just "Patient has Deficient Knowledge"

But "Patient has Deficient Knowledge AND medication costs AND limited family support AND insurance restrictions AND no transportation"

The keystone might be: "Access to Sustainable Resources"

- If we do not solve access problems, teaching is insufficient
- Resource barriers will undermine patient's ability to apply knowledge

Interventions target system: Social work for medication assistance, community resources for transportation, extended home health authorization, if possible, backup plans if not.

## WHERE TO LEARN MORE:

This chapter provides brief overview showing OPT Model's extensibility to care coordination. The CCCR Systems Model deserves full treatment beyond this teaching guide's scope.

### For deeper study:

- Kuiper, R., O'Donnell, S., Pesut, D. J., & Turrise, S. (2017). The Essentials of Clinical Reasoning for Nurses
- Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., & Arms, T. (2016). Clinical Reasoning and Care Coordination in Advanced Practice Nursing
- Care coordination literature emphasizing systems thinking and interprofessional collaboration

KEY POINT: The OPT Model you have learned applies at individual patient level. Care coordination scales this reasoning to team and organizational levels. Same principles (webs showing relationships, keystone identification, outcome specification, testing) apply at larger system scale.

- -

CONCLUSION: Where You Go From Here

### You have now learned the complete OPT Model:

- Why it matters (Chapter 1)
- How to build Clinical Reasoning Webs (Chapter 2)

- How to identify keystone issues (Chapter 3)
- How to specify outcomes and test (Chapter 4)
- How to develop metacognitive awareness (Chapter 5)
- How it works in practice, simple to complex (Chapter 6)
- How it extends to care coordination (Chapter 7)

## NEXT STEPS FOR CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT:

1. PRACTICE: Use OPT Model with every patient. Make it routine, not special assignment.

2. REFLECT: After each clinical day, examine your reasoning metacognitively.

3. SHARE: Discuss your Clinical Reasoning Webs with peers, preceptors, instructors.

4. QUESTION: When uncertain, ask: What would my web show? What is the keystone? What outcomes am I targeting?

5. TEACH: Explaining OPT Model to others deepens your understanding.

The OPT Model is not "one more thing" to learn. It is a framework for organizing thinking you are already trying to do. It makes expert reasoning visible, teachable, and improvable.

Use it. Trust it. Let it evolve with your growing expertise.

You have learned how expert nurses think. Now go be one.

# REFERENCES

## OPT MODEL - FOUNDATIONAL WORKS


Pesut, D. J., & Herman, J. (1998). OPT: Transformation of nursing process for contemporary practice. Nursing Outlook, 46(1), 29-36.

Pesut, D. J., & Herman, J. (1999). Clinical reasoning: The art and science of critical and creative thinking. Delmar Publishers.

Pesut, D. J. (2008). Thoughts on thinking with complexity in mind. In C. Lindberg, S. Nash, & C. Lindberg (Eds.), On the edge: Nursing in the age of complexity (pp. 211-238). Plexus Press.

Kautz, D. D., Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., Knight-Brown, P., & Daneker, D. (2005). Promoting clinical reasoning in undergraduate nursing students: Application and evaluation of the Outcome Present State Test (OPT) model of clinical reasoning. International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship, 2(1), Article 1.

Bartlett, R., Bland, A., Rossen, E., Kautz, D., Benfield, S., & Carnevale, T. (2008). Evaluation of the outcome-present state-test model as a way to teach clinical reasoning. Journal of Nursing Education, 47(8), 337-344.

Kuiper, R., & Pesut, D. J. (2004). Promoting cognitive and metacognitive reflective reasoning skills in nursing practice: Self-regulated learning theory. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 45(4), 381-391.


## CARE COORDINATION CLINICAL REASONING (CCCR) MODEL


Kuiper, R., O'Donnell, S., Pesut, D. J., & Turrise, S. (2017). The essentials of clinical reasoning for nurses: Using the outcome-present state-test model for reflective practice. Sigma Theta Tau International.

Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., & Arms, T. (2016). Clinical reasoning and care coordination in advanced practice nursing. Springer Publishing Company.

Pesut, D. J. (2018). Reflective clinical reasoning. In P. S. Yoder-Wise & K. Kowalski (Eds.), Beyond leading and managing: Nursing administration for the future (2nd ed., pp. 247-261). Elsevier.


## NURSING DIAGNOSIS AND STANDARDIZED LANGUAGES


NANDA International. (2021). Nursing diagnoses: Definitions and classification 2021-2023 (12th ed.). Thieme.

Moorhead, S., Swanson, E., Johnson, M., & Maas, M. L. (2018). Nursing Outcomes Classification (NOC): Measurement of health outcomes (6th ed.). Elsevier.

Butcher, H. K., Bulechek, G. M., Dochterman, J. M., & Wagner, C. M. (2018). Nursing Interventions Classification (NIC) (7th ed.). Elsevier.

Johnson, M., Moorhead, S., Bulechek, G., Butcher, H., Maas, M., & Swanson, E. (2012). NOC and NIC linkages to NANDA-I and clinical conditions: Supporting critical reasoning and quality care (3rd ed.). Elsevier.

## CLINICAL REASONING - GENERAL

Tanner, C. A. (2006). Thinking like a nurse: A research-based model of clinical judgment in nursing. Journal of Nursing Education, 45(6), 204-211.

Benner, P., Sutphen, M., Leonard, V., & Day, L. (2010). Educating nurses: A call for radical transformation. Jossey-Bass.

Benner, P., Tanner, C. A., & Chesla, C. A. (2009). Expertise in nursing practice: Caring, clinical judgment, and ethics (2nd ed.). Springer Publishing Company.

Simmons, B. (2010). Clinical reasoning: Concept analysis. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 66(5), 1151-1158.

Levett-Jones, T., Hoffman, K., Dempsey, J., Jeong, S. Y., Noble, D., Norton, C. A., Roche, J., & Hickey, N. (2010). The 'five rights' of clinical reasoning: An educational model to enhance nursing students' ability to identify and manage clinically 'at risk' patients. Nurse Education Today, 30(6), 515-520.

Cappelletti, A., Engel, J. K., & Prentice, D. (2014). Systematic review of clinical judgment and reasoning in nursing. Journal of Nursing Education, 53(8), 453-458.

Croskerry, P. (2009). A universal model of diagnostic reasoning. Academic Medicine, 84(8), 1022-1028.

Banning, M. (2008). Clinical reasoning and its application to nursing: Concepts and research studies. Nurse Education in Practice, 8(3), 177-183.

## METACOGNITION AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1991). Transformative dimensions of adult learning. Jossey-Bass.

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. Curriculum Inquiry, 6(3), 205-228.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory into Practice, 41(2), 64-70.

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 19(4), 460-475.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906-911.

Nielsen, A., Stragnell, S., & Jester, P. (2007). Guide for reflection using the clinical judgment model. Journal of Nursing Education, 46(11), 513-516.

Ruth-Sahd, L. A. (2003). Reflective practice: A critical analysis of data-based studies and implications for nursing education. Journal of Nursing Education, 42(11), 488-497.

Mann, K., Gordon, J., & MacLeod, A. (2009). Reflection and reflective practice in health professions education: A systematic review. Advances in Health Sciences Education, 14(4), 595-621.

Tsingos, C., Bosnic-Anticevich, S., & Smith, L. (2015). Reflective practice and its implications for pharmacy education. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 79(6), Article 98.

## SELF-REGULATED LEARNING

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation (pp. 451-502). Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (2011). Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance. Routledge.

Cleary, T. J., & Sandars, J. (2011). Assessing self-regulatory processes during clinical skill performance: A pilot study. Medical Teacher, 33(7), e368-e374.

Sandars, J., & Cleary, T. J. (2011). Self-regulation theory: Applications to medical education: AMEE Guide No. 58. Medical Teacher, 33(11), 875-886.

## CRITICAL THINKING

Facione, P. A. (1990). Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction. The California Academic Press.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2006). Critical thinking: The nature of critical and creative thought. Journal of Developmental Education, 30(2), 34-35.

Ennis, R. H. (1985). A logical basis for measuring critical thinking skills. Educational Leadership, 43(2), 44-48.

Alfaro-LeFevre, R. (2017). Critical thinking, clinical reasoning, and clinical judgment: A practical approach (6th ed.). Elsevier.

Scheffer, B. K., & Rubenfeld, M. G. (2000). A consensus statement on critical thinking in nursing. Journal of Nursing Education, 39(8), 352-359.

## CREATIVE THINKING

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), Handbook of creativity (pp. 3-15). Cambridge University Press.

De Bono, E. (1985). Six thinking hats. Little, Brown and Company.

Amabile, T. M. (1996). Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity. Westview Press.

Cropley, A. (2006). In praise of convergent thinking. Creativity Research Journal, 18(3), 391-404.

Chan, Z. C. (2013). A systematic review of creative thinking/creativity in nursing education. Nurse Education Today, 33(11), 1382-1387.

## SYSTEMS THINKING

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. Doubleday.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). Thinking in systems: A primer. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Ackoff, R. L. (1999). Ackoff's best: His classic writings on management. John Wiley & Sons.

Sterman, J. D. (2000). Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world. McGraw-Hill.

Anderson, R. A., & McDaniel, R. R. (2000). Managing health care organizations: Where professionalism meets complexity science. Health Care Management Review, 25(1), 83-92.

Dolansky, M. A., & Moore, S. M. (2013). Quality and safety education for nurses (QSEN): The key is systems thinking. OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 18(3), Manuscript 1.

Stalter, A. M., & Mota, A. (2018). Systems thinking. In J. B. Butts & K. L. Rich (Eds.), Philosophies and theories for advanced nursing practice (3rd ed., pp. 403-428). Jones & Bartlett Learning.

## COMPLEXITY THINKING AND NURSING

Lindberg, C., Nash, S., & Lindberg, C. (2008). On the edge: Nursing in the age of complexity. Plexus Press.

Zimmerman, B., Lindberg, C., & Plsek, P. (1998). Edgeware: Insights from complexity science for health care leaders. VHA Inc.

Plsek, P. E., & Greenhalgh, T. (2001). Complexity science: The challenge of complexity in health care. BMJ, 323(7313), 625-628.

McDaniel, R. R., & Driebe, D. J. (2001). Complexity science and health care management. In J. D. Blair, M. D. Fottler, & G. T. Savage (Eds.), Advances in health care management (Vol. 2, pp. 11-36). Emerald Group Publishing.

Clancy, T. R., Effken, J. A., & Pesut, D. (2008). Applications of complex systems theory in nursing education, research, and practice. Nursing Outlook, 56(5), 248-256.

Begun, J. W., Zimmerman, B., & Dooley, K. (2003). Health care organizations as complex adaptive systems. In S. M. Mick & M. Wyttenbach (Eds.), Advances in health care organization theory (pp. 253-288). Jossey-Bass.

## EXPERTISE DEVELOPMENT

Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). Mind over machine: The power of human intuition and expertise in the era of the computer. Free Press.

Benner, P. (1984). From novice to expert: Excellence and power in clinical nursing practice. Addison-Wesley.

Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. Psychological Review, 100(3), 363-406.

Ericsson, K. A. (2008). Deliberate practice and acquisition of expert performance: A general overview. Academic Emergency Medicine, 15(11), 988-994.

Mylopoulos, M., & Regehr, G. (2007). Cognitive metaphors of expertise and knowledge: Prospects and limitations for medical education. Medical Education, 41(12), 1159-1165.

## PATTERN RECOGNITION

Norman, G. (2005). Research in clinical reasoning: Past history and current trends. Medical Education, 39(4), 418-427.

Croskerry, P., & Norman, G. (2008). Overconfidence in clinical decision making. The American Journal of Medicine, 121(5), S24-S29.

Charlin, B., Boshuizen, H. P., Custers, E. J., & Feltovich, P. J. (2007). Scripts and clinical reasoning. Medical Education, 41(12), 1178-1184.

## DECISION-MAKING AND JUDGMENT

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Klein, G. (1998). Sources of power: How people make decisions. MIT Press.

Croskerry, P. (2003). The importance of cognitive errors in diagnosis and strategies to minimize them. Academic Medicine, 78(8), 775-780.

Thompson, C., & Dowding, D. (2002). Clinical decision making and judgement in nursing. Churchill Livingstone.

Standing, M. (2017). Clinical judgement and decision-making in nursing (3rd ed.). Learning Matters.

## CONCEPT MAPPING AND VISUAL TOOLS

Novak, J. D., & Cañas, A. J. (2008). The theory underlying concept maps and how to construct and use them. Florida Institute for Human and Machine Cognition.

West, D. C., Pomeroy, J. R., Park, J. K., Gerstenberger, E. A., & Sandoval, J. (2000). Critical thinking in graduate medical education: A role for concept mapping assessment? JAMA, 284(9), 1105-1110.

Daley, B. J., Shaw, C. R., Balistrieri, T., Glasenapp, K., & Piacentine, L. (1999). Concept maps: A strategy to teach and evaluate critical thinking. Journal of Nursing Education, 38(1), 42-47.

Wheeler, L. A., & Collins, S. K. (2003). The influence of concept mapping on critical thinking in baccalaureate nursing students. Journal of Professional Nursing, 19(6), 339-346.

## ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Oermann, M. H., & Gaberson, K. B. (2016). Evaluation and testing in nursing education (5th ed.). Springer Publishing Company.

Billings, D. M., & Halstead, J. A. (2020). Teaching in nursing: A guide for faculty (6th ed.). Elsevier.

Spurlock, D. R. (2020). The single-best-answer multiple-choice question: Are we using our most effective weapon? Journal of Nursing Education, 59(7), 353-356.

Adamson, K. A., Gubrud, P., Sideras, S., & Lasater, K. (2012). Assessing the reliability, validity, and use of the Lasater Clinical Judgment Rubric: Three approaches. Journal of Nursing Education, 51(2), 66-73.

## SIMULATION AND CLINICAL EDUCATION

Jeffries, P. R. (2016). The NLN Jeffries simulation theory. National League for Nursing.

International Nursing Association for Clinical Simulation and Learning (INACSL) Standards Committee. (2016). INACSL standards of best practice: SimulationSM. Clinical Simulation in Nursing, 12(S), S1-S50.

Hayden, J. K., Smiley, R. A., Alexander, M., Kardong-Edgren, S., & Jeffries, P. R. (2014). The NCSBN national simulation study: A longitudinal, randomized, controlled study replacing clinical hours with simulation in prelicensure nursing education. Journal of Nursing Regulation, 5(2), S3-S40.

Cant, R. P., & Cooper, S. J. (2017). Use of simulation-based learning in undergraduate nurse education: An umbrella systematic review. Nurse Education Today, 49, 63-71.

## INTERPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND COLLABORATION

Interprofessional Education Collaborative. (2016). Core competencies for interprofessional collaborative practice: 2016 update. Interprofessional Education Collaborative.

Reeves, S., Perrier, L., Goldman, J., Freeth, D., & Zwarenstein, M. (2013). Interprofessional education: Effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes (update). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (3), CD002213.

Thistlethwaite, J. (2012). Interprofessional education: A review of context, learning and the research agenda. Medical Education, 46(1), 58-70.

## QUALITY AND SAFETY

Institute of Medicine. (2000). To err is human: Building a safer health system. National Academies Press.

Institute of Medicine. (2001). Crossing the quality chasm: A new health system for the 21st century. National Academies Press.

Cronenwett, L., Sherwood, G., Barnsteiner, J., Disch, J., Johnson, J., Mitchell, P., Sullivan, D. T., & Warren, J. (2007). Quality and safety education for nurses. Nursing Outlook, 55(3), 122-131.

## LEARNING THEORY AND PEDAGOGY

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.

Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development (8th ed.). Routledge.

Fink, L. D. (2013). Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school (Expanded ed.). National Academy Press.

## COGNITIVE LOAD AND INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). Cognitive load theory. Springer.

Van Merriënboer, J. J., & Sweller, J. (2005). Cognitive load theory and complex learning: Recent developments and future directions. Educational Psychology Review, 17(2), 147-177.

Mayer, R. E. (2009). Multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

## DEVELOPMENTAL THEORIES RELEVANT TO CLINICAL REASONING

Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self: Problem and process in human development. Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. (1994). In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life. Harvard University Press.

Torbert, W. R., & Associates. (2004). Action inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership. Berrett-Koehler.

Perry, W. G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults. Jossey-Bass.

## WISDOM AND PRACTICAL REASONING

Baltes, P. B., & Staudinger, U. M. (2000). Wisdom: A metaheuristic (pragmatic) to orchestrate mind and virtue toward excellence. American Psychologist, 55(1), 122-136.

Sternberg, R. J. (1998). A balance theory of wisdom. Review of General Psychology, 2(4), 347-365.

Ardelt, M. (2004). Wisdom as expert knowledge system: A critical review of a contemporary operationalization of an ancient concept. Human Development, 47(5), 257-285.

## FORESIGHT AND FUTURES THINKING

Slaughter, R. A. (1995). The foresight principle: Cultural recovery in the 21st century. Praeger.

Hines, A., & Bishop, P. (2015). Thinking about the future: Guidelines for strategic foresight (2nd ed.). Social Technologies.

Pesut, D. J. (2000). Looking back, looking forward: 125 years of nursing and the profession's historical path to nursing science. Nursing Science Quarterly, 13(3), 177-183.

## PARTNERSHIP THEORY AND CARING SCIENCE

Eisler, R. (2002). The power of partnership: Seven relationships that will change your life. New World Library.

Watson, J. (2008). Nursing: The philosophy and science of caring (Rev. ed.). University Press of Colorado.

Watson, J. (2012). Human caring science: A theory of nursing (2nd ed.). Jones & Bartlett Learning.

## POLARITY MANAGEMENT

Christopherson, Tracy & Troseth, Michelle. (2024). Polarity Intelligence: The Missing Logic in Leadership, Morgan James Publishing, New York. https://www.missinglogic.com/

Johnson, B. (2020). Polarity management: Identifying and managing unsolvable problems. HRD Press.

Johnson, B. (2014). And: Making a difference by leveraging polarity, paradox or dilemma. HRD Press.

## EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE

Melnyk, B. M., & Fineout-Overholt, E. (2019). Evidence-based practice in nursing and healthcare: A guide to best practice (4th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.

Sackett, D. L., Rosenberg, W. M., Gray, J. A., Haynes, R. B., & Richardson, W. S. (1996). Evidence based medicine: What it is and what it is not. BMJ, 312(7023), 71-72.

DiCenso, A., Guyatt, G., & Ciliska, D. (2005). Evidence-based nursing: A guide to clinical practice. Elsevier Mosby.

## NURSING KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT

Carper, B. A. (1978). Fundamental patterns of knowing in nursing. Advances in Nursing Science, 1(1), 13-24.

Chinn, P. L., & Kramer, M. K. (2018). Knowledge development in nursing: Theory and process (10th ed.). Elsevier.

Fawcett, J., & DeSanto-Madeya, S. (2013). Contemporary nursing knowledge: Analysis and evaluation of nursing models and theories (3rd ed.). F. A. Davis.

## HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS AND POLICY

Porter-O'Grady, T., & Malloch, K. (2018). Quantum leadership: Building better partnerships for sustainable health (5th ed.). Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Longest, B. B. (2016). Health policymaking in the United States (6th ed.). Health Administration Press.

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Jarvis, P. (2010). Adult education and lifelong learning: Theory and practice (4th ed.). Routledge.

Merriam, S. B., Caffarella, R. S., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2007). Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

American Nurses Association. (2015). Nursing: Scope and standards of practice (3rd ed.). American Nurses Association.

## TEAM DYNAMICS AND COMMUNICATION

Lencioni, P. (2002). The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable. Jossey-Bass.

Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a "big five" in teamwork? Small Group Research, 36(5), 555-599.

Leonard, M., Graham, S., & Bonacum, D. (2004). The human factor: The critical importance of effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. Quality and Safety in Health Care, 13(Suppl 1), i85-i90.

## CULTURAL COMPETENCE AND HEALTH EQUITY

Campinha-Bacote, J. (2002). The process of cultural competence in the delivery of healthcare services: A model of care. Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 13(3), 181-184.

Leininger, M. M., & McFarland, M. R. (2006). Culture care diversity and universality: A worldwide nursing theory (2nd ed.). Jones & Bartlett.

Institute of Medicine. (2003). Unequal treatment: Confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care. National Academies Press.

## MORAL AND ETHICAL REASONING

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). Principles of biomedical ethics (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Rest, J. R. (1986). Moral development: Advances in research and theory. Praeger.

Fry, S. T., Veatch, R. M., & Taylor, C. (2011). Case studies in nursing ethics (4th ed.). Jones & Bartlett Learning.

## LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Kotter, J. P. (1996). Leading change. Harvard Business School Press.

Scharmer, C. O. (2009). Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges. Berrett-Koehler.

Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading. Harvard Business School Press.

## APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY AND POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (2005). Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change. Berrett-Koehler.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. American Psychologist, 56(3), 218-226.

## ADDITIONAL OPT MODEL APPLICATIONS AND RESEARCH

Kuiper, R. (2013). Metacognitive factors that impact student nurse use of point of care technology in clinical settings. International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship, 10(1), 75-81.

Turner, P. (2005). Critical thinking in nursing education and practice as defined in the literature. Nursing Education Perspectives, 26(5), 272-277.

Atkinson, D., & Murray, T. (2008). OPT: Developing critical thinking for clinical decision making. Nursing Education Perspectives, 29(5), 296-299.

Bittner, N. P., & Tobin, T. I. (1998). Critical thinking: Strategies for clinical practice. Journal for Nurses in Staff Development, 14(6), 267-272.

Forneris, S. G., & Peden-McAlpine, C. (2007). Evaluation of a reflective learning intervention to improve critical thinking in novice nurses. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 57(4), 410-421.

Lasater, K. (2007). High-fidelity simulation and the development of clinical judgment: Students' experiences. Journal of Nursing Education, 46(6), 269-276.

Liou, S. R., & Cheng, C. Y. (2014). Using clinical scenario-based testing to assess clinical competence in nursing students. Journal of Professional Nursing, 30(2), 161-167.

Nielsen, A. (2009). Concept-based learning activities using the clinical judgment model as a foundation for clinical learning. Journal of Nursing Education, 48(6), 350-354.