Published in final edited form as:

Nurs Outlook. 2008 ; 56(5): 206–214.e3. doi:10.1016/j.outlook.2008.06.007.

A Nursing Informatics Research Agenda for 2008–18: Contextual Influences and Key Components

Suzanne Bakken, RN, DNSc, FAAN, FACMI [Alumni Professor of Nursing; Professor of Biomedical Informatics],

Columbia University School of Nursing, and College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University

Patricia W. Stone, RN, MPH, PhD [Associate Professor of Nursing], and

Columbia University School of Nursing

Elaine L. Larson, RN, PhD, FAAN, CIC [Professor of Pharmaceutical and Therapeutic Research and Associate Dean for Research; Professor of Epidemiology]

Columbia University School of Nursing, and Joseph Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University.

Abstract

The context for nursing informatics research has changed significantly since the National Institute of Nursing Research-funded Nursing Informatics Research Agenda was published in 1993 and the Delphi study of nursing informatics research priorities reported a decade ago. The authors focus on three specific aspects of context - genomic health care, shifting research paradigms, and social (Web 2.0) technologies - that must be considered in formulating a nursing informatics research agenda. These influences are illustrated using the significant issue of healthcare associated infections (HAI). A nursing informatics research agenda for 2008–18 must expand users of interest to include interdisciplinary researchers; build upon the knowledge gained in nursing concept representation to address genomic and environmental data; guide the reengineering of nursing practice; harness new technologies to empower patients and their caregivers for collaborative knowledge development; develop user-configurable software approaches that support complex data visualization, analysis, and predictive modeling; facilitate the development of middle-range nursing informatics theories; and encourage innovative evaluation methodologies that attend to human-computer interface factors and organizational context.

The context for nursing informatics research has changed significantly since the National Institute of Nursing Research (NINR)-funded Nursing Informatics Research Agenda was published in 1993¹ and the Delphi study of nursing informatics research priorities reported a decade ago.² Given that context is a core construct of nursing's meta-paradigm and consequently that of nursing informatics,³ the authors' premise is that a nursing informatics research agenda must reflect changes in context while affirming commitment to the core meta-paradigm constructs of patient, health, and nursing. Although there are many contextual changes of relevance to the practice of nursing informatics including economics, consumerism, emerging diseases, workforce shortages, models of care delivery, and globalization,⁴ in this

Correspondence: Suzanne Bakken, RN, DNSc, FAAN, FACMI, Columbia University School of Nursing, 630 W. 168th Street, New York, NY 10032, e-mail:sbh22@columbia.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

article, the authors focus on three specific aspects of context - genomic health care, shifting research paradigms, and social (Web 2.0) technologies - that must be acknowledged in formulating a nursing informatics research agenda. These influences are illustrated using the significant issue of healthcare associated infections (HAI). Lastly, the authors suggest key components of a nursing informatics research agenda for the next decade.

Background

Genomic Health Care

The initial draft of the Human Genome Project in 2001⁵ heralded the age of genomic health care in which evolving understandings of genetic contributions to human health are being applied to the prevention, diagnosis, monitoring and treatment of diseases with “the ultimate promise of revolutionizing the diagnosis and treatment of many illnesses.” (p.540)⁶ Subsequently, Collins and colleagues⁷ articulated a framework for genomics research and scholarship comprising three themes: Genomes to Biology, Genomes to Health, and Genomes to Society.

Based on the understanding that health outcomes are the result of multiple determinants, a recent Institute of Medicine report,⁸ highlighted the need to examine the complex interactions among genes, behavior, and the social environment. The Committee called for the creation of new data sets to inform interdisciplinary and translational research – these data sets would include variables related to biological and genetic measures, but also social and behavioral variables. Goal 3 of the National Library of Medicine’s (NLM) Long Range Plan for 2006–2016⁹ --Integrated biomedical, clinical, and public health information systems that promote scientific discovery and speed the translation of research into practice -- is aligned to meet the need for new data sets and has three associated recommendations: 1) Develop linked databases for discovering relationships between clinical data, genetic information, and environmental factors; 2) Promote development of Next Generation electronic health records to facilitate patient-centric care, clinical research, and public health; and 3) Promote development and use of advanced electronic representation of biomedical knowledge in conjunction with electronic health records.

The role of domain experts in characterizing the phenotypic data to be integrated with genomic and environmental data is paramount. In the context of infectious diseases, Petri et al.¹⁰ contend that “the most sophisticated of genetic and epidemiological tools are useless when applied to a poorly defined phenotype” (p. 5). A similar argument has been posited for the role of nursing by a number of authors^{11–14} who point out the importance of nursing’s specialized knowledge base, which includes integration of biobehavioral and environmental concepts, to genomic health care and to the design of tools that support the organization and application of genomic data for practice, education, research, and policy making. In addition, several authors^{14,15} suggest that incorporation of genomics into nursing research is necessary to assure that nursing practice is based on scientific evidence. Nurse researchers have integrated genomics into their programs of research and reports illustrate application of genetics in many clinical areas including cardiovascular disease, schizophrenia, and child health.^{16–18} Also of relevance and consistent with nursing’s focus on human responses, Read et al.¹⁹ developed and validated the Psychological Adaptation to Genetic Information Scale.

A number of societal concerns accompany the promise of genomic health care and must be addressed if the promise is to be achieved.^{14,20} Of most relevance to informing a nursing informatics research agenda are those related to: fairness in the use of genetic information; privacy and confidentiality of genetic information; psychological impact and stigmatization due genetic differences; use of genetic information in reproductive decision making; education of clinicians, researchers, patients, and the general public in genetic capabilities, scientific

limitations, and social risks; and uncertainties associated with gene tests for susceptibilities and complex conditions (e.g., obesity) linked to multiple genes and gene-environment interactions.²⁰

A nursing informatics research agenda must support integration and use of genomic data for nursing care and for nursing research.

Shifting Research Paradigms

The manner in which research is conducted is changing dramatically. One major driver is the NIH Roadmap for Medical Research which articulates the importance of interdisciplinary and translational research.^{21,22} In addition, partially motivated by the Medicare Prescription Drug Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 and Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) initiatives, there is a movement toward study designs that test clinical and policy innovations in real world settings with an emphasis on effectiveness or comparative effectiveness as a complement to efficacy testing through randomized, controlled trials (RCTs).²³ Thirdly, there is increased attention at the federal level toward building the science of dissemination and implementation in the service of public health.²⁴

The Roadmap comprises three major programs (New Pathways to Discovery, Research Teams of the Future, and Re-engineering the Clinical Research Enterprise).^{21,22} Individual and institutional awards (e.g., Clinical and Translational Science Awards) are aimed at accelerating fundamental discovery and translating that knowledge into effective prevention strategies and new treatments. Translational research is broadly defined within the Roadmap and includes the traditional notions of applying discoveries from laboratory and preclinical studies to the development of human studies (bench-to-bedside and back), but also translation of findings of humans studies into best practices and policies toward the goal of improved health. In discussing challenges associated with these two types of translation, the Institute of Medicine's Clinical Research Roundtable²⁵ described the former as T1 and the latter as T2. Woolf²⁶ suggests that calling both T1 and T2 translational research is confusing and also contends that "adequate investment in T2 research is vital to fully salvage investments in T1 research." (p. 212)

Competence in interdisciplinary research is a prerequisite for both T1 and T2 translational studies since information sharing and communication among researchers from varied backgrounds is vital across all stages of the research process. The Roadmap defines interdisciplinary research as that which "integrates the analytical strengths of two or more often disparate scientific disciplines to solve a given biological problem". Based on a systematic literature review, interviews and field test conducted through Roadmap planning center funding, a team of researchers (including SB and EL) from the fields of biomedical informatics, dentistry, economics, epidemiology, medicine, nursing, physiology, and public health, proposed an expanded definition:²⁷

Interdisciplinary research is any study or group of studies undertaken by scholars from two or more distinct scientific disciplines. The research is based upon a conceptual model that links or integrates theoretical frameworks from those disciplines, uses study design and methodology that is not limited to any one field, and requires the use of perspectives and skills of the involved disciplines throughout multiple phases of the research process. (p.341)

Subsequently, a validated set of competencies based upon this definition was published.²⁸

Increased availability of electronic data, improved computational power, and development of sophisticated analytic techniques along with concerns regarding the limited external validity of RCTs^{29,30} have motivated the application of practice-based research designs and increased

attention to the science of dissemination and implementation (e.g., 2007 NIH Conference on Building the Science of Dissemination and Implementation in the Service of Public Health).²⁴ Whether experimental, quasi-experimental, or observational (i.e., incorporate the natural variation in data from routine clinical practice), these designs share in common an emphasis on effectiveness in real world settings and use of data generated routinely from those settings as compared to efficacy testing under controlled conditions. The following examples depict these principles.

In terms of experimental design, Glynn et al. used data from existing information systems to inform design decisions in a cluster-randomized trial.³¹ Data about how many patients are seen by more than one clinician in a practice or how many clinicians cross multiple practices allow the research team to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of particular design strategies, for example, whether randomization in a study of a new protocol for management of deep vein thrombosis should occur at the patient, clinician, or practice level. Behavioral researchers³² have specified the need for and key characteristics of practical behavioral trials that are conducted across settings, include heterogeneous patients, and address multiple outcomes, patient preferences, and algorithms for intervention tailoring.

Quasi-experimental designs such as “designed delays” without random assignment in which a clinical or policy intervention is rolled out to multiple sites at planned intervals have also been advocated and offer several advantages.³³ As in wait-list design, the control group eventually receives the intervention and secondly, the timing may be tied to delays that are naturally occurring in the real world.

Horn and colleagues have delineated the steps of an observational research methodology for comparative effectiveness research, which they call practice-based evidence for clinical practice improvement (PBE-CPI), and have implemented it across multiple topic areas and settings.^{34,35} PBE-CPI is characterized by 7 features: 1) consideration of all interventions to determine the relative contribution of each, 2) general rather specific hypotheses, 3) maximizing external validity by limiting sample inclusion or exclusion criteria, 4) robust measures of severity of illness and functional status for characterization of patients, 5) statistical control of patient differences through measures such as risk-adjustment, 6) essential role of transdisciplinary clinical practice team through all phases of the research, and 7) transparency.³⁴

Beyond comparative effectiveness research, there is a need to build the science of dissemination and implementation so that practices found to be more effective in real-world settings are adopted. A number of theoretical models have been proposed and are being tested in multiple settings. As compared to models of research utilization and evidence-based practice, which are primarily clinician-oriented (e.g., the Stetler model³⁶), these models emphasize organizational and community aspects. The Reach, Efficacy/Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance (RE-AIM) framework and its associated metrics have primarily been applied to self-management interventions.^{30,37,38} The Veteran Affairs Medical Center Quality Enhancement Research Initiative (QUERI) approach has been implemented for a variety of clinical conditions (e.g., colorectal cancer).³⁹ The Availability, Responsiveness, and Continuity (ARC) Organizational and Community Intervention Model⁴⁰ has provided the theoretical basis for adoption of new strategies or technologies in mental health services at the organization and community level.

These trends in the conduct of research portend challenges and opportunities that should be considered in a nursing informatics research agenda.

Social (Web 2.0) Technologies

Web 2.0 has been conceptualized as “a knowledge-oriented environment where human interactions generate content that is published, managed, and used through network applications in a service-oriented architecture.”⁴¹ Web 2.0 encompasses technologies such as blogs, wikis, podcasts, Really Simple Syndication (RSS) feeds, social software (e.g., Facebook and MySpace social networking sites), and web application programming interfaces (Table 1). Web 2.0 is in its infancy in health care, but offers several features of relevance to patients and clinicians.^{42,43} Through Wiki software, content development occurs collectively among members of a community – the largest example being Wikipedia – and while enhancing collaboration, this collective creation also challenges traditional notions of expertise and intellectual property. In addition to user-controlled content development and distribution, Web 2.0 platforms (e.g., iGoogle) support user configuration of interfaces in ways that match their mental models or needs and sharing or re-purposing of the created resources (e.g., a calculator widget might be incorporated into many different types of Web pages). RSS supports syndication, aggregation, and notification of data from multiple sources (e.g., journals, newspapers, blogs) as a single feed into a user interface (e.g., Web page, iPod) through a subscription process. Social networking sites facilitate the building of communities among those who share interests or activities (identified through tagged profiles) and typically enable communication via multiple channels such as chat, messaging, email, video, voice chat, file sharing, blogging, and discussion groups.

In championing platforms and applications that support collaborative approaches in science, the authors⁴⁴ of “Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything” use the aforementioned Human Genome Project as an example of massive, distributed public-private collaborations that resulted in GenBank®,⁴⁵ an annotated collection of all publicly available DNA sequences. Moreover, the authors note that the Human Genome Project represents for science “a watershed moment, when a number of pharmaceutical firms abandoned their proprietary human genome projects to back open collaborations” (p. 163) and subsequently challenged the traditional notions of how research is conducted and accelerated innovation.

Web 2.0 principles, platforms, and technologies will not only dramatically change the manner in which research studies are designed, conducted, and disseminated, but also offer the foundation for innovative intervention strategies. Shneiderman calls for new kinds of science, which he calls Science 2.0, and notes that “advancing Science 2.0 will require a shift in priorities to promote integrative thinking that combine computer science know-how with social science sensitivity.” (p. 1350)⁴⁶

HAI Example

The reader is referred to the web for an example that illustrates application of key principles from the contextual influences described in the previous section to the topic of HAI.

Key Components of a Nursing Informatics Research Agenda for 2008–18

Reflective of the contemporary needs in nursing practice and the existing information and communication infrastructure (i.e., before widespread access to the World Wide Web), the recommended priorities for nursing informatics research for 1992–1996 reflected a focus on nursing data, information, and knowledge, most often in isolation from other types of data. The 29 recommended priorities were organized into 7 categories: 1) using data, information, and knowledge to deliver and manage patient care (n=6), 2) defining and describing data and information for patient care (n=7), 3) acquiring and delivering knowledge from and for patient care (n=3), 4) investigating new technologies to create tools for patient care (n=7), 5) applying patient care ergonomics to the patient-nurse-machine interaction (n=2), 6) integrating systems

for integrating better patient care (n=3), and 7) evaluating the effects of nursing information systems (n=1). Because of closely related priorities across categories, the priorities are collapsed and re-organized in Table 2. User needs of interest were primarily those of nurses, but consistent with nursing's meta-paradigm, the information and decision-making needs of patients and families were also identified in several recommendations. Priorities also included the evaluation of the effects of technology on the nurses' psychophysiological comfort and functioning (i.e., humancomputer interaction) and on the nurses' relationships with patients and other health professionals. Another aspect of human-computer interaction mentioned, but not named as such, was the notion of flexible systems tailored to user knowledge and expertise. In addition, although not explicitly defined as practice-based research, development of clinical databases to generate knowledge about linkages among structure, processes, and outcomes was identified as a methodological priority to examine effectiveness, quality of care, costs, and productivity for guidance of practice and policy. The resulting National Institutes of Health Program Announcement (PA-95-10), Enhancing Clinical Care Through Informatics, which was co-sponsored by NINR and NLM, focused primarily on nursing clinical data, processes and outcomes of care, and clinical decision making.

The 1998 priorities identified through an electronic Delphi survey of nursing informatics experts and nurse researchers reinforced the 1993 priorities and reflected evolving consumerism in healthcare and changes in telecommunication infrastructure and technologies including the emergence of the World Wide Web. Research aimed at patients as direct users of technology including consumer health informatics applications was ranked in the survey as 6th of 10 priorities by nurse researchers and 10th by nursing informatics experts. The focus on patients as technology users is consistent with the changing definition of nursing informatics which in 2002 acknowledged the role of nursing informatics in supporting patient decision making, "Nursing informatics facilitates the integration of data, information, and knowledge to support patients, nurses, and other providers in their decision making in all roles and settings." (p. 260)⁴⁷

The research guideposts delineated in a white paper by the American Medical Informatics Association Nursing Informatics Working Group⁴ affirmed important targets for nursing informatics research: assessing and improving health care and health outcomes, reducing health disparities in health care for minorities, building data infrastructure to support quality assessments and improvement, and protecting patient privacy and security.

A nursing informatics research agenda must be based upon an understanding of the construct of nursing informatics intervention or solution. In contrast to clinical interventions, nursing informatics is accomplished through the development and application of information structures, information processes, and information and communication technologies. This is clearly delineated not only in the American Nurses Association's definition of nursing informatics,⁴⁷ but also in Effken's informatics research organizing model,³ which was based upon the American Academy of Nursing's model for quality health outcomes⁴⁸ and integrates nursing's meta-paradigm constructs (environment, patient, health, nursing [in this instance, nursing informatics]).

In the following paragraphs, the authors suggest key components of a nursing informatics research agenda for the next decade (2008–18) organized by the categories from Table 2.

User Information Needs—Genomic health care and the well-recognized interaction between environmental and genetic factors require a broadening of the types of information required to meet the health-related information, decision making, and skill building needs of nurses, patients, and families. Characterized as a "data tsunami" in the NLM's strategic plan,⁹ volumes of data will require not only computational intervention, but also human intervention

to convert data into usable information and knowledge. Additionally, the nursing informatics agenda should more directly focus on meeting the information needs of interdisciplinary researchers along the continuum from discovery through implementation in practice with a particular emphasis on the development and use of information structures, processes, and technologies (e.g., collaborative tools such as Wikis) to reduce T2 translation roadblocks.

Acquisition, Representation, and Storage of Data, Information, and Knowledge

—In the last 15 years, significant progress has been made in the acquisition, representation, and storage of nursing data (nursing diagnoses, interventions, and outcomes),^{49–55} information, and knowledge and in the integration of nursing concept representations with broader healthcare terminologies.^{56–60} Given the expanded breadth of user information needs, research that enables the acquisition, representation, and storage of genomic and environmental data in a manner that supports visualization and analysis in conjunction with patient and nursing data is also needed. Determinations will need to be made about when integration should occur at the data storage level, the visualization level, or the analytic level.

Informatics Support for Nursing and Healthcare Practice—The majority of 1993 recommendations focused on the informatics support for nursing practice, but in nursing as in the broader healthcare environment the impact of information systems on care practices and patient outcomes has not yet been realized. In his essay entitled “Strategic Action in Health Information Technology: Why the Obvious has Taken So Long”, Shortliffe⁶¹ notes that the barriers to adoption are not primarily technical; they relate to the biomedical culture, making the business case, and structural barriers such as inadequate investment in information technology. In nursing, the significant efforts regarding concept representation described in the prior section provide an essential building block for supporting nursing practice.^{62,63} At this juncture, nursing informatics research is urgently needed to guide the reengineering of nursing practice within the context of interdisciplinary care teams through application of information technology to create what Brennan et al.⁶⁴ have called technology-enabled practice. It is vital that the research be based upon a theoretical model or framework to begin to address the dearth of middle-range nursing informatics theories (an exception is Staggers and Parks’ nurse computer interaction framework⁶⁵) to complement abstract models and frameworks such as those proposed by Graves and Corcoran,⁶⁶ Turley,⁶⁷ Effken,³ and Alexander.⁶⁸ These middle-range theories are needed to predict which information structures, processes, and technologies are likely to achieve the desired results and to build the science of nursing informatics.

Informatics Support for Patients/Consumers and Families—For several decades, the development and evaluation of multi-faceted informatics interventions for patients/consumers and families using a nursing perspective has been the target of several nursing informatics programs of research in a variety of settings.^{69–71} The types of technologies used have changed in concert with the evolution of technology in general. However, beyond the technologies that comprise it, Web 2.0 as a concept encourages broad sharing of contextualized data and information and collaborative knowledge creation in a manner that changes traditional definitions of expertise and facilitates access to the expertise of patients/consumers and caregivers in unimagined ways. Thus, nursing informatics research agenda should include a focus on developing and applying informatics strategies enabled by Web 2.0 and future technologies to empower patients and their caregivers for collaborative knowledge development particularly related to self-management in chronic care, symptom management, and end-of-life care, key areas of interest to nursing and to the NINR.⁷² Nursing informatics research should not be constrained by current conceptualizations of patient/consumer-oriented applications such as portals, personal health records, and continuity of care records, but rather strive for modular development of structures and processes that support specific functions (e.g.,

tailoring algorithm, consumer vocabulary, message library, risk assessment and communication) that can be accessed through a variety of applications and technology platforms.

Informatics Support for Practice-based Knowledge Generation—One of the 1993 NINR Expert Panel¹ priorities addressed the foundational and methodological support for practice-based research more than a decade prior to its emergence as significant approach to measuring comparative effectiveness. As distinct from practice-based clinical research or health services research perspectives, which focus on applying a variety of analytic techniques to examine linkages among various structure, process, and outcome data elements to guide practice and/or policy, the focus of informatics research is on developing the information structures (e.g., re-usable concept representations, tailored templates for data acquisition), processes (e.g., data mining algorithms, natural language processing), and technologies (e.g., interfaces to data marts) that support knowledge generation from practice. Knowledge discovery in databases requires domain expertise as well as informatics expertise and has been focus of several nursing informatics researchers.^{73–75} Given the volume, breadth and variety of data available for knowledge discovery, there is a tremendous need for the development of user-configurable software approaches that support complex data visualization, analysis, and predictive modeling.

Design and Evaluation Methodologies—Both 1993 and 1998 priorities emphasized evaluation of impact on practice and outcomes. As a strategy for maximizing what is learned, Stead et al. proposed a broader conceptualization of evaluation across stages of the system development life cycle and accentuated the need to match evaluation method to stage of development.^{76,77} Nursing informatics research reflects a panoply of evaluation methods from qualitative methods to randomized, controlled trials.^{78–82} Although there has been relatively more attention to human-computer interface aspects in nursing informatics research^{80,83} than in other domain areas, more research is needed in order to manage the impending “data tsunami” and to take advantage of the user-configurability of Web 2.0 platforms. As nursing informatics innovations move from efficacy to effectiveness evaluations, practice-based research designs such as those described earlier in this article warrant consideration as evaluation methodologies because of the importance of factors such as organizational context, “dose” of informatics intervention, and patient variables (e.g., severity of illness) on outcomes.

Conclusions

The underlying nursing informatics principles of the 1993 and 1998 priorities for nursing informatics research continue to be relevant. The contextual influences described in this paper and illustrated through the HAI example suggest that a nursing informatics agenda for 2008–18 must expand users of interest to include interdisciplinary researchers; build upon the knowledge gained in nursing concept representation to address genomic and environmental data; guide the reengineering of nursing practice; harness new technologies to empower patients and their caregivers for collaborative knowledge development; develop user-configurable software approaches that support complex data visualization, analysis, and predictive modeling; facilitate the development of middle-range nursing informatics theories; and encourage innovative evaluation methodologies that attend to human-computer interface factors and organizational context.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The preparation of this manuscript was support by Center for the Evidence-based Practice in the Underserved (P30NR010677) (SB, EL, PS), the Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Antimicrobial Resistance (P20RR020616) (EL, PS), and the Irving Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (UL1RR024156) (SB).

References

1. NINR Priority Expert Panel on Nursing Informatics. Nursing informatics: enhancing patient care. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health; 1993.
2. Brennan PF, Zielstorff RD, Ozbolt JG, Strombom I. Setting a national research agenda in nursing informatics. *Medinfo* 1998;9(Pt 2):1188–1191.
3. Effken JA. An organizing framework for nursing informatics research. *Comput Inform Nurs* 2003 Nov–Dec;21(6):316–323. [PubMed: 14992032]quiz 324–315
4. McCormick KA, Delaney CJ, Brennan PF, et al. Guideposts to the future—an agenda for nursing informatics. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2007 Jan–Feb;14(1):19–24. [PubMed: 17068358]
5. Venter JC, Adams MD, Myers EW, et al. The sequence of the human genome. *Science* 2001 Feb 16;291(5507):1304–1351. [PubMed: 11181995]
6. Collins FS, McKusick VA. Implications of the Human Genome Project for medical science. *Jama* 2001 Feb 7;285(5):540–544. [PubMed: 11176855]
7. Collins FS, Green ED, Guttmacher AE, Guyer MS. A vision for the future of genomics research. *Nature* 2003 Apr 24;422(6934):835–847. [PubMed: 12695777]
8. Committee on Assessing Interactions Among Social B, and Genetic Factors in Health. Genes, Behavior, and the Social Environment: Moving Beyond the Nature/Nurture Debate. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine of the National Academies; 2006.
9. NLM's Long Range Plan 2006–2016: Charting a Course for the Twenty-first Century. Bethesda, MD: National Library of Medicine; 2006.
10. Petri W, BD K, Haque R, Duggal P. Genes influencing susceptibility to infection. *J Infect Dis* 2008;197:4–7. [PubMed: 18171277]
11. Feetham S, Thomson EJ, Hinshaw AS. Nursing leadership in genomics for health and society. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2005;37(2):102–110. [PubMed: 15960053]
12. Jenkins J, Grady PA, Collins FS. Nurses and the genomic revolution. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2005;37(2):98–101. [PubMed: 15960052]
13. Hsieh, Y.; Peace, J.; Brennan, PF. nurseAdvance Collection on Genomics in Nursing and Healthcare. Indianapolis, IN: Sigma Theta Tau; 2007. Informatics, genomic health & nursing: Challenge and opportunities at the intersection.
14. Conley YP, Tinkle MB. The future of genomic nursing research. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2007;39(1):17–24. [PubMed: 17393961]
15. Feetham S. The new genetics: Opportunities for nursing research and leadership. *Res Nurs Health* 2000;23(4):257–259. [PubMed: 10940950]
16. Frazier L, Johnson RL, Sparks E. Genomics and cardiovascular disease. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2005;37(4):315–321. [PubMed: 16396403]
17. Keltner NL. Genomic influences on schizophrenia-related neurotransmitter systems. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2005;37(4):322–328. [PubMed: 16396404]
18. Kenner C, Gallo AM, Bryant KD. Promoting children's health through understanding of genetics and genomics. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2005;37(4):308–314. [PubMed: 16396402]
19. Read CY, Perry DJ, Duffy ME. Design and psychometric evaluation of the Psychological Adaptation to Genetic Information Scale. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2005;37(3):203–208. [PubMed: 16235859]
20. Human Genome Project Information: Ethical, Legal, and Social Issues. 2007 Aug 31 [Accessed January 15, 2008]. http://www.ornl.gov/sci/techresources/Human_Genome/elsi/elsi.shtml
21. Zerhouni E. Medicine. The NIH Roadmap. *Science* 2003 Oct 3;302(5642):63–72. [PubMed: 14526066]
22. NIH Roadmap for Medical Research. [Accessed January 5, 2008]. <http://nihroadmap.nih.gov/>

23. Lohr KN. Emerging methods in comparative effectiveness and safety: symposium overview and summary. *Med Care* 2007 Oct;45(10 Supl 2):S5–S8. [PubMed: 17909383]
24. Paper presented at: Building the Science of Dissemination and Implementation in the Service of Public Health. Bethesda, MD: 2007.
25. Sung NS, Crowley WF Jr, Genel M, et al. Central challenges facing the national clinical research enterprise. *Jama* 2003 Mar 12;289(10):1278–1287. [PubMed: 12633190]
26. Woolf SH. The meaning of translational research and why it matters. *Jama* 2008 Jan 9;299(2):211–213. [PubMed: 18182604]
27. Aboelela SW, Larson E, Bakken S, et al. Defining interdisciplinary research: conclusions from a critical review of the literature. *Health Serv Res* 2007 Feb;42(1 Pt 1):329–346. [PubMed: 17355595]
28. Gebbie KM, Meier BM, Bakken S, et al. Conducting interdisciplinary research: Defining the required competencies. *J Allied Health*. in press
29. Steckler A, McLeroy KR. The importance of external validity. *Am J Public Health* 2008 Jan;98(1):9–10. [PubMed: 18048772]
30. Glasgow RE, McKay HG, Piette JD, Reynolds KD. The RE-AIM framework for evaluating interventions: what can it tell us about approaches to chronic illness management? *Patient Educ Couns* 2001 Aug;44(2):119–127. [PubMed: 11479052]
31. Glynn RJ, Brookhart MA, Stedman M, Avorn J, Solomon DH. Design of cluster-randomized trials of quality improvement interventions aimed at medical care providers. *Med Care* 2007 Oct;45(10 Supl 2):S38–S43. [PubMed: 17909381]
32. Glasgow RE, Davidson KW, Dobkin PL, Ockene J, Spring B. Practical behavioral trials to advance evidence-based behavioral medicine. *Ann Behav Med* 2006 Feb;31(1):5–13. [PubMed: 16472033]
33. Maclure M, Carleton B, Schneeweiss S. Designed delays versus rigorous pragmatic trials: lower carat gold standards can produce relevant drug evaluations. *Med Care* 2007 Oct;45(10 Supl 2):S44–S49. [PubMed: 17909382]
34. Horn SD, Gassaway J. Practice-based evidence study design for comparative effectiveness research. *Med Care* 2007 Oct;45(10 Supl 2):S50–S57. [PubMed: 17909384]
35. Latham NK, Jette DU, Coster W, et al. Occupational therapy activities and intervention techniques for clients with stroke in six rehabilitation hospitals. *Am J Occup Ther* 2006 Jul–Aug;60(4):369–378. [PubMed: 16915866]
36. Stetler CB. Updating the Stetler Model of research utilization to facilitate evidence-based practice. *Nurs Outlook* 2001 Nov–Dec;49(6):272–279. [PubMed: 11753294]
37. Glasgow RE, Nelson CC, Strycker LA, King DK. Using RE-AIM metrics to evaluate diabetes self-management support interventions. *Am J Prev Med* 2006 Jan;30(1):67–73. [PubMed: 16414426]
38. Glasgow RE, Klesges LM, Dziewaltowski DA, Estabrooks PA, Vogt TM. Evaluating the impact of health promotion programs: using the RE-AIM framework to form summary measures for decision making involving complex issues. *Health Educ Res* 2006 Oct;21(5):688–694. [PubMed: 16945984]
39. Kochevar LK, Yano EM. Understanding health care organization needs and context. Beyond performance gaps. *J Gen Intern Med* 2006 Feb;21:S25–S29. [PubMed: 16637957]
40. Glisson C, Schoenwald SK. The ARC organizational and community intervention strategy for implementing evidence-based children's mental health treatments. *Ment Health Serv Res* 2005 Dec;7(4):243–259. [PubMed: 16320107]
41. Wikipedia. [Accessed January 2, 2008]. www.wikipedia.org
42. Senathirajah, Y. Development of user-configurable information source pages for medical information retrieval; AMIA Annu Symp Proc; 2007. p. 1109
43. Giustini D. How Web 2.0 is changing medicine. *Bmj* 2006 Dec 23;333(7582):1283–1284. [PubMed: 17185707]
44. Tapscott, D.; Williams, AD. *Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything*. New York, NY: Penguin Group; 2006.
45. GenBank®. 2008 Jan 9 [Accessed January 18, 2008]. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Genbank/index.html>
46. Shneiderman B. Computer science. *Science* 2008 Mar 7;319(5868):1349–1350. [PubMed: 18323442]

47. Staggers N, Thompson CB. The evolution of definitions for nursing informatics: a critical analysis and revised definition. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2002 May–Jun;9(3):255–261. [PubMed: 11971886]
48. Mitchell PH, Ferketich S, Jennings BM. Quality health outcomes model. American Academy of Nursing Expert Panel on Quality Health Care. *Image J Nurs Sch* 1998;30(1):43–46. [PubMed: 9549940]
49. ICNP® version 1 - International Classification For Nursing Practice. Geneva: International Council of Nurses; 2005.
50. Grobe SJ. The Nursing Intervention Lexicon and Taxonomy: Implications for representing nursing care data in automated records. *Holis Nurs Pract* 1996;11(1):48–63.
51. Johnson, M.; Maas, M.; Moorhead, S., editors. *Nursing Outcomes Classification (NOC)*. 2nd ed.. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby; 2000.
52. Martin, KS. *The Omaha System - A Key to Practice, Documentation, and Information Management*. 2nd ed.. Elsevier; 2004.
53. McCloskey, JC.; Bulechek, GM. *Nursing Interventions Classification*. 3rd ed.. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby; 2000.
54. NANDA International. *Nursing diagnoses: Definitions and classification 2005–2006*. Philadelphia, PA: NANDA International; 2005.
55. Saba, V. *The Clinical Care Classification (CCC) System Manual*. New York: Springer; 2007.
56. Bakken S, Warren JJ, Lundberg C, et al. An evaluation of the usefulness of two terminology models for integrating nursing diagnosis concepts into SNOMED Clinical Terms. *Int J Med Inform* 2002;68(1–3):71–77. [PubMed: 12467792]
57. Casey A, Spisla C, Konicek D, Warren JJ. Practical definition of SNOMED CT concepts: The case of education, advice and counselling. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2006;122:742–745. [PubMed: 17102363]
58. Hardiker, NR.; Casey, A.; Coenen, A.; Konicek, D. Mutual enhancement of diverse terminologies; *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*; 2006. p. 319-323.
59. Kim H, Harris MR, Savova G, Chute CG. Content coverage of SNOMED-CT toward the ICU nursing flowsheets and the acuity indicators. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2006;122:722–726. [PubMed: 17102358]
60. Ozbolt J. The Nursing Terminology Summit Conferences: a case study of successful collaboration for change. *J Biomed Inform* 2003 Aug–Oct;36(4–5):362–374. [PubMed: 14643732]
61. Shortliffe EH. Strategic action in health information technology: why the obvious has taken so long. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2005 Sep–Oct;24(5):1222–1233. [PubMed: 16162567]
62. Henry SB. Informatics: essential infrastructure for quality assessment and improvement in nursing. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 1995;2(3):169–182. [PubMed: 7614118]
63. Committee on Data Standards for Patient Safety. *Patient Safety: Achieving a New Standard for Care*. Washington, DC: Board on Health Care Services, Institute of Medicine; 2004.
64. Brennan PF, Burke L, Casper G, et al. Creating technology-enhanced practice: A university-home care-corporate alliance. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2006;122:644–648. [PubMed: 17102341]
65. Staggers N, Parks PL. Description and initial applications of the Staggers & Parks Nurse-Computer Interaction Framework. *Comput Nurs* 1993 Nov–Dec;11(6):282–290. [PubMed: 8275398]
66. Graves JR, Corcoran S. The study of nursing informatics. *Image J Nurs Sch* 1989;21:227–231. [PubMed: 2807330]
67. Turley JP. Toward a model for nursing informatics. *Image J Nurs Sch* 1996 Winter;28(4):309–313. [PubMed: 8987276]
68. Alexander GL. The nurse-patient trajectory framework. *Medinfo* 2007;12(Pt 2):910–914.
69. Brennan PF, Moore SM, Smyth KA. Computerlink: Electronic support for the home caregiver. *Adv Nurs Scie* 1991;13(4):14–27.
70. Brennan PF, Casper G, Kossman S, Burke L. HeartCareII: home care support for patients with chronic cardiac disease. *Medinfo* 2007;12(Pt 2):988–992.
71. Ruland CM. Shared decision making and nursing informatics research in Norway. *Appl Nurs Res* 2005 May;18(2):70–72. [PubMed: 15991101]discussion 72–73
72. Strategic Plan. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Nursing Research; 2006.

73. Abbott, PA. The challenges of data mining in large nursing home datasets. In: Saba, V.; Carr, R.; Sermeus, W.; Rocha, P., editors. *Nursing Informatics 2000. One Step Beyond: The Evolution of Technology and Nursing*. Proceedings of the 7th IMIA International Conference on Nursing Use of Computers and Information Science. Auckland, New Zealand: adis International; 2000. p. 153-160.
74. Delaney, C.; Ruiz, ME.; Clarke, M.; Srinivasan, P. Knowledge discovery in databases: Data mining NMDS. In: Saba, V.; Carr, R.; Sermeus, W.; Rocha, P., editors. *Nursing Informatics 2000. One Step Beyond: The Evolution of Technology and Nursing*. Proceedings of the 7th IMIA International Conference on Nursing Use of Computers and Information Science. Auckland, New Zealand: adis International; 2000. p. 61-65.
75. Goodwin L, VanDyne M, Lin S, Talbert S. Data mining issues and opportunities for building nursing knowledge. *J Biomed Inform* 2003 Aug–Oct;36(4–5):379–388. [PubMed: 14643734]
76. Stead WW. Matching the level of evaluation to a project's stage of development. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 1996 Jan–Feb;3(1):92–94. [PubMed: 8750393]
77. Stead WW, Haynes RB, Fuller S, et al. Designing medical informatics research and library--resource projects to increase what is learned. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 1994 Jan–Feb;1(1):28–33. [PubMed: 7719785]
78. Gassert CA. Defining information requirements using holistic models: introduction to a case study. *Holist Nurs Pract* 1996 Oct;11(1):64–74. [PubMed: 8945175]
79. Currie LM, Mellino LV, Cimino JJ, Bakken S. Development and representation of a fall-injury risk assessment instrument in a clinical information system. *Medinfo* 2004;11(Pt 1):721–725.
80. Staggers N, Kobus D, Brown C. Nurses' evaluations of a novel design for an electronic medication administration record. *Comput Inform Nurs* 2007 Mar–Apr;25(2):67–75. [PubMed: 17356327]
81. Nahm ES, Vaydia V, Ho D, Scharf B, Seagull J. Outcomes assessment of clinical information system implementation: a practical guide. *Nurs Outlook* 2007 Nov–Dec;55(6):282–288. [PubMed: 18061012]
82. Brennan PF, Moore SM, Smyth KA. The effects of a special computer network on caregivers of persons with Alzheimer's disease. *Nurs Res* 1995;44(3):166–172. [PubMed: 7761293]
83. Lai T-Y, Larson E, Rockoff M, Bakken S. The user acceptance of HIV TIDES - Tailored interventions for management of depressive symptoms in People Living with HIV/AIDS. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2008 Mar–Apr;15(2):219–226.
84. Klevens RM, Edwards JR, Richards CL Jr. et al. Estimating health care-associated infections and deaths in U.S. hospitals, 2002. *Public Health Rep* 2007 Mar–Apr;122(2):160–166. [PubMed: 17357358]
85. Glisson C, Landsverk J, Schoenwald S, et al. Assessing the Organizational Social Context (OSC) of Mental Health Services: Implications for Research and Practice. *Adm Policy Ment Health* 2008 Mar; 35(1–2):98–113. [PubMed: 18085434]

Table 1**Web 2.0 Terms and Definitions**

Term	Wikipedia Definition⁴¹
blog (weblog)	A website where entries are made in journal style and displayed in a reverse chronological order.
Podcast	A multimedia file that is subscription based (paid or unpaid) and distributed over the Internet using syndication feeds, for playback on mobile devices and personal computers.
RSS (really simple syndication)	RSS is a family of web feed formats. A web feed is a data format used for serving users frequently updated content. Content distributors syndicate a web feed, thereby allowing users to subscribe to it. Making a collection of web feeds accessible in one spot is known as aggregation.
Social software	Application that enables people to rendezvous, connect or collaborate through computer-mediated communication and to form online communities.
Web widget	A third party item that can be embedded in a web page (e.g., calendar)
wiki	A wiki is a type of Web site that allows the visitors themselves to easily add, remove, and otherwise edit and change some available content, sometimes without the need for registration. This ease of interaction and operation makes a wiki an effective tool for collaborative authoring. The term wiki also can refer to the collaborative software itself (wiki engine) that facilitates the operation of such a Web site, or to certain specific wiki sites, including the computer science site (an original wiki), WikiWikiWeb, and on-line encyclopedias such as Wikipedia.

Table 2

Summary of Priorities from NINR Expert Panel (1993) and Delphi Survey (1998)

Priority Areas	1993	1998
<i>User Needs</i>		
Identification of users' (nurses, patients, families) information needs	■	■
Nature and processes of clinical decision making and skill development	■	
Match information technologies to nursing work patterns	■	
<i>Capture, Representation and Storage of Data, Information, and Knowledge</i>		
Develop, validate, and formalize nursing language terms, taxonomies, and classifications	■	■
Interdigitate nursing language schemes with larger standards initiatives	■	
Design and management of nursing information databases for use in patient management, clinical records, and research	■	■
Develop and test clinical data storage schemes that optimize single-recording, multiple use in nursing	■	
Develop alternative modes of conceptualizing, operationalizing, quantifying, and representing nursing information for incorporation into future information systems	■	
Demonstrate connectivity architecture for capture and storage of patient care information across settings	■	
<i>Informatics Support for Nursing and Healthcare Practice</i>		
Technology development including decision support systems to support nursing practice (integrates human-computer interaction)	■	■
Use of telecommunications technology for nursing practice		■
Professional practice issues (e.g., competencies, confidentiality)		■
<i>Informatics Support for Patients/Families/Consumers</i>		
Patient use of information technology	■	■
Consumer health informatics		■
<i>Informatics Support for Practice-based Knowledge Generation</i>		
Develop systems to build clinical databases to generate and analyze knowledge linkages among resource consumption (structure), care processes (including nursing diagnoses and interventions), and outcomes to guide practice and policy	■	
<i>Design and Evaluation Methodologies</i>		
Develop evaluation methodologies for studying system use and impact on nursing decision making, nursing practice, and if possible, patient outcomes	■	
Systems modeling and evaluation	■	■