

Appendix B: Annual Peer Reviewer Observation Form

Quality Assurance in Simulation & Interactive Learning - Peer reviewer Observation Form

Course title: _____ XXXX _____

Course lead: _____ XXXX _____

Date of review: _____ XX.XX.XXXX _____

Name of Peer reviewer: XXXX

	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1. Pre-course correspondence:				
i) Reading:				
Please indicate if the course has any pre-course reading materials. <i>(NB this is not essential)</i>	Y			
ii) Type of material:				
- NTS/ CRM literature		N		Could possibly include a generic NTS / Human Factors article
- Clinical literature (e.g. NICE standards, evidence based article)	Y			XX paper from XX Journal. Relevant reading for the course.
iii) Notification email:				
Please indicate if the course notification email includes:				Reminder email sent to delegates 1 week before.
- Start and end times	Y			Some candidates suggested the programme had details of each scenario (i.e. diagnosis).
- A map of the venue	Y			As a PDF
- Information about refreshments	Y			
- Other	Y			Details regarding air conditioning included.
2. Course Administration:				
i) Attendance record & Timetable				
Please indicate if:				
- A course attendance list was taken	Y			List available for sign-in at beginning of the day
- A course timetable was provided	Y			Copies available on the day and pre-course
ii) Consent:				
Was any form of consent for filming requested?	Y			Completed pre-course

iii) Did the course run to time?	Y			Started on time. Ran to time during morning session. No evidence the sessions were cut short or rushed. Slightly behind time in the afternoon but time caught up during simulation scenarios but not rushed. Finished at 5pm (stated time).
3. Pre-briefing faculty :	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Please indicate if the faculty attended a pre-course pre-brief orientation: E.g. - To the course's learning objectives - Allocation of roles - Assisting novice faculty to undertake roles and receive feedback on performance)		N		At start of course, all faculty present therefore no pre-course brief. Discussion included aims and objectives for course and each scenario, participant allocation, faculty role allocation. Also experienced faculty delegated to observe and "debrief the debrief" of novice debriefers.
4. Type of simulation programme/ modality being observed:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Please indicate which modality is in use on course: - Low fidelity (case studies, role play, part task trainers, static mannequins)		N		
- Mixed modality HPS/ or Actors and part task/ skills based course		N		
- High fidelity full scale human patient simulators, virtual reality or standardised patients {*or actors}	Y			
ii) Were any other teaching modalities employed as part of the course? e.g. Didactic sessions, skills workshops, group work, case based discussion	Y			x1 didactic lecture and x1 workshop included
5. Environment- Simulation:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Please indicate the degree of immersive simulated environment the training is taking place in:				
- In-situ training in the clinical environment		N		
- Centre based with dedicated clinical environment		Y		Simulation centre
- Classroom based with adapted props to recreate reality		N		

6. Environment- Debriefing:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Please indicate if there is a designated and private area for debriefing	Y			Separate seminar room with AV equipment available
7. Faculty and Facilitators: Please indicate the number of faculty and facilitators for the course:	4			Comments
i) Technician	1			
ii) Debriefer (Numbers & Level)				
- Novice				
- Intermediate				
- Advanced	3			2 x Sim Fellow 1 x Consultant
- Expert	1			1 x Senior Nurse/SMT
iii) Embedded participant (e.g. Plant/role player)	1			Played by a faculty – one per scenario
iv) Actor(s)				
8. Participants:				Comments
Please indicate the number of students on the course	9			12 booked on course
9. Interprofessional:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Please indicate if the course is interprofessional (i.e. has 2 or more professions participating on the course)	Y			Nurse x 5 Physio x 2 Surgical SpR x1 SHO x1 Need to explore how courses are booked to ensure mix of delegates of appropriate level
10. Learning Objectives:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Please indicate if there are specific measurable results participants are expected to achieve during the simulation based course	Y			NTS skills – difficult to measure. Technical skills below.
- None			NA	
- 1-2			NA	
- 3-5	Y - 3			Aims: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve... To drive improvements... Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learn.... Increase knowledge of... Be aware of ...
- More than 5			NA	

	Yes	No	NA	Comments
11. Pre-briefing participants:				
i) Psychological & Physical safety: Please indicate if the facilitator indicated that debrief formats are designed to allow a safe environment for participants to speak up, share thoughts, feelings, perceptions without the risk of retribution or embarrassment, that they may see / experience challenges and that the simulation environment permits mistakes	Y			Explained performance is not judged Emphasised confidentiality, professional conduct, constructive feedback. Also explicit explanation of expectations of delegates in scenarios and the debrief.
ii) On the day course pre-brief: Please indicate if the participants received a course pre-briefing (simulation orientation) including the following:	Y			
- Introduction to other participants	Y			Icebreaker
- Introduction to faculty and roles	Y			Faculty included in ice-breaker
- Introduced to course objectives	Y			Course Aims / NTS
- Introduction to the modality being used/ course format	Y			Explained a mix of modalities
- Introduction to the modality of simulation with Human factors (immersion to recreate reality for purposes of exploring individual and team performances in NTS & patient safety)	Y			Discussed relation to other industries and also recent government reports. Used NTS video. Discussed safety 1 and safety 2
- Introduction to the debrief mode	Y			
ii) Environmental orientation: Please indicate if the participants received information regarding the following:				
- Housekeeping & Health safety	Y			In morning introduction
- Orientation to the clinical environment	Y			
- Orientation to manikins functions/ equipment	Y			Full meet the manikin session
- Orientation to debrief environment	Y			Explained diamond format.
iv) Professional integrity: Please indicate if the course introduction discusses confidentiality and the protection of course content & participants including:	Y			Discussed course content and personal experiences
- Demonstrating professional and ethical behaviour	Y			'follow your normal code of conduct' 'we want you to be yourself'
- Receiving and providing constructive feedback	Y			Expectations within debrief
- Mutual respect (try and see each others points of view)	Y			Explicitly mentioned
12. Scenarios:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Please indicate if the participants				

receive a pre-brief to the scenario:				
- Verbally	Y			Nurse briefed with observers Doctor outside of the room
- Hand written	Y			Handover sheet given to all
- Opportunity to ask questions	Y			
ii) How many simulated scenarios were there?				
- 1-2				
- 3-5	Y			4 Scenarios
- >5				
iii) Were there specific learning objectives for each scenario?				
- None		N		
- 1-3	Y			
- 4-5		N		
- >5		N		
iv) Were the scenarios appropriate to the learner's level/grade and previous experience?	Y			Scenarios designed for ward based staff. Adapted for others present as required.
13. Embedded participant (plant):	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Please indicate if the influence of the EP is:				
- Positive				
- Negative	Y			Played by faculty
- Neutral				
- Distracter				
14. Formative feedback:				Comments
In the situation where clinical or professional performance is identified as a concern, please indicate how the faculty / centre gives formative feedback to individuals				No concerns
15. Debrief observational specific questions – ALL Scenarios	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Debrief format: Please indicate the model of debrief or format of debrief that was used:				
- None				
- DAA	Y			Diamond Debrief
- PEARL				
- Plus Delta				
- Advocacy with Inquiry				
- Team gains				
- 3D Diffusing, Discovering & Deepening				
- Other:				
ii) Was the model on display/ available	Y			Model outlined on PowerPoint.

for participants to refer to?				Was available as a laminate on the table after lunch.
iii) Were facilitators: - Co-debriefing	Y			Co-debriefing with sometimes a third person helping with technical skills/knowledge
- Single debriefer				
- Other				
iv) Was video playback used in the debrief?		N		
v) Did the debrief allow space for participants to reflect on the simulation experience? Including: - Skills (kinetic) - Knowledge (cognitive) - Feelings / interactions (affective) In order to enhance behavioural changes and application in practice <i>(meta cognitive skill acquisition to enhance the theory practice gap)</i>	Y			All debriefs: Description: well structured, systematic, allows for participant input. Summative statements given. Transition zone to technical aspects covered. Joint discussion as opposed to didactic session. Clear analysis sections with focus on non-technical skills. Occasional lack of application phase in debriefs.
vi) Was there comparison to real life experiences?	Y			
vii) Was there a chance to correct any misconceptions?	Y			Discussion around technical aspects covered
- Were these handled sensitively?				
viii) Did the debriefer ask open ended questions?	Y			
ix) Was there discussion of specific non-technical skills or human factors during the debrief?	Y			
x) Was there any discussion of application of reflection and learning to future practice?	Y			
16. Psychological safety:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Maintenance of safety Please indicate if you feel that the facilitator (s) maintained a safe environment for participants to speak up, share thoughts, feelings, perceptions without the risk of retribution or embarrassment	Y			No concerns around psychological safety during the first half of the day. Maintained throughout the day during the full immersion simulations.
ii) Validation If during the debrief participants shared personal experiences - Was this contribution validated?	Y			

	Yes	No	NA	Comments
17. Evaluation:				
Please indicate the type of evaluation utilised for the training:				
i) Kirkpatrick Levels				
- Reaction of student - what they thought and felt about the training	Y			
- Learning - the resulting increase in knowledge or capability	Y			
- Behaviour - extent of behaviour and capability improvement and implementation/application	N			
- Results - the effects on the business or environment resulting from the trainee's performance	N			
ii) Pre-course Evaluation	Y			
- Do the evaluation tools measure pre course knowledge/skills/attitudes?				
iii) Post-course Evaluation	Y			
- Do the evaluation tools measure post course knowledge/skills/attitudes?				
iv) Evaluation of Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes		N		Does not measure a change but instead asks about perceived changes
- Does the evaluation tool measure a change in knowledge, skills or attitudes as a result of the course?				
v) Feedback	Y			Single questions
- Does the evaluation tool provide space for feedback about the course/ faculty/ environment?				
18. Faculty / Course debrief:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Faculty debrief	Y			I performed debrief of debrief. This was discussed with the team during the day. Senior faculty was available to perform debrief of the debrief and in the debrief room observing other faculty debriefing.
- Did the faculty debrief each other formatively at any stage of the day?				
- If so, was a specific tool used? E.g. OSAD		N		
ii) What level was the debriefer of the debriefs?				
* see appendix x for definition of levels				
- Novice				
- Intermediate				
- Advanced	Y			

- Expert				
iii) Did the faculty debrief the whole course/ review the evaluations at the close of the day?	Y			End of course discussion took place between myself and three faculty members. Faculty leads discussed potential changes / improvements. Use "Day to Day" QA form at end of course.
- Were changes/ suggestions recorded?	Y			YES on "Day to Day" form
19. For surgical skills courses:	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Consultant presence - Is there an appropriate Consultant surgeon present as faculty?			NA	NA
ii) Candidate assessment - Is the assessment of candidates appropriate to the skill being taught? (see specific course curricula/ assessment documents)			NA	NA
20. Course governance	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Is the course delivery standardised? E.g. Each course content includes the same aims/ content/ scenarios	Y			Faculty packs created Same scenarios used
ii) Is the course accredited in any format? E.g. Royal college of Surgeons, RCN,CPD hours		N		In the process of accreditation with KHP
iii) Is the course commercially sponsored/ endorsed?		N		
- If yes – is this clearly stated / faculty disclosure stated?				
21. Annual return specific questions	Yes	No	NA	Comments
i) Review Board - Does the course have a course review board?	Y			Meeting at the end of the run of course to review
ii) Participant outcomes and Review - Does the course review receive collated course information about the participant's outcomes to make judgements about the programme, improve or amend the course for effectiveness?	Y			By course lead

* These standards are adapted from the INACSL (2013) standards: International Nursing Association for Clinical Simulation and Learning (INACSL) (2013) Standards for Simulation *Clinical Simulation in Nursing* 9(6S) Si – S32 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2013.05.010>