London Simulation Network Peer Review Template

Simulation Peer Review Guide, Peer Review Summary and Action Plan

Peer review visits are intended to be developmental, with the opportunity to compare operational and governance systems, reflect on the design and delivery of simulation courses, consider programmes in the light of best practice standards and to exchange good practice, good ideas and good processes.

This form comprises 2 parts:

PART A – Peer Review Guide (optional)

This quality assurance tool has been designed based on the ASPiH Standards for Simulation Based Education 2017 and with headings and prompts to aid your reflection, not to mandate content. Centres within the London Simulation network are invited to use this tool for self-reflection and peer review if helpful, but completion is optional.

PART B – Peer Review Summary and Action Plan (required)

As a network, we intend to collate outcomes from peer reviews in order to inform investment in faculty development and simulation-based education.

Following the post observation discussions, the peer reviewer (who undertook the observation), is required to complete the **Peer Review Summary. The Action Plan** is to be completed by the reviewee (who received the review). It is a requirement that anyone who has received HEE peer review funding will complete this section. This should be done on the day and agreed with both the reviewer and reviewee. Once completed, please share the whole of part B with the network hosts ([LSN@uclpartners.com](mailto:LSN@uclpartners.com)).

An **anonymised** report will then be generated from the themes identified across all peer reviews within the simulation network and shared with HEE.

## PART A

## Peer Review Guide

## Course and Review Details

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Name |  | Reviewer Name & Position |  |
| Centre |  | Reviewer place of work |  |
| Course Lead(s) |  | Quality Review Date |  |

## Course Administration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Did all course registrants attend? Yes No  Plan identified for DNA’s Yes No | Did course start at planned time? | Yes No |
| **Notes on potential improvements or good practice identified:** | | |

## Simulation Programme

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Simulation Modality |  | Standards Guidance | |  | |
| Immersive / human mannequin simulator |  | * Objectives challenging but achievable | |  | |
| Part task training |  | * Objectives mapped to relevant curriculum or needs analysis | |  | |
| Virtual reality / other haptic |  | * Fidelity appropriate for objectives (different aspects) | |  | |
| In-situ /mobile simulation |  | * If intended as IPE, objectives & debrief aims relevant for all | |  | |
| Simulated patient / actor |  | * Pre-course materials determined (especially procedural) | |  | |
| Multi-modal / hybrid |  | * Yearly programme evaluation, team member named to oversee | |  | |
| Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  | * Course manual available to ensure consistency between faculty | |  | |
| **Did conduct of simulation and debrief align with learning objectives?**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Notes on potential improvements or good practice identified:** | | |  | |
| **Pre-Brief held for faculty Yes No**  *Including: Introductions, agenda, role allocation/guidance, scenario overview, learning objectives, emphasis on safe learning environment* |  | **Pre-Brief held for learners Yes No**  *Including: Confidentiality, ethos of safe learning environment, whether assessment is involved, expectation of professionalism, roles, and introduction to simulation environment/equipment* | | |

## Simulation Faculty

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty Questions |  | Standards Guidance |  |
| **Ratio of faculty to learners:** |  | * Appropriate ratio of faculty to learners to support learning needs |  |
| **Have all faculty had debrief training?** |  | * All faculty should be trained & competent in process of debrief |  |
| **Co-debriefing occurring with novices?** |  | * Novice debriefers should observe or co-facilitate with experienced faculty, and receive feedback using validated tools (DASH, OSAD) |  |
| **For multi and/or interprofessional courses, different professions represented in faculty?** |  | * Different faculty professions may support interprofessional learning |  |
| **Tools used for peer review of debrief?** |  | * Regular evaluation using peer review by learners and fellow faculty should be undertaken |  |
| **Dedicated technical support available?**  **Aware of Science Council accreditation?** |  | * Technical faculty competent to manage & troubleshoot equipment, involved in design of scenarios to optimize fidelity |  |
| **To what extent did faculty establish and maintain a safe learning environment?**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Notes on potential improvements or good practice identified:** | | |  |

## Debriefing

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model Used |  | Standards Guidance |  |
| Diamond Debrief |  | * Debrief should take place in a specific, separate environment |  |
| PEARL |  | * Facilitator determines areas for debrief in line with objectives |  |
| Plus Delta |  | * Clear that debrief is safe for discussion & learning & confidential |  |
| Advocacy with Inquiry |  | * If simulated patients/actors used, debrief role agreed in advance |  |
| Other (please specify) |  | * Technical & non-technical aspects and human factors approach to patient safety should be included where possible |  |
| **Was video used to facilitate debrief?** |  | **Was specific peer review of debrief performed?** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  *Peer review of debrief may be done separately* |  |
| **Notes on potential improvements or good practice identified:** | | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final comments on quality assurance process from peer reviewer and course faculty |  |
|  |  |

## PART B

# Peer Review Summary and Action Plan

This Peer Review Summary is to be completed by the reviewer (who completed the review).

## Course and Review Details

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Name |  | Reviewer Name & Position |  |
| Centre |  | Reviewer place of work |  |
|  |  | Review Date |  |

## Programme strengths:

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Areas for development: |

## Action Plan following peer review