

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).

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	Did course start at planned time?	Yes	No
Plan identified for DNA's	Yes	No			

Notes on potential improvements or good practice identified:

Simulation Programme

Simulation Modality	Standards Guidance
<input type="checkbox"/> Immersive / human mannequin simulator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives challenging but achievable
<input type="checkbox"/> Part task training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives mapped to relevant curriculum or needs analysis
<input type="checkbox"/> Virtual reality / other haptic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fidelity appropriate for objectives (different aspects)
<input type="checkbox"/> In-situ /mobile simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If intended as IPE, objectives & debrief aims relevant for all
<input type="checkbox"/> Simulated patient / actor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-course materials determined (especially procedural)
<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-modal / hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yearly programme evaluation, team member named to oversee
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Pre-Brief held for learners	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Including: Introductions, agenda, role allocation/guidance, scenario overview, learning objectives, emphasis on safe learning environment			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:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate ratio of faculty to learners to support learning needs
Have all faculty had debrief training?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All faculty should be trained & competent in process of debrief
Co-debriefing occurring with novices?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different faculty professions may support interprofessional learning
Tools used for peer review of debrief?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular evaluation using peer review by learners and fellow faculty should be undertaken
Dedicated technical support available?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical faculty competent to manage & troubleshoot equipment, involved in design of scenarios to optimize fidelity
Aware of Science Council accreditation?	
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
<input type="checkbox"/> Diamond Debrief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Debrief should take place in a specific, separate environment
<input type="checkbox"/> PEARL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitator determines areas for debrief in line with objectives
<input type="checkbox"/> Plus Delta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear that debrief is safe for discussion & learning & confidential
<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy with Inquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If simulated patients/actors used, debrief role agreed in advance
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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