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Objectives

• Discuss and relate the relevance of debriefing to simulation-based learning

• Identify elements present in a debriefing

• Examine a debriefing model and discuss current methods of debriefing

• Investigate a debriefer rating scale

• Utilize role-play activity
Defining Debriefing in Simulation

- Conversation between two or more participants to review a simulated activity
  - Participants identify their actions, thought processes and emotional states in order to improve performance
  - A *Debriefer* makes an implicit comparison between a desired level of performance and the level of performance observed
    - Identifies the “performance gap”
- The debriefing requires that the student/healthcare provider take a psychological risk
“Debriefing is the most important feature of simulation based education”
Value of Feedback

• “Feedback, knowledge of results of one’s performance, is the single most important feature of medical education toward the goal of effective learning”

• Promotes learning and appears to slow decay of knowledge

• Feedback comes in many forms
  – May be provided by the simulator itself, by the instructor, or by viewing videotape of the simulation activity
  – The feedback method itself is less important than its presence
Debriefing can make or break a simulation session
Some ground rules...

- Provide a supportive environment
  - Students need to feel valued, respected, and free to learn
- Create an environment of trust early
  - The Pre-Brief
    - Objectives
    - Expectations
    - Time to recognize that each learner brings life-experience and culture
Process or Approach to the Debriefing

- **Structure**
  - “although reflection after a learning experience might occur naturally, it is likely to be unsystematic”
- **Model/style**
  - Natural order of human processing
    - Experience the event, reflection, discussion, learn or modify behaviors based on experience
- **Objectives**
  - Session should be tailored to the objectives of the simulation
  - Two Questions
    - What knowledge, skill, or attitude is the learner to know?
    - What specifically is to be learned about them?
Debriefing Phases

Beginning – Reactions Phase
Allow participants to express their initial reactions (emotion OK)
Discusses facts as necessary to eliminate confusion
Avoid ridiculing or shifting right to analysis

Middle – Analysis Phase
Ask questions that prompt the learner to discuss and reflect
Listen with genuine curiosity – seek to understand their “frames”
Avoid telling the participants what to do without getting them to reflect first

End – Summary Phase
Ask participants to summarize what they learned
“what went well?”
“Given a similar situation, what would you do differently?”
• Setting Expectations
  – Expectations are clear
  – Purpose, objectives, and process itself
• Supportive environment
  – Students report that environment is “stressful and intimidating” (Fanning and Gaba)
  – Student centered
• Open sharing
  – Genuine inquiry and good will
  – Active Participation encouraged
- Facilitate the discussions to relationship of experience
- The students analyze and evaluate
  - Mistakes are viewed as opportunities for learning, not reasons for punishment
  - Turn intangibles into tangibles
  - Promote transfer of learning to practice
- Defined by Objectives
  - May be well-defined
  - May be emergent
A Note about the Facilitator...

• Perception of the facilitator
  – Expert
  – Experience and training

• Facilitate
  – Guide and direct rather than lecture
  – You are the learners resource
  – Positioned as co-learner
    • May be most effective when behavioral change is part of the objective
Types of Facilitators...Who are you?

- Judgmental
- Non-Judgmental
- Debriefing with Good Judgment
The Judgmental Instructor

• Truth is in the hands of the instructor
• Error belongs to trainee
• Problems
  – Humiliation
  – Dampened motivation
  – Reluctance to raise questions
  – Exit of trainees from the program
• Advantages
  – Little doubt about what the instructor feels was wrong with the simulation
The Non-Judgmental Instructor

• Uses protective social strategies to “sugar-coat” error
  – The sandwich approach
• Reluctance to state the problem explicitly
  – Argyris termed “easing in”
• Hints leak out through subtle clues
  – Facial expression, tenor, cadence, and body language
Debriefing with Good Judgment

- Approach emphasizes disclosing instructors judgments and eliciting students assumptions
- Draws from 35 years of research in behavioral science
  - Focus on how to improve professional effectiveness through “reflective practice”
  - Examines values, assumptions, and knowledge-base that drives one’s own professional practice (Schön)
- Recognizes sub-par performance as puzzles to be solved rather than mistakes made and attempts to achieve better results in the future
- Includes a process/approach
  - Includes 3 elements
  - Provides insight into student’s mental models

There’s No Such Thing as “Nonjudgmental” Debriefing: A Theory and Method for Debriefing with Good Judgment

Second Element: The Stance

- Unites the contradictory values of curiosity about and respect for the trainee, and the value of a clear, evaluative judgment about the trainees’ performance
  - Empowers the instructor to utilize expertise
  - Explicit comparison to known target
Third Element: A Way of Speaking

- Advocacy and Inquiry
  - Advocacy is an assertion, observation, or statement
  - Inquiry is a question
- Instructor states a hypothesis followed by testing with inquiry
- Approach
  - Instructor notices relevant result
  - Observe actions that led to result
  - Use advocacy/inquiry to discover frame
## Debriefing with good judgment

### Advocacy
- My perspective
- Use first person
- Make perspective clear
- Examples
  - “I observed...”
  - “I’m concerned because...”
  - “I saw that .....”

### Inquiry
- Short, open ended questions
- Examples:
  - “I wonder what the patient would say?”
  - “I’m curious how you see it?”
  - “Can you think of any other options”
Discovering Frames through Curiosity, Advocacy and Inquiry

Learner’s Frame that produced the results

Once the frame has been discovered, the facilitator may then seek to change behavior

• Distinguishes between debriefing, guided reflection, and reflective practice
• Goals of debriefing
• Elements of debriefing
• Role of the faculty
• Approaches
• Process
“Structured and Supported Debriefing” American Heart Association
http://www.onlineaha.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=info.trainingeducation

- Structured and Evidence Supported Method
  - G.A.S. Tool (Gather – Analyze – Summarize)
  - Learner Focused
Definition:
- A learner-centric process designed to standardize the instructor/student debriefing interaction.
- Assists the learner determine *What* they did, *Why* they did it, and ways to improve

Structure
- 3-phases with related goals, actions, and time estimates

Support
- Elements include both interpersonal support as well as the use of protocols, algorithms, and best evidence to inform debriefing statements and questions
DASH Assessment Tool

- Debriefing Assessment for Simulation in Healthcare
- Evaluates the strategies and techniques used to conduct debriefings by examining concrete behaviors
- Based on evidence and theory about how people learn and change in experiential contexts
- “Effective DASH raters will be people who have had some formal debriefing training and will have led debriefings 100 or more times.”
  - Robert Simon, Ed.D, CHFP
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**Scoresheet.**

Please rate each of the elements for the debriefings using the scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extremely Effective / Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consistently Effective / Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mostly Effective / Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat Effective / Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mostly Ineffective / Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consistently Ineffective / Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extremely Ineffective / Abysmal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Element #1 – Sets the stage for an engaging learning environment</th>
<th>Element #2 – Maintains an engaging context for learning</th>
<th>Element #3 – Structures debriefing in an organized way</th>
<th>Element #4 – Provokes interesting and engaging discussions and fosters reflective practice</th>
<th>Element #5 – Identifies performance gaps</th>
<th>Element #6 – Helps close performance gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debriefing A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debriefing B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debriefing C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DASH Assessment Tool

- **Pre-Simulation Activities**
  - **Element #1 - Sets stage for learning environment**
    - Did they clarify course objectives, roles, expectations?
    - Did they establish a “fiction contract” with participants?
    - Attends to logistical details
    - Did they convey a commitment to respecting students and understanding perspectives?

- **Post-Simulation**
  - **Element #2 - Maintains engaging context for learning**
    - Did they clarify debriefing objectives, roles and expectations?
    - Did they help students cope with and learn in limited realism context?
    - Did they set a tone for realism?
    - Did they convey respect for the student?

  - **Element #3 - Organize your discussion – develop a process or utilize a model**
    - Did they conduct a REACTIONS phase?
    - Did they conduct an ANALYSIS phase?
    - Did they conduct a SUMMARY phase?

  - **Element #4 - Provoke engaging discussions and fosters reflective practice**
    - Did they use concrete, observable actions and outcomes for basis of discussion?
    - Did they reveal own reasoning and judgments?
    - Did they use non-verbal techniques for facilitation? Did they use video, replay and review devices?
    - Did they recognize and manage any upset participants?

  - **Element #5 - Identify and explore performance gaps**
    - Did they provide feedback on performance?
    - Did they explore basis of the performance gap (when appropriate)

  - **Element #6 - Help close performance gaps through discussion and teaching**
    - Did they help close performance gaps through discussion and teaching?
    - Did they demonstrate firm grasp of the subject?
    - Did they meet objectives of the simulation?
Next Steps

- Practice....
- Set realistic goals/time lines
- Develop an action plan
- Faculty enrichment/Continuing Education/Staff Development
- Budget for formal training
  - Time: Hands-on time with Simulation
  - Financially: Custom training with Simulation Experts
- Networking
Questions or Comments
*Please time your break as the next interactive session will need to begin on time!
- Standardize processes = consistency
- Consistency can be benchmarked, studied and modified to meet needs
- Regardless of tool for evaluating student or instructor, tools allow organized/consistent processes.
- Let’s Practice
  - Participate Sample Debriefing
Please give us feedback...