# REFLECTION ON REFLECTION IMSH2021 16 February 2021

## WHAT ARE PROCESS NOTES?

- Process notes can include 3 phases of note taking that allow us to make sense of complex interactions
  - 1. In the 1<sup>st</sup> phase we OBSERVE AND RECORD: we create a detailed description similar to a video recording or stage directions that might allow us to relive the interaction. Process notes provide a vivid, concrete, durable account of the interaction. The advantage over a simple transcript or video is that we can absorb and highlight key features of the interaction even while we are taking notes.
  - In the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase we REFLECT: we review the detailed notes and see what jumps out at us. For example, we might notice such things as repetition of phrases/themes/actions, mismatch between body language and spoken words, tone of voice, expressed emotions, key actions taken or not taken.
  - 3. In the **3**<sup>rd</sup> **phase** we REFLECT ON REFLECTION: we draw conclusions about patterns of actions or causes and effects. We can develop theories, draw conclusions, speculate about interventions that we might make.
- We can write our own process notes, or ask an observer to write them
- We can use them for instructional purposes, e.g., giving feedback or debriefing
- We can use them for our own professional development
- We can write them in real time, or after the interaction
- We can archive and review them again later for additional reflections
- We can share them with the other persons in the interaction and ask for their reflections as well

### AN EXAMPLE:

Situation: Three anesthesiology residents in their first (CA-1), second (CA-2), and third (CA-3) years, on their 2nd day on service, come to the simulation center for training. They go through 3 scenarios. In each case the resident is the only anesthesiologist in the room to start.

In both the 1st and 2nd case, there comes a critical moment when intubation is indicated. In both cases, the resident (first the CA-3, then the CA-2) delays in intubating the patient. In the control room, the 2 instructors (both anesthesiology faculty) are dismayed. There is a debriefing after each scenario. I take detailed notes on the debriefings so that I can reconstruct what happened in the debriefings later.

# Phase 1: A brief excerpt of the detailed description while watching the debriefing

- "Glad I saw you do the PE and repeat the PE... I thought that was great."
- > Endorsed r/o'g out aspiration first
- "What else do you want to talk about?"
- "Your algorithm looked like... -- is that right?"
- "What is your algorithm for managing hypoxemia?" (asked of CA-1-- after she answered, asked CA-2, "what about you?")
- CA-2 said what he would have done
- "I like the fact that you brought up getting the ABG early on (to CA-2).
- (Turned to Jr. Instructor) Jr. Instructor brought up need to intubate-- what were the signs that intubation was necessary? -presented it as "challenge" to know if
- "Btwn the time you first assessed the pt to the time you called for the intubation tray was about 10 minutes-- that felt long to me-- how did it feel to you?"
- "It seemed like you were reluctant to provide positive pressure ventilation, were you reluctant?"
- "I think if this were a real case and someone reviewed the times, would fall within reason. The reason I was worried, is it seemed long to me. When a pt loses consciousness, important to secure airway. There really isn't an alternative to intubation after loc. That's why it seemed long to me. That's why I would have like to see you commit." -- [lots of advocacy, no inquiry] "Other than that, the algorithm was good."

## Phase 2: Reflection (written after the debriefing)

- 1st case-- instructors were puzzled and alarmed that the CA-3 took so long to intubate the patient. It was so surprising, in fact, that the case was unable to proceed at the usual pace because the patient had not been intubated.
- The debriefing eventually got around to discussion of the delayed intubation and a fairly detailed discussion of the criteria for intubation (although I would say that they did not express the same alarm in the debriefing as they did in the control room during the case).
- 2nd case-- SAME THING! Delayed intubation. Again went over criteria for intubation.
- > => Why did teaching in the 1st debriefing not prevent the same mistake in the second scenario?

#### Phase 3: Reflection on Reflection (written well after the first reflections)

- ➤ I am most interested to understand-- how did this happen? How can it be that the CA-2 made the exact same mistake that the CA-3 made moments earlier?
- The CA-2 heard the criteria for intubation, but did not absorb this information and use it when it was his turn.
- I think that I learned again that "telling is not teaching and listening is not learning."
- How do I know when someone has learned something? Especially when I think it's critically important information?
- I review my notes again to search for clues.
- I see examples of where the instructors delayed getting to their greatest concern, that the intubation had been delayed.
- I see examples of the instructors expressing their concern so gently as to be contradictory and confusing.
- I do not hear the instructors ask for any summarizing or takeaway points after the first debriefing.
- With these observations, I can begin to create a plan for improvement.

Observing and Recording	Reflection	Reflection on Reflection

Recreation of event/interaction	Reflection	Reflection on Reflection
event/interaction		

## Debriefing Assessment for Simulation in Healthcare (DASH) Instructor Version<sup>©</sup>

**Directions:** Please provide a self-assessment of your performance for the introduction and debriefing in this simulation-based exercise. Use the following rating scale to rate the "Behaviors" and "Elements." Do your best to rate your **overall effectiveness for the whole Element** guided by the Behaviors that define it. If a listed Behavior is not applicable (e.g. how you handled upset people if no one got upset), just ignore it and don't let that influence your evaluation. You may have done some things well and some things not so well within each Element. The Element rating is your **overall** impression of how well you executed that particular Element.



Element 1 assesses the introduction at the beginning of the simulation-based exercise. Elements 2 through 6 assess the debriefing.

## **Rating Scale**

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Descriptor	Extremely	Consistently	Mostly	Somewhat	Mostly	Consistently	Extremely
	Ineffective /	Ineffective /	Ineffective /	Effective /	Effective /	Effective /	Effective /
	Detrimental	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good	Outstanding

## Element 1 assesses the introduction at the beginning of a simulation-based exercise.

Skip this element if you did not participate in the introduction.

El	Element 1 Rating Ele		ng Elem	ent 1
Is	et the stage for an engaging learning experience		_	
	Behavior		Behavi	ior Score
Α.	I introduced myself, described the simulation environment, what would be expected activity, and introduced the learning objectives, and clarified issues of confidential	_	the	
B. I explained the strengths and weaknesses of the simulation and what the participants could do to get the most out of simulated clinical experiences				
C.	I attended to logistical details as necessary such as toilet location, food availability	and sch	nedule	
D.	I stimulated the participants to share their thoughts and questions about the upcor and debriefing and reassured them that they wouldn't be shamed or humiliated in	Ū		

## Elements 2 through 6 assess a debriefing.

Ele	ement 2	Ratir	ng Elem	ent 2	
l m	naintained an engaging context for learning		_		_
	Behavior		Behav	ior Score	,
A.	I clarified the purpose of the debriefing, what was expected of the participants, an	d my rol	e (as		
	the instructor) in the debriefing				
B.	I acknowledged concerns about realism and helped the participants learn even th	ough the	)		
	case(s) were simulated				
C.	I showed respect towards the participants				
D.	I ensured the focus was on learning and not on making people feel bad about ma	king mis	takes		
E.	I empowered participants to share thoughts and emotions without fear of being sh	named or	7		
	humiliated				

Ele	Element 3		Rating Elemen	
Is	tructured the debriefing in an organized way		-	
	Behavior		Behav	ior Score
Α.	A. I guided the conversation such that it progressed logically rather than jumping around from point to point			
B. Near the beginning of the debriefing, I encouraged participants to share their genuine reactions				
	to the case(s) and I took their remarks seriously			
C.	In the middle, I helped the participants analyze actions and thought processes as	we revie	ewed	
	the case(s)			
D.	At the end of the debriefing, there was a summary phase where I helped tie obser	vations		
	together and relate the case(s) to ways the participants could improve their future	clinical		
	practice			

Element 4 I provoked in-depth discussions that led	I them to reflect on Rating Element	1
their performance		
Behavior	Behavior Sco	re
A. I used concrete examples—not just abstract or generalize	zed comments—to get participants to	
think about their performance		
B. My point of view was clear; I didn't force participants to guess what I was thinking		
C. I listened and made people feel heard by trying to includ	de everyone, paraphrasing, and using	
non-verbal actions like eye contact and nodding etc		
D. I used video or recorded data to support analysis and lea	earning	
E. If someone got upset during the debriefing, I was respectful and constructive in trying to help		
them deal with it		

Element 5 I identified what they did well or poorly – and why		ig Element	5
Behavior Beh			
A. I provided concrete feedback to participants on their performance or that of the team based on			
accurate statements of fact and my honest point of view			
B. I helped explore what participants were thinking or trying to accomplish at key moments			

	Element 6 I helped them see how to improve or how to sustain good performance  Rating Element 6 I helped them see how to improve or how to sustain good performance		ent 6	
	Behavior Beh			
A.	A. I helped participants learn how to improve weak areas or how to repeat good performance			
B.	B. I was knowledgeable and used that knowledge to help participants see how to perform well in			
the future				
C.	I made sure we covered the most important topics			

 $Copyright, \ Center \ for \ Medical \ Simulation, \ \underline{www.harvardmedsim.org}, \ 2011$ 

## Reflection on Reflection Workshop Bibliography

Eppich WJ, Hunt EA, Duval-Arnould JM, Siddall VJ, Cheng A. Structuring Feedback and Debriefing to Achieve Mastery Learning Goals: Academic Medicine. 2015 Nov;90(11):1501–8.

Kolbe M, Rudolph JW. What's the headline on your mind right now? How reflection guides simulation-based faculty development in a master class. BMJ Simulation and Technology Enhanced Learning. 2018 Feb 1;0:1–7.

Rudolph JW, Foldy EG, Robinson T, Kendall S, Taylor SS, Simon R. Helping Without Harming: The Instructor's Feedback Dilemma in Debriefing—A Case Study. Simulation in Healthcare: The Journal of the Society for Simulation in Healthcare. 2013 Oct;8(5):304–16.

Simon R, Raemer DB, Rudolph JW. Debriefing Assessment for Simulation in Healthcare (DASH)© – Instructor Version, Long Form. Center for Medical Simulation, Boston, Massachusetts. Available at: https://harvardmedsim.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/DASH.IV.LongForm.2012.05.pdf. 2012. English, French, Japanese, Spanish. Accessed June 8, 2018.

Yalom I, Brown S, Bloch S. The Written Summary as a Group Psychotherapy Technique. Archives of General Psychiatry. 1975 May 1;32(5):605.