Evaluating Facilitator Competency:
What Have We Learned?

INACSL CONFERENCE, 2016

Kim Leighton, PhD, RN, ANEF
Vickie Mudra, BS
Gregory Gilbert, EdD, MSPH, PStat(r)
INACSL is an accredited ANCC provider.
• Conflict of Interest
  – Kim Leighton, Vickie Mudra, & Greg Gilbert report no conflict of interest
  – Julia Greenawalt (INACSL Conference Administrator & Nurse Planner) reports no conflict of interest
  – Leann Horsley (INACSL Lead Nurse Planner) reports no conflict of interest

• Successful Completion
  – Attend 90% of session
  – Complete online evaluation
Upon completion of this presentation, participants will be able to:

1. Discuss rubric development, rationale, and challenges
2. Explain use of G theory to analyze data
3. Apply rubric to various behaviors and situations
4. Utilize the FCR to guide faculty development
• Background
  – Need to evaluate training but no tool existed

• Purpose
  – Identify competent facilitators and provide adequate resources to others

• Theoretical Framework
  – Benner’s Novice-to-Expert Theory

• Foundation
  – INACSL Standards of Best Practice: Simulation
Tool Development

• Identify Concepts
  – Preparation, Prebriefing, Facilitation, Debriefing, Evaluation

• Identify Components

• Presentations and Feedback
  – Conferences, workshops
  – Expert panel

• Compression of Levels

• Use of Likert-Scale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPTS</th>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>BEGINNER (1) TO ADVANCED BEGINNER (2)</th>
<th>COMPETENT (3)</th>
<th>PROFICIENT (4) TO EXPERT (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>Identifies need for small groups at the bedside</td>
<td>Demonstrates creativity in scheduling approaches</td>
<td>Schedules participants for optimal learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of learning</td>
<td>Correlates objectives for all domains of learning to the level of the participants education or experience</td>
<td>Incorporates objectives that integrate holistic patient-centered care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informs lab staff of plans to conduct simulation</td>
<td>Collaborates with lab staff to ensure learning objectives will be met</td>
<td>Reviews prior simulated clinical experiences (SCEs) to ensure improvements made in learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Level (e.g. environment, simulation modality)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intends to use materials/simulation modality based on own comfort/ease</td>
<td>Plans for a level of fidelity that will meet the desired outcomes</td>
<td>Designs experience to closely replicate environment of care in accordance with learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply/Equipment Availability</td>
<td>Lists supplies and equipment needed for SCE</td>
<td>Organizes learning materials according to priority of need</td>
<td>Develops or enhances materials to allow learners to critically think</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informs participants of any preparation requirements prior to arrival to SCE</td>
<td>Determines whether participants are prepared for the SCE</td>
<td>Analyzes whether level of preparation is sufficient to optimize learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intends to evaluate whether the participants were satisfied with the SCE</td>
<td>Plans to gather data to evaluate the experience, facilitator, and/or learning outcomes</td>
<td>Plans to use psychometrically sound evaluation tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G Theory

• Multidimensional vs. unidimensional
• More complete analysis
• Identifies sources of variation
• Can be used for allocation of resources
• Analog to reliability coefficients

• *The estimated proportion of observed score variance due to the universe-score variance is .XX (the G coefficient).*
CHALLENGES!
Challenges

• Concurrent rollout of other initiatives
• Mission = Teaching
• Staff evaluating faculty
• Performance, being observed
• Faculty development planning vs evaluation
• Summer! Holidays! Exams! . . . .
Challenges Continued!

• IRB completion did not equal participation
  – Key faculty left positions
  – Faculty supported---then didn’t participate
  – Technology issues

• Some participants did not view entire webinars

• Manual processes

• Frequent follow-up required
EXEMPLARS
Where Are We Now?

• Participants
  – Five US schools
  – One school outside US

• Data collection ends JUNE 30, 2016!!

• Manuscript submission

• Survey dissemination
• Using the Facilitator Competency Rubric

• Facilitator Development

• Facilitator Evaluation
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